

Appendix

Crime by Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as the Senate considers legislation relating to our postal services, I believe it pertinent to call attention to the attempted efforts to cheat unsuspecting folks out of money by use of the mails.

The Congress, I believe, should well consider not only stricter enforcement of existing laws, but further examination of the situation to see whether or not new laws are necessary to prevent this preying upon the public.

Recently, the Green Bay Press-Gazette published an article by J. W. Davis entitled "Mail Crooks Prey on Unfortunate—Schemes Exposed."

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette, Sept. 16, 1962]

MAIL CROOKS PREY ON UNFORTUNATE— SCHEMES EXPOSED

(By J. W. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—Some mail fraud crooks are vicious in small ways. They'd cheat a crippled shutin or a poor widow.

Some are extortionists who would even fake a nude photograph to make it appear that a young woman posed obscenely.

Some of the cheat-by-mail promoters are big operators, out to defraud ordinarily hard-headed businessmen.

"The variety of mail fraud promotions is without limit," says Henry B. Montague, Chief Postal Inspector.

"Persons in all walks of life are potential victims."

The number, as well as the variety, of frauds has reached new peaks. So have convictions, engineered by Montague's inspectors with help from the Justice Department's Criminal Division and U.S. attorneys across the country.

MANY SENT TO JAIL

In the last fiscal year there were 524 convictions for mail fraud, a record. Jail sentences of varying length and fines totaling \$347,000 were imposed in these cases. Investigations also resulted in the restitution of \$1,414,000 to victims.

Montague, 50, a quiet but authoritative sort of man who began his career as a postal clerk in Poughkeepsie, N.Y., talked to a reporter about new and old trends in mail fraud.

Take first the advance fee racket under which, Montague said, millions of dollars have been fleeced from businessmen. It is new, at least in its widespread scope.

Montague pulled out one of his official reports to explain how it works:

"Criminals operating across State lines attempt to induce the owners of small businesses to sell their businesses or real estate or to secure business loans.

"The victim is required to pay an advance fee as evidence of good faith. Oral assurances are given that the fee would be returned if the desired services are not rendered.

"The signed contract, however, reveals in the fine print that the only services provided by the promoter are to bring the victim's needs to the attention of various institutions."

EIGHT THOUSAND BUSINESSMEN BILKED BY ONE FIRM

North American Associates, Inc., in Denver, he figured, collected more than \$2 million from 8,000 businessmen this way.

Another scheme that has slipped into widespread operation lately is based on imitating, very closely and very crookedly, the names of reputable business firms.

A crook adopts a firm name resembling that of a well-known company. Sometimes he spells it just a little differently; sometimes he simply uses "Corp." in the title, instead of the usual "Co."

Then he orders merchandise on credit from wholesale houses or elsewhere. Clerks in the supplying firms are deceived by the name on the letterhead or order form and ship out the goods without any question. The crook sells the merchandise in a hurry and then disappears.

To possible future targets of these schemes, Montague suggests:

"Have some knowledge of the people you are doing business with."

It's as simple as that.

Persistent mail fraud schemes that Montague and his men run up against are fake charities, insurance rackets, home repair schemes, real estate promotions, vending and knitting machine swindles, work-at-home schemes of various types and medical cure-alls including fake cures for cancer, tuberculosis, and arthritis.

Postmaster General E. Edward Day has this to say: "Thousands of sharpies annually pry hundreds of millions of dollars out of a gullible and unsuspecting American public through worthless get-well-quick schemes."

In one Louisiana operation called the Scientific Life X-Ray Service, the public paid an estimated \$25,000 for voodoo powders and oils. Postal inspectors had trouble lining up witnesses since victims believed the promoter would hex them if they testified.

The following, picked at random from the inspection service's files, demonstrate the variety of cases that pop up from day to day:

Shut-in victims: Work-at-home shutins were the particular target of one Long Beach, Calif., promoter who had a scheme he advertised as paying up to \$162 a week for addressing envelopes. Victims sent \$10 each—in some cases \$16—"and received several pages of instructions without value." The promoter got 8 years in prison.

Mail order deal: At San Bruno, Calif., one Alfred Joseph Crowe was convicted of inducing 53 victims to give him \$41,000 for contracts to start their own mail order businesses. The victims were promised fabulous profits, if they would invest \$550 to \$1,200, but none of them "made enough to pay the postage on the material they mailed," the postal service said. Crowe got 2 years.

Lonely hearts: From Boyerton, Pa., a man and woman who operated a lonely hearts

club corresponded with persons in 25 States and by means of false pretenses and misrepresentations, including promises of marriage, obtained a total of \$2,500. Each also obtained a 2-year prison term.

Big joiner: In Philadelphia, one man joined record and book clubs in a wholesale way, using fictitious names, and obtaining merchandise valued at \$5,300 without payment. "On occasion," it was reported, "there were so many packages for delivery to the residence that the mail carrier was unable to carry them."

Beauty treatment: At Las Vegas, Nev., a self-styled beauty scientist was arrested on charges of peddling an allegedly dangerous facial rejuvenation treatment. Postal inspectors estimated that approximately \$1 million was paid by 500 subscribers to her treatment. Some of them filed disfigurement suits which resulted in judgment awards of \$186,000. The "scientist" was released on \$5,000 bond.

Tax refunds: In Rochester, N.Y., postal inspectors, Secret Service agents and Internal Revenue agents swooped down on a man accused of filing false income tax refund claims under assumed names. They said he admitted obtaining \$20,000 in refunds. He is now out on bond.

Sex pill: In less than a year, Irving Greene, of Jersey City, N.J., took in an estimated \$120,000 from the sale of Tigron, described by inspectors as a worthless sex rejuvenator pill. He was given a suspended sentence and fined \$750.

Knitting and sewing machine promotions: Thousands of housewives have been victimized by promoters of this scheme who induce them to purchase machines at exorbitant prices ranging up to \$500 upon representations that they could supplement their incomes while working at home through the sale of garments.

"The promoters promise to purchase the garments at a substantial profit. Many victims execute chattel mortgages to pay for the machines and lose their household possessions when the expected income does not materialize."

(The knit machine scheme occurred in the Green Bay area several years ago. It followed essentially the outline given by Montague. Several indictments against operators of the organization selling the machines were returned in Milwaukee Federal court, and civil suits were started in Brown County courts to recover the purchasers' costs.)

"The old 'Spanish prisoner' swindle still pops up about every 18 months," Montague said.

In this hardly changed version a fraud that goes back 300 years or more, air mail letters go out from some city in Mexico or elsewhere in Latin America (they used to originate in Spain) to a select list of dentists, physicians, or lawyers, or the like, in the United States. The promoters want professional people who might be expected to have money.

CLAIMS VALUABLES HIDDEN

The signer represents himself as an ex-banker, who has been unjustly jailed. He writes that before he was arrested he hid away a trunk full of valuables; \$300,000 is the usual valuation.

Help him bribe his way out of prison, the writer says, and he'll split the contents of the trunk with you—just send the bribe money fast. It seems next to impossible that anyone would fall for this, but the very

A7143

A7144

fact that the scheme persists would indicate it still pays off.

Montague has a special contempt for those who practice the old mail-after-death scheme. These operators watch for death announcements and then quickly send out COD packages, addressed to the deceased.

Sorrowful survivors—perhaps a widow, son, or daughter—will often reason that "this is one of the last things he wanted, and we will pay for it."

Who Deprives You of Your Rights?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, with all the constant talk we hear, particularly in Congress, of our rights, it is well to be reminded of the fact that every right carries with it a reciprocal duty.

I am happy to call the attention of our colleagues to the following statement issued by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America as the Jews of the world approach the beginning of their New Year, Rosh Hashanah. I believe this statement is very meaningful to all people, regardless of their religious persuasion. It is basic to all monotheistic religions.

I also wish to take this time to extend to all of our colleagues my very best wishes for health and happiness in the years ahead, and for a recess that I hope we can soon take, during which they can first make an appropriate accounting to their constituents for their service here, then have a well deserved rest, so that they may continue to serve their people and our Nation with renewed vigor.

The statement is as follows:

WHO DEPRIVES YOU OF YOUR RIGHTS

You have the right to think and speak your mind, the right to have a family, the right to choose where to live, the right to work, the right to a good life, the right to worship God.

We all realize how much these, and many other of our deepest rights, are threatened from many parts of the world, today. And we're ready to struggle in every way possible to protect our rights from being taken from us by others.

Yet we don't always see how the security and enjoyment of our rights can be taken from us—by ourselves.

Let us examine some of the inevitable reasons for this:

There is no way, for example, to enjoy our right to a family, without fulfilling our duty to care for our children.

For how can anyone expect to get fulfillment and pleasure from his children if they are not raised well?

It is no different with other rights. All experience, history and tradition make clear that no right stands alone.

We can enjoy a right only by accepting the duty which is its other side.

THE RIGHT TO THINK AND SPEAK OUR MIND

This is inseparable from our duty to listen; to give those around us the same rights of expression we want so much for ourselves. When we do not listen, how can we expect others to let us speak?

THE RIGHT TO HAVE A FAMILY

We make this right empty and meaningless if we keep postponing the time we spend with our own family. It is a familiar delusion to think that our greatest duty to our family is to provide those we love with material security, however important this may be. They need our presence and our active love still more.

THE RIGHT TO CHOOSE WHERE TO LIVE

Whenever we self-righteously complain and discriminate against our neighbors—whenever we fail our duties as a good neighbor—we undermine the very foundation of our rights to choose where to live.

THE RIGHT TO WORK

In the complexities of modern society, each of us has the right to earn a living for himself and his family, in ways consistent with his talents. But we fail our duty when we do not give, to whatever we do, a full measure of integrity and effort. And in failing this duty we defeat our right to work.

THE RIGHT TO A GOOD LIFE

No one can give us a good life. We are given only the opportunity; there still remain our duty and actions to achieve it.

And we advance ourselves whenever we decide to reflect for a time, rather than to keep rushing through life; whenever we decide to give ourselves to a community action instead of limiting ourselves to giving only money; whenever we decide to seek wisdom from those who can teach us—and don't put off the reading of a book.

THE RIGHT TO WORSHIP GOD

We see everywhere how much the evil in human affairs comes from the tendency to mistake a part of life—power or status or possessions—for the whole of it.

We can make the same error in our beliefs. For our right to worship God is also our duty not to fall into the idolatry of worshipping any part of His creation as though it were the whole.

It is clear, then, that to enjoy our rights we must fulfill our duties. They are the only path to the full possession of our rights. Moreover, we can be sure of living in a society where each individual's rights are insured only when we achieve a society where all are concerned with their duties, and only then.

Proposed Soviet Trawler Port In Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in today's Philadelphia Inquirer be inserted in the Appendix of the Record.

The views expressed in the editorial I endorse. I would hope that the administration will soon come up with a positive policy in answer to this newest Communist threat to our hemisphere.

The editorial follows:

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

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Sept. 27, 1962]

"TRAWLER PORT" A POOR DISGUISE

If anyone but the Soviets had promised to build a port for Cuba—and to turn over an

unspecified number of trawlers for Cuban use—and if anyone but Fidel Castro were nominally in charge of Cuba, we probably could pass it off as progress and get set for more fishing competition.

Unfortunately, it is the Soviet Union which has made the promise and it is the Reds' bearded puppet, Castro, to whom the promise has been made. This changes things.

Russia seems to be getting a reputation as an ever-willing port-builder for other people—other people in strategic spots around the world. They have built a base for Yemen, right on the Red Sea lifeline. There are reports Morocco will have a Russian aquatic project near Gibraltar. The fact that, if these ports should turn out to be naval bases, and the Russians retain use or control of them, they could seriously damage Western shipping seems more than a coincidence.

So, too, the projected trawler port in Havana Bay for Cuba—in neat scoring position to choke off traffic to the Panama Canal and north-south inter-American trade, including United States-Puerto Rico shipping and Venezuela oil tankers.

The additional fact that no Russian fishing has ever been done in the Caribbean or even in that latitude of the Atlantic Ocean, lends all the more suspicion to this latest maneuver. The United States is well advised, indeed, to keep a close eye on it. Increased and closer patrolling and scrutiny by sea and air will obviously be needed. An outright refusal to put up with it, based on the Monroe Doctrine and our national interests, would not be out of order, either.

However, there are some intermediate steps toward stopping the tremendous flow of Russian arms, men, and supplies to Cuba which this Government has not taken yet—so such plain speaking is probably not even considered at this time. Although we have literally begged our NATO Allies to get their ships out of the "supply Cuba" trade, only West Germany has promised, so far, to do anything about it.

And, curiously, American ships which fly flags of convenience have not been seriously inconvenienced by our national needs, nor have foreign ships which take Communist trade to Cuba, then stop off in America to pick up return loads for Europe. These shipments could be curbed by U.S. Government action—and probably should be.

We are not happy with the prospect of a Soviet naval base in Cuba. It is an outrageous affront not only to the United States but to this entire hemisphere. A Communist strong point at that point bodes no good for any of Cuba's neighbors.

Imagine what Hitler could have done to us with a base in Havana.

Negroes Seeking Vote Have Trouble in Delta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Washington Post of September 12 tells the story of what is happening to Negro citizens in Mississippi who are peaceably seeking to exercise that fundamental right of American citizenship which undergirds and is the essence of American government. That right is the right to vote, to be a partici-

What a Difference a Few Months and an Election Can Make

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for some years we have heard about the deficit in the Post Office Department. Recent action by the Senate and House Committees on Post Office and Civil Service recommends an increase in postage rates which has the support of the administration. In the Eisenhower administration they opposed the same proposed increase in postage which they now seek. We are all familiar with the efforts of the steel industry to increase its price about 4 percent to cover increased costs which met with vociferous opposition from the administration. Revenue from stamps goes to the Federal Treasury—an increase in steel goes to private industry. Both affect us all.

The inconsistency of the administration's support of and opposition to Government and private industry is pointed up in an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune today. I suggest all Members read it. The editorial follows:

POSTAL STAMPS AND STEEL

The Senate Post Office Committee has approved the administration's bill to raise postal revenues by about \$600 million and to raise wages of Government employees generally by an even greater amount. A similar bill has already been approved by the House and higher postal rates next January seem almost certain.

It would be a shame, however, to let the administration raise the price of postal service without mentioning the price of steel.

Mr. Kennedy marshaled all of the force at his disposal last spring to prevent an increase in the price of steel, just as he has done to obtain an increase in the price of postal service.

His reason for opposing the steel price increase was partly that the industry tended to be monopolistic. The Post Office is certainly a greater monopoly.

He said that the price of steel affected us all. Certainly the price of postage affects us all.

The increase proposed by a few of the leading steel companies amounted to about 4 percent. The postal rate increase will amount to about 20 percent. First class mail will go from 4 to 5 cents; postcards from 3 to 4 cents, and air mail from 7 to 8 cents. The estimated \$600 million increase in revenue would amount to almost exactly 20 percent of last year's revenue from domestic postal service.

The 4 percent steel price increase would have come on top of an increase of about 19 percent over the average for the years 1954-57. The 20 percent postal rate increase comes on top of an even greater increase in 1958.

We do not object to higher pay for postal workers, who receive considerably less than the average Government worker, or to making the Post Office Department self-supporting. But the administration is pushing hypocrisy to an extreme when it demands for a Government department what it has denied to private industry.

The chief difference between selling a postage stamp and selling an ingot of steel, we may conclude, is not in size or in weight or in the economics of the transaction; it is political. The money received from the postage stamp goes to the Government, hence an increase in revenue is good. The money received for an ingot of steel goes to private industry (except for the Government's tax cut); hence, it is bad.

By the same token the Democrats opposed, during Mr. Eisenhower's administration, the same increase in postal rates which they now seek. To increase Post Office revenue in a Republican administration, it seems, is bad; to increase it in a Democratic administration is good.

This sort of logic wouldn't stand up even in a prekindergarten class.

Will Family-Sized Farm Survive?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the farm bill, adopted by Congress, holds little promise of substantially improving the economic outlook in agriculture.

Because of this nonpromising outlook, the Congress, as well as the farmers themselves, must further explore to see what can be done to improve the farm economy.

Unless this is done, the diminished farm income may have dramatically adverse effects on the whole economy. Moreover, the trend will create increasingly serious problems for the farmers themselves, particularly the family-size farm.

Recently, the Wisconsin Agriculturist published a special report by Ralph S. Yohe entitled "Will Family-Size Farm Survive?"

Reflecting thoughtfully upon the trends and problems in agriculture, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Wisconsin Agriculturist, Sept. 15, 1962]

WILL FAMILY-SIZED FARM SURVIVE?

(By Ralph S. Yohe)

Wisconsin farm folks move off the farm at the rate of 12 families a day. We lose 250 farms a day in the United States.

If the trend of the last 10 years continues, we will have 600,000 fewer commercial farms in the United States in 1970 than we had in 1959, says a recent report by the Agriculture Committee of the National Planning Association. National Planning Association is an independent, nongovernment planning organization that watches the economic front.

Here is the percentage of the U.S. labor force in farming over the years:

	Percent
1850.....	64
1900.....	38
1930.....	22
1960.....	9
1975 (estimate).....	6

Fewer farmers can feed our growing population because of dramatic increases in farm efficiency. This pickup in production per man in agriculture has not been matched by industry, says the National Planning Association report.

Output per man hour in farming went up over 5 percent per year from 1950 to 1960. Manufacturing gained less than 3 percent per year. All production increased slightly over 2 percent.

The fruits of this increased efficiency has been passed on to the American public. One hour of factory work would buy:

	In 1947-49	In 1960
Quarts of milk.....	6.5	8.1
Dozen eggs.....	1.8	3.6
Pork cuts.....pounds..	2.2	3.6
Choice beef.....pounds..	1.9	2.5

What reward has this brought the farmer? He is smothered in surpluses. His income has gone down since World War II, while his city neighbors' income has gone up. Hundreds of thousands of farm people are being pushed into cities already plagued by unemployment.

What will happen during the next 10 years? More farm people will move to town, the National Planning Association says, if they can find jobs. The farms left will be larger. Many of them will come from combining smaller present day farms. Some smaller farms will grow bigger.

Many of the farm people trekking to the city will be poorly trained for city or town jobs. In 1959 farm people 18 years or older had 3.5 years less schooling than the rest of the people. Sixty percent of the farm people had only 8 years or less schooling.

What about the the medium-sized family farm? Will it be crowded out by still bigger farms? Farms selling more than \$40,000 worth of products a year are growing at a faster rate than farms selling \$10,000 to \$39,000. Yet the \$40,000 or more farms are less than 5 percent of our total commercial farms.

John M. Brewster of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, qualifies family farms as those hiring the equivalent of 1½ full-time men per year. If this is truly a family farm, then the family farm selling \$10,000 or more products a year looks in good shape.

Why aren't the big boys taking over? They can't get farm labor, and if they hire labor at industrial wages, it doesn't pay.

"The family farmer quite frequently is willing to take a little less money than he might get in town," says the National Planning Association report. "When a period of low prices comes along, the family farm can out-survive the big farm with a heavy payroll."

Moderate farms still have some advantage over very big ones. Beyond 350 acres you don't gain much on a grain farm. "For practical purposes, farms larger than 350 acres probably have about the same cost per dollar of crops produced," says Earl Heady, Iowa State University.

Another farm management expert says, "We have little reason to believe that any substantial reduction in unit cost is achieved by most types of farming beyond those farms having gross sales round \$25,000."

Here's the way the National Planning Association committee foresees the future of the family farm.

By 1970 we'll have about 1.8 million commercial farms—600,000 less than in 1959—if the trend of the last 10 years continues.

If unemployment in town creeps up because of automation, the total number of commercial farms may show little change. Small farmers will share poverty out in the country instead of looking for jobs that don't exist in town.

If unemployment declines, if farm income holds up, if we have special efforts to help some small farmers expand their farming and other small farmers to train for city jobs, then we could have 1.5 million fewer commercial farms by 1970. It would mean a larger number of family farms with a reasonable income.

The greatest menace to the family farm is not the growth of oversized farms. Rather, it is the danger that city unemployment should rise. Coupled with farm surpluses, unemployment could push many now profitable family farms down into the ranks of the unprofitable, says the report.

Kind of farm	Number of farms	
	1949	1959
Family farms (less than 1½ man-years of hired labor)—		
With less than \$10,000 marketings	3,100,000	1,600,000
With \$10,000 or more marketings	334,000	680,000
Larger than family farms (hiring more than 1½ man-years labor)	150,000	234,000

Responsibility in Cuban Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to place in the RECORD the following interesting analysis by David Lawrence entitled "Responsibility in Cuban Affair":

RESPONSIBILITY IN CUBAN AFFAIR—ACCOUNT OF COMMAND DECISIONS IN THE INVASION ATTEMPT IS GIVEN

President Kennedy in his speeches likes to refer to his troubles—particularly Cuba—as having been "inherited" from the Eisenhower administration. Former President Truman says in his political outbursts that Mr. Eisenhower was a "lazy" President. The real question is not how much time a President gives to golf or yachting or campaigning or social events, but how he uses the time he does give to official business—the kind of decisions he makes.

Members of Congress have in the last few days put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a lengthy article that was published 2 weeks ago in U.S. News & World Report giving a comprehensive account of the fateful decision President Kennedy made when he first withdrew and then—when it was too late—actually approved air support for the Cuban exiles in their invasions of their homeland in April 1961.

Ever since that time there have been attempts to blame the whole fiasco on the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff or on the Central Intelligence Agency. But President Kennedy told the truth when he himself assumed full responsibility. What hasn't been generally known, however, is how he came to make the mistake he did. The magazine article was the result of many weeks of investigation and research among official sources, particularly among persons who were in the know at the time. Certain administration officials have since conceded the accuracy of the article. It reads in part as follows:

"A fateful decision, made by President Kennedy on Sunday, April 16, 1961, is rising now to plague the United States. On that Sunday evening, an armed force of Cuban

refugees, trained by the United States, was at sea, sailing secretly to invade Fidel Castro's Cuba. The American President, a few hours earlier, had given final approval to that invasion.

"Only the day before, on April 15, a surprise attack by B-26 bombing planes belonging to the invaders had knocked out all but seven planes of Castro's tiny air force.

"A second air strike was scheduled for Monday morning, April 17. It was to coincide with the landing of the invaders. It was supposed to finish the job of wiping out Castro's planes and to provide air support for the invasion.

"Secure in the assurance of air support, the invaders went ashore in the early-morning darkness of Monday, April 17. Their landing was successful: 1,400 armed men reached the beaches of a place called the Bay of Pigs.

"In the battle that followed, Castro's troops suffered heavy casualties. Castro's tanks, coming up to the battle, were sitting ducks for an attack by air. Confidently, the little invading force waited for its air support to arrive. Its leaders had assurance of that support. It was provided in the pre-invasion planning.

"Hours before, on Sunday evening, a small but potent force of B-26's was sitting in readiness on an airfield 500 miles away (in a Latin American country), waiting to take off for the Bay of Pigs. Those were planes of the invasion force, with Cuban pilots. But those planes didn't take off. The reason: President Kennedy forbade their use.

"When the invasion began, in the pre-dawn hours of Monday, the need of air support became apparent. Worried, the non-military officials in Washington who were running the invasion went to President Kennedy for a new decision. They suggested that U.S. Navy planes from a U.S. aircraft carrier be used to fly air support for the invaders.

"In the planning of the invasion—planning begun under the Eisenhower administration—the Joint Chiefs of Staff had recommended the use of air support. President Kennedy vetoed the idea. He insisted that there was to be no direct American participation. Now, with the outcome possibly hanging in the balance, military and non-military men joined in renewing the plea.

"Once again, in the early morning hours of Monday, April 17, President Kennedy made a fateful decision. He said 'no' to the use of U.S. planes.

"With no air support, the invasion soon began to run into trouble * * *. In the face of this situation, President Kennedy took the wraps off the Cuban fliers. On Monday noon he said they could go into action. But bad weather interfered at first. Finally, an air strike was set up for early Wednesday.

"On Tuesday, however, the situation continued to deteriorate * * *. By Tuesday night, April 18, a crisis was clearly at hand. Once again there was an appeal to President Kennedy. On the night the President, in white tie and tails, was playing host at a congressional reception in the White House. He left the party to confer with his advisers—both civilian and military. Again it was proposed to use U.S. planes to save the invasion.

"This time the President relented slightly. He consented to using one carrier's planes for just 1 hour on Wednesday morning—just long enough to provide cover for the invaders to land some supplies and for their planes to make a quick strike. U.S. planes, still, were not to attack land targets.

"Even this limited plan for U.S. aid went awry. There were communications mixups. The Cuban fliers mistimed their strike. The U.S. planes never got into action. And anyway, it developed, it was too late. By sun-

down of Wednesday, April 19, the invasion was a failure. The invaders inflicted close to 2,000 casualties on Castro's forces, suffered only a hundred or so casualties of their own. But without air support, the invaders could not hold out. Most of them wound up as Castro captives."

Criticism and analysis in retrospect by those who know the whole story is concentrated today on one point—full authority should be given in advance and a military operation should be handled by military men near the battle scene and not many hundreds of miles away in the White House or even in the Pentagon.

Judge Joe Wicks Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a letter by Judge Joe Wicks, retired, on the general policies that should be followed with reference to our American Indians, with special reference to the problems in the State of Washington.

Judge Wicks is an enrolled member of the Cherokee Tribe, has had an illustrious life as a lawyer and superior court judge in Okanogan County, Wash. He knows what he is talking about and his comments are well worth reading by all who are constructively interested in Indian affairs:

[From the Omack (Wash.) Chronicle, Sept. 13, 1962]

END SEGREGATION OF INDIANS

(By Joseph Wicks, superior court judge, retired)

It is true that I have some knowledge of the issue of State jurisdiction over our Indian citizens other than my contact with it as superior court judge of this district for approximately 15 years.

In fact, I have been in personal contact with the issue all of my life. This is by reason of the fact that I am an enrolled member of the Cherokee Indians, one of the five civilized tribes of the State of Oklahoma.

On the issue of jurisdiction, I have never been able to see eye to eye with the policies of the Federal Government in its dealing with the Indian and his property and have very often found myself at variance with many people of Indian blood, wherein they have sought to have the Federal Government to continue its supervision and jurisdiction over the Indian and his property.

The fact that the Indian was here before the coming of the white man, the black man, and the Oriental, does not, in and of itself so far as his rights, powers, privileges, responsibilities and obligations, make him any different from the other American citizens.

Specifically, it is my observation that in many instances the more vocal Indian is the first to demand the benefits provided under State laws for its citizens, but is often reluctant to assume the responsibilities those laws impose upon its beneficiaries. This attitude is wrong in any segment of our people.

I find among the people of Indian blood the learned, the intelligent, the stupid, the industrious, and the lazy, just as are found in

nected disabilities. I supported legislation which increases by some 9 percent the compensation of service-connected disabilities and supported the law which increased basic allowances for living quarters for members of the Armed Forces and, of course, I approved the act which increased payments to veterans' widows and blinded veterans.

NATURAL RESOURCES

I approved the 10-year comprehensive program of oceanographic research and service, as well as the water pollution control program and the study for saline water conversion.

NEW YORK

As chairman of the steering committee, a bipartisan group consisting of New York Representatives and Senators, I have devoted a good deal of my time and efforts to obtain defense contracts for the State of New York. In this, the steering committee has had an appreciable degree of success.

The steering committee, under my leadership, likewise succeeded in having the United States participate in the New York World's Fair. We succeeded in having an appropriation of \$17 million granted by the Department of Commerce for the defrayal of expenses in connection with Federal participation in the New York World's Fair. I am both pleased and proud to be a member of the board of directors of this fair.

The full weight of the steering committee, as I noted before, has been thrown into increasing New York's share of the U.S. defense business. I have been in constant communication with the Secretaries of Defense, Labor, and Commerce and with the General Services Administration to stimulate the channel of Federal contracts into areas of labor surplus. The steering committee has worked toward the introduction and passage into law creating a New York New Jersey Transportation Agency to serve New York's transportation needs.

We have worked for the transfer of 1,265 acres of the former Sampson Air Force Base to the State for its use in park and recreational facilities.

The steering committee has prevented withdrawal of facilities of the Brooklyn Army Terminal and has prevented Air Force removal of missile-ship work from the Bethlehem Steel Corp. shipyards in Brooklyn, and we have pressed for increased appropriations for the Long Island beach erosion and hurricane protection project arising out of the March 1962 storm damage.

You will note in the above list the enactment of Public Law 87-409, to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip 7 in the city of New York for use by the U.S. Army.

I have devoted additional time to the problems of the Brooklyn Navy Yard which are many and which are complex. I have not ceased my labors to see that work is channeled into the Brooklyn Navy Yard. I have sought to do all I could do to prevent a reduction in force.

This, of course, is an abbreviated account of my activities in the 87th Congress. I beg to remind you of some of

the basic legislation which I have authored during the 20 Congresses of which I have served. Among such legislation you will find the Federal Register Act; the Celler-Kefauver antimerger bill; the Displaced Persons Act; the Foreign Trade Zone Act; the Celler-Sparkman Act providing for the finality of the Clayton Act orders; the Celler-O'Mahoney Automobile Act; the Federal Tort Claims Act, and many others.

ADMINISTRATIVE WORK

I have taken a deep interest in each of my constituents who have approached me on personal problems of their own. Thus I have been in the fortunate position of being able to help thousands of my constituents. Daily, my office is busy with problems of veterans and their families. Pleas concerning immigrants are carefully perused. Loans for small businessmen are successfully prosecuted through the Small Business Administration. I have aided scores and scores of people in their quests for housing apartments. Pleas of Federal post office and civil service employees never go unheeded. I have secured for New York City numerous public buildings, such as post offices and public works structures.

I was a member of the platform committee at the Democratic National Convention at Los Angeles in 1960 that fashioned the platform upon which President Kennedy was elected. I stand four square behind that platform, and I fully support the policies of President John F. Kennedy.

I have served you for almost 40 years. If it is your wish, I shall continue to serve you with the same vigor, with the same interest in your welfare and the welfare of our country, and with the same pride I have in being the Representative of a district that is alive, not only to domestic affairs but also alive to the great issues that confront us as leaders of the free world.

I do hope that upon the above record I will be approved by you for reelection.

Inaction on Cuba May Be Worst Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Dean Dusk has disclosed that the Kennedy administration will not permit Cuba to export communism to other countries in the Western Hemisphere. He has stated that to accomplish this purpose we will, along with taking certain other steps, intercept shipments of munitions and war materials outbound from Cuba to any other American Republic. The Kennedy administration has thus put its stamp of approval on the implementation of the doctrine of contraband, or search and seizure. The Secretary of State has enunciated a modern application of a peaceful procedure available to us un-

der the established principles of international law.

The foregoing position has met with almost unanimous support in the Congress. The only quarrel which many of us have concerns the point at which we should invoke the doctrine of contraband. Many of us feel that we should use this international legal tool now to peaceably prevent the further flow of Communist warmaking capability into Cuba. Last year the State Department advised us that Castro then had far more arms than were needed for the defense of Cuba, and thus the clear intent of the present massive Communist military buildup can only be to launch armed subversive aggression against free republics to the south of us. Many of us fear that continued inaction can only make our ultimate position less tenable in the eyes of the world and more hazardous for the protection of our own freedom and security.

The distinguished authority, Marguerite Higgins, in the following article taken from the Minneapolis Star of September 26, faces up to the probable ultimate consequences of our present policy:

INACTION ON CUBA MAY BE WORST COURSE

(By Marguerite Higgins)

UNITED NATIONS.—Said the Latin American: "If the United States were to do something effective to checkmate Soviet intervention in Cuba, my government would congratulate you privately and lacerate you publicly."

This quotation, noted on a brief visit to the United Nations, was not offered as a scientific sampling of opinion. Still it did not deviate from roughly similar sentiments expressed along embassy row in Washington.

Therefore it raised some interesting questions about the "new realism" in American foreign policy that Chester Bowles, apparently speaking for once with White House blessing, recently expounded in a speech denouncing those who wish to do something about Cuba.

According to Bowles, the new realism is founded on the contention that if America did something about Cuba it would "undercut our influence in world affairs, blacken our reputation in the United Nations, forfeit our traditional claim to moral leadership * * * set the stage for sweeping Soviet victories in the critically important fields of diplomacy and politics * * * and a lessening of our influence in world affairs."

If this truly represents the New Frontier's assumptions, then the questions needs urgently to be put: Does unwillingness to apply American power effectively in Cuba and elsewhere save us from the dire consequences outlined by Bowles?

To put it another way, does inaction heighten our influence in world affairs, whiten our reputation in the United Nations, and enhance our traditional claim to moral leadership?

Since the New Frontier has taken to labeling its critics in foreign affairs as rash, hot-headed and trigger happy, it would seem appropriate, for the purposes of perspective, to introduce some views on the uses of American power of a diplomat who has never been known to be anything but cool—and even pragmatic.

He is Robert Murphy, former Under Secretary of State, who in a hitherto unpublished commencement address at Boston University reported on a visit to Latin America during and after the abortive invasion of the Bay of Pigs.

Said Murphy: "I was in Brazil at the time of the Cuban operation. I was a bit startled to be told that the reason the United States failed to intervene openly in Cuba was because our Government feared it would provoke war between the U.S.S.R. and the United States. I found little or no recognition of the consistent effort our Government has loyally made through the years to adhere to a policy of nonintervention."

So, if Murphy is a good reporter, the U.S. unwillingness to use its power got the worst of all possible verdicts: Our moral leadership, far from being enhanced, yielded to the suspicion that we were merely motivated by fear of Russia.

"One of the principles to which we have been firmly attached is the collective approach to international questions," Murphy continued, "but again I feel that we have gone too far in our pursuit of a basically sound idea in resorting to the collective approach indiscriminately. There are situations, for example, where we are too ready and eager to merge our national identity in the United Nations.

"At times I believe we do this because of reluctance to face up to a risk on our own national account. Leaning on a collectivity that includes many weak, inexperienced and frankly selfish nations leads us into situations where we are reduced to the lowest common denominator.

"Therefore, we have no alternative to asserting our independent national will and judgment, letting our associates as well as our opponents know that on issues involving our fundamental national security we are capable of going our own way."

Thus, according to the old realism of Murphy, the United States of America, which holds in its own destiny the decline or survival of freedom in our time, should not be deterred from doing anything necessary to that survival because other nations refuse to hold its hand.

AID Administrator in Formosa Makes Headway by Emphasis on Private Initiative, Training of Local Managers, and Self-Reliance as Essential Requirements of Success in Achieving Economic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the China News of August 8, 1962, commenting on the constructive services in Taiwan of the Administrator of our AID program there these last 4 years, Dr. Wesley C. Haraldson, originally from North Dakota and with a doctorate degree from the University of Minnesota.

The editorial gives two important evidences of real progress in this difficult problem of how to achieve maximum progress in newly developing countries. First, it shows the persistent emphasis of the American Administrator on the necessity of the recipient country to do its utmost to move from reliance on outside help to reliance on itself. It is

easier, I can testify from observations in many countries, to give help to people than to help people to help themselves. Second, the editorial shows that the seed sown is bearing fruit. The recipient country is being called upon by its own newspapers to move more vigorously in the direction that clearly is best for all. Commendation is in order for all concerned.

The editorial follows:

[From the China News, Aug. 8, 1962]

HARALDSON DEPARTURE

People come and people go. They usually leave behind something for us to remember them with. Only some of them leave behind more.

Wesley C. Haraldson is one of them. The Director of the International Development Agency is leaving Free China tomorrow. He will be long remembered as an outspoken friend.

Indeed, no Government official could ever question the views expressed by Mr. Haraldson—that more vitality is needed in Taiwan's economy; that private industry should be given the front seat instead of the present secondary role; that consumption, especially Government consumption, should be cut down in favor of useful production; and that Free China must need acquire a new set of values and criteria if Free China wants to be a modern, up-to-date country.

The Government officials here do not question the wisdom of the Haraldson views. But they do not like the blunt way he puts it and says it so often. That is why in the past there have been arguments and discussions.

The arguments and discussions will continue. Mr. Haraldson's departure by no means means that his views have prevailed and that Free China's economy has taken on an abrupt change in favor of his beliefs. It takes time. And we are confident his views will gradually be driven home to all people in Free China, resulting in beneficial modifications.

It takes time. But the changes will come to reside with us.

Mr. Haraldson is therefore leaving with the satisfaction that someday somehow he may see his travails prevail.

We say Mr. Haraldson is an outspoken friend judiciously. Only a genuine friend will care to give us his frank views and criticisms with no malice intended. And Haraldson is such a man. His honesty, integrity, and concern have never been questioned. On the other hand, they will always be remembered.

In this connection, it is time for the free Chinese to sit down and really think of the role American aid has played in the giantish economic reconstruction work here. Mr. Haraldson says in his last press conference in Taipei that he hopes to see free China achieve economic self-sustaining in a few years without having to rely on American aid.

Let's ask ourselves this question: Can we do that? We have been talking about self-sufficiency for years. And all the while we have been depending all the more on foreign aid. As the situation now stands, self-sufficiency is almost beyond our reach.

Something must be done and must be done immediately. No nation in the world can afford to depend on foreign aid forever. West Europe was helped by the Marshall plan but West Europe today is in a position to dole out economic aid to other developing countries.

Of course, West Europe has always been technically and economically ahead of China. But that does not mean we should resign ourselves to the fate of being an international beggar for centuries to come.

During Mr. Haraldson's stay in Taiwan, American aid pattern has changed. There will be further changes. Now, it is the duty of every Chinese, including all those in the Government, to think actively of the future and do something about it.

The Chambers-Roush Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial in the Kokomo, Ind., Tribune, of Sunday, September 23, 1962, concerning the Chambers-Roush race in Indiana's Fifth District and under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix section of the RECORD:

THE CHAMBERS-ROUSH RACE

National political attention will turn on Indiana's Fifth District in the election this November because of the close finish which featured the congressional voting between J. EDWARD ROUSH, Democrat, and George Chambers, Republican, in 1960. The two men are rematched for another test at the polls.

Any contest that was as close as the one 2 years ago is bound to bring differences of opinion as to whether it was decided rightly.

Chambers' friends feel he was counted out in 1960. They point out that he had a slim margin of victory on the basis of returns announced after the votes were counted over the district, and they say that several curious things happened following that announcement.

One of these curious developments was that Chambers was certified by two different Indiana Secretaries of State as having been duly elected. The first Secretary of State to so certify his election was John R. Walsh, a Democrat. When Walsh was succeeded by Charles O. Hendricks, a Republican, the latter also formally certified Chambers as the winner.

Then, of course, ROUSH contested the election and the House of Representatives in Washington decided to count the votes over and named a subcommittee to conduct the recount. Although Republican members of this subcommittee signed its final report declaring ROUSH to be the winner by 99 votes, among several strange things they questioned was the manner in which the investigation of the election returns took place.

Several strange things took place in Washington. One of these was the maneuvering by the Democratic leadership in the House in regard to the Chambers-Roush case. A paper which some Congressmen said was a false certification was circulated among Members of the House by Ralph Roberts, the House Clerk, indicated that ROUSH was the formally certified victor. It was on the basis of this piece of paper that the House, on a straight party line, refused to seat Chambers when he presented himself to be sworn in.

At the same time it was refusing to seat Chambers, in January 1961, the House voted to seat two Congressmen from other States who, like Chambers, had been challenged. They, however, were Democrats and their politics appeared to have made a difference to the Democratic-controlled House.

1962

Supported extension of corporate tax and current schedule of excise taxes on liquor, cigarettes, and so forth, and repeals 10 percent levy on rail and bus fares.

Supported proposal raising temporary debt limit to accommodate defense cost.

Voted for increase on postal rates to achieve sound Post Office Department fiscal operations.

Supported increased lending authority of Small Business Administration for business and disaster loans.

Voted for bill requiring public disclosure of identical bids on Government contracts.

Voted for bill to make permanent a provision of the Soil Bank Act permitting harvesting of hay on conservation reserve acreage under disaster conditions.

Supported increase in rates of compensation for service-connected disabled veterans.

Supported proposal to curb the usage of the mails for the distribution of Communist propaganda.

Voted against taxpayer funds being spent for subsidized electric power for preferential areas—Hanford project.

Voted for extension of direct housing loan program for veterans.

During adjournment, I will be traveling in all the counties that make up the new Second District. The new area contains the following counties: Atchison, Brown, Clay, Doniphan, Geary, Jackson, Leavenworth, Marshall, Nemaha, Pottawatomie, Riley, Shawnee, Wabaunsee, Washington, and the County of Wyandotte outside of city limits of Kansas City, Kan.

My aim will be to meet with as many people as possible in each county. While your office in Washington will be open as usual to take care of your inquiries and requests, in addition for your service, we will have a district office in the Hotel Jayhawk in Topeka. I hope you will contact me at any time if you feel we can be of assistance. It is no imposition or bother; our office is organized with the aim of serving and working for you.

Commonsense Approach to Cuba and Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the editorial section of last night's Washington Evening Star contained two such thoughtful treatments of the Cuban situation that I am moved to include both for the RECORD. These articles, I believe, summarize a growing call for a commonsense approach to not only Cuba, but our foreign aid program and our relations with those nations which call themselves our allies.

The editorials follow:

"CUBA IS AN AMERICAN PROBLEM"—NATIONS' ARGUMENT AGAINST BLOCKADE CRITICIZED AS FAULTY NEUTRALISM

(By David Lawrence)

Maybe it will be a little easier now for President Kennedy to understand why there's so much opposition in Congress to the foreign-aid bill.

Maybe it will be easier for the British Government to understand a demand that may come some day from the American people that American troops and also financial aid be withdrawn from Europe.

For no less a person than the member of the British Cabinet who heads up the Treasury Department in London has just told an American audience on television that Cuba is "essentially an American problem," and hence Britain couldn't pledge support for an economic blockade. The Foreign Minister of Norway also told Secretary of State Rusk that Cuba is "an American problem."

But supposing the United States had said to the world that Vietnam was "essentially an Asian problem?" Supposing that President Eisenhower, instead of landing marines in Lebanon, had said the Soviet aggression in that area was "essentially a Middle East problem?" And supposing President Kennedy had said in recent months that the fate of Berlin was "essentially a European problem?" What would have been the reaction then in London and in other European capitals?

Cuba is not "an American problem." It is a world problem, because Soviet aggression recognizes no geographical limits. The military and economic sinews of Castro's government are being provided today by the Soviet Union. The United States rightly seeks to impose an economic blockade on Cuba. Secretary Rusk is meeting with Foreign Ministers of various countries this week to persuade them to help by requiring their ships not to carry cargoes to Cuba. But even Canada—our next-door neighbor—has been hesitant to go along.

Naturally, the businessmen in these countries are opposed to any embargo on trade with Cuba. Will material interests and selfishness, however, prevail against a policy of checkmating the Soviet Union's aggression? Failure of the Western countries to work together in the 1930's caused the collapse of the economic blockade against Mussolini imposed by the League of Nations. World War II came as a result of the Nazi belief in the apparent disunity on our side.

It already is being argued by some governments that their ships are under long-term charter and can't be persuaded to withhold their transportation facilities. But in a matter of preserving the peace of the world, the larger interest should, of course, prevail. If it doesn't, will not public opinion in the United States tend to be less concerned about threats by the Soviet Union to European countries?

The whole future of foreign aid, moreover, will be dealt a body blow if the principal nations of the world continue to evade their own obligation to help carry the financial burden of America's troops in Europe and in other countries. The taxpayers of the United States will not long support such a one-sided arrangement. Representative Otto PASSMAN, of Louisiana, Democrat, who has led the fight against the foreign-aid bill and succeeded in lopping off a sizable amount from it in the House at this session, will gain many more supporters next year if the European governments ignore Soviet military aggression in this hemisphere and continue to insist that the United States should pay most of the cost of its military forces assembled to check Soviet aggression in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Also, the U.S. Government has just dramatically come to the rescue of the United

Nations by voting a \$100-million purchase of bonds to pay the expenses of U.N. armies in Africa. The President of the United States didn't say that the Congo mess was essentially an African problem.

Maybe the charitable explanation of all this is that neither the newspapers of Europe nor the American Ambassadors there have conveyed the whole story of how the people of this country really feel about the Soviet infiltration and military buildup in Cuba. One reason for this may be because President Kennedy and Secretary of State Rusk have maintained a mistaken policy of silence. They haven't said a word publicly to the Government of the Soviet Union to protest what it has done in Cuba. The reported explanation is that the advisers of Messrs. Kennedy and Rusk have insisted that to do so would "increase tensions" over Berlin. But tensions have increased now not only over Berlin but over Cuba. The West gives the impression of disunity, and the U.S. Government gives the impression of timidity if not of fear to notify the Soviet Union that it has deliberately interfered in the Western Hemisphere and has assisted a dictatorship to continue to deprive the Cuban people of their sovereign rights.

A real opportunity has been missed by the Kennedy administration to make it clear everywhere that what has happened in Cuba in the last 2 years is a world problem, and that the aggression by the Soviets must be checked by the free world.

For this is no time for neutralism either by the smaller countries or by the larger nations that regularly receive financial or economic or military aid from the taxpayers of the United States.

ALLIES ISOLATING UNITED STATES OVER CUBA: AMERICA'S EUROPEAN AND LATIN FRIENDS ARE EXPECTED TO BE HURT MOST BY IT

(By William S. White)

A new and involuntary form of creeping isolationism is arising in the free world. This is a gathering spiritual isolation of the United States from most of its Western Allies and most of Latin America in the matter of Castro Cuba.

This country, in effect is not only being forced to stand substantially alone in dealing with the Soviet Union's military penetration of this hemisphere in Cuba. We are also being lectured in a rather superior tone by our Allies about the foolishness of becoming "too excited" about Cuba. Much of Western Europe thinks it knows more than we do about the degree of danger in our own area.

Much of Latin America will not see the danger at all—not yet. It is in the comfortable position of being able to refuse any real cooperation with us in full awareness that when attempts are made to export a bit of Sovietization to its own soil we shall move in as protectors.

The plain truth is that the United States has never been put in a more galling position. And even some of our good friends, human nature being what it is, are not too unhappy at seeing the powerful American eagle's tail feathers being pulled. We are not, however, the ones who will be most hurt in the end by this, our involuntary isolation. We can take care of ourselves in this hemisphere. Indeed, long since we could have done so. We would have tossed Castroism out of Cuba as a tin of annoying rubbish from our backyard but for our desire to avoid Allied criticism and anguished howls of "intervention" from the same Latin American nations we are safeguarding from the very real "intervention" of the Soviet Union.

The true sufferers, unless soon our Western Allied friends and our Latin neighbors decide to give us at least a minimum cooperation,

will be those very Western Allies, those very Latin neighbors.

The British, the Norwegians and others; who thus far refuse the patiently determined appeals of Secretary of State Rusk to halt shipping to Cuba, are giving many fine legalisms for withholding even this tepid act of support. After all, they say, nobody is at war with Cuba; free trade is free trade, and so on. But they can awake one day to find that in maintaining their right to this tinpot trade with Castro they have, so to speak, lost a much bigger customer, the basic goodwill of the people of the United States.

The Latin Americans, in hanging back from any joint plan genuinely to seal off Cuba in this hemisphere, can awake and find they cannot forever play both sides. The multi-billion-dollar American aid in the Alliance for Progress does not come from the pockets of the reformist types who are so oddly understanding of Latin-American hemming and hawing. It comes from the American people, through the American Congress. And the American Congress already is dangerously fed up with the elegant sophistries of can't-do Allies and Latin neighbors. Already, foreign aid in any and every form is in trouble at the Capitol. The time may come when it is in deep and irreparable trouble.

What profit to our Allies and Latin neighbors if they win their little argument about precedents and all that, but really do force us really to go it alone?

They would all be wise to make some effort better to understand the actual mood of Congress and country. Cuba may be trivial to them. But to Congress and country it is far from that; and the present mood of bewildered anger can, without much more provocation, become ugly indeed, from their viewpoint.

USO Squadron Adoption Program, Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, Sheppard Air Force Base is located in my congressional district at Wichita Falls, Tex., and I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress and to the citizens of the United States an interesting program which has been developed by the squadron adoption plan. I particularly bring this to your attention because of the unusual relationship that exists between the military citizens of Sheppard Air Force Base and the civilian citizens of our community. Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Moore, commander at Sheppard Air Force Base, has found that through the combined effort of the civic organizations and the military personnel of the Wichita Falls area, it has enhanced the desirability of being connected with that particular base and is thus reflected in the high morale of the Air Force personnel.

The USO squadron adoption program is as follows:

USO SQUADRON ADOPTION PROGRAM, WICHITA FALLS, TEX., SERVING SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE

In August 1962, the 26th Sheppard Air Force Base Squadron was adopted by the Hub, S. & Q. Clothiers, of Wichita Falls, Tex. This squadron was the newly organized 3775th School Squadron.

Since its inception in 1959, 26 Wichita Falls business and civic organizations have become sponsors for Sheppard squadrons ranging from a small weather detachment group adopted by the First State Bank to the entire SAC wing, adopted by the four ranchers: W. T. Waggoner Ranch, Bridwell Hereford Ranch, T-Bone Ranch and Lake Creek Ranch.

In April of 1959, the Wichita Falls Rotary Club extended a friendly hand to one of the squadrons at Sheppard Air Force Base in the first of a series of efforts to bring Sheppard airmen more into the life of the community of Wichita Falls, and to acquaint the citizens of the city with their military neighbors. The program, sparked by the Wichita Falls USO, was conceived and promoted by Col. Floyd Taylor, retired, past chairman of the area USO Committee and still active in USO programs. Maj. Gen. Thomas E. Moore, then brigadier general, commanding officer at Sheppard Air Force Base was most cooperative on behalf of the squadron adoption concept and recognized it as an excellent means to promote good public relations between the community and the base. On numerous occasions General Moore and his staff have cited the squadron adoption program for its favorable impact upon the personnel at the base.

Colonel Taylor's plan is this: Find the right business or civic group in the community for the right squadron on base. In adopting a squadron, leaders of the sponsoring organization and the squadron exchange visits to determine the nature of the squadron and of the organization. The visits are in themselves a type of indoctrination for members of each group since they take place both in town and on base. These informal meetings, where military leaders explain the mission of the squadron and the business people tell of their group and of the community, usually reveal many common interests.

These exchanges soon result in the development and promotion of such activities as sightseeing trips, concerts, rodeos, football games, golf and bowling tournaments, special social and holiday events, personal remembrances of birthdays, sickness, weddings, and even death.

An interesting development to come out of the squadron adoption plan is the "Plant a tree at SAFB." Nearly 1,000 trees have been contributed by civilian and military donors in this plan developed by a former promotion manager of the Wichita Falls Times Publishing Co. which sponsors the 3770th School Squadron. The campaign was conducted in 1961 and 1962.

Other sponsors of squadrons than those previously mentioned are: The Optimist Club, Lions Club, Parker Square State Bank, First Wichita National Bank, University Kiwanis Club, Wichita Falls Kiwanis Club, City National Bank, junior chamber of commerce, Perkins-Timberlake Co., Wichita County Bar Association, Sears, Roebuck & Co., Whites Stores, Inc., Southwest Rotary Club, Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., Texas Electric Service Co., McClurkan's Department Store, Business and Professional Women's Club (adopted the WAF squadron), Fedway Department Store, KSYD-TV channel 6, Marchman Hotel, and Robert Seabury Homes.

Out of the squadron adoption plan has developed a community-base relationship

without equal. The base is a positive and obvious part of the Wichita Falls community. There was a need to find a means for linking these two separates together and Colonel Taylor's plan and diligent supervision brought it about.

The success of the program, according to General Moore, has made Sheppard Air Base one of the most desired duty posts as determined by Air Force personnel.

Needless War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a hurried trip to the Eighth District of Indiana, where I had the privilege of meeting with many of my constituents. One of the matters uppermost in many of their minds is that of Cuba.

I believe that this administration and the President of the United States are following the right course in dealing with Castro and his brand of communism. There are some who advocate invasion of the island. They are making irresponsible statements and would not be the ones who would have to be in the landing parties crossing the Cuban beaches. The United States is attempting to isolate Cuba from the rest of the free world. The passage of the Cuban resolution by the Congress strengthens the position of the President and shows the world that we, as a nation, are solidly behind him. Force should be the last resort. There are other means which can be and are being used by the United States.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the September 23 issue of the Evansville Sunday Courier & Press. It is right to the point and deserving of attention:

NEEDLESS WAR

"Do something about Cuba," is an old cry. In 1898 it got us into war with Spain, a war later found to have been totally unnecessary. That episode of history is well worth bearing in mind these days.

Stories of Spanish outrages in her Cuban colony had inflamed Americans. President McKinley demanded that Spain revoke her concentration camps for Cuban rebels. Spain agreed, and was also willing to grant an armistice to the Cubans. Our minister to Spain reported that before August 1 he expected to get Spanish acceptance of any terms the rebels might ask, even independence or the cession of the island to the United States.

What more could we want? Yet "do something" Senators and newspapers had so worked up public opinion and Congress that these wanted war at all costs. President McKinley, who did not want war, could have stood in the way. His rugged predecessor, Grover Cleveland, probably would have done so. McKinley, lacking Cleveland's iron, gave way and the clamorous had their war.

The war was costly in money and in lives, the latter mostly by disease in unsanitary

camps. We also got the Philippines, which we did not want, and which immediately engaged us in a 3-year guerrilla war. Our possession of the Philippines was one reason for Pearl Harbor.

The lesson of 1898 is pertinent in 1962. "Do something" can be a costly cry, when those who utter it have no responsibility for what happens afterward.

Amendment to the Foreign Aid Bill That Would Deny U.S. Aid to Any Country Whose Ships Have Carried Arms or Strategic Materials to Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 27, 1962

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the President of the United States by Mr. J. M. Calhoun, secretary-treasurer of the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association:

NATIONAL MARINE ENGINEERS'

BENEFICIAL ASSOCIATION,

New York, N.Y., September 24, 1962.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: According to press reports, the House of Representatives has approved an amendment to the foreign aid bill that would deny U.S. aid to any country whose ships have carried arms or strategic materials to Cuba. We endorse Representative FELLY's amendment and urge the administration to support it in the Senate.

We also endorse the amendment submitted by Representative BONNER that would ban any ship carrying war supplies or economic goods to Cuba from entering a U.S. port to pick up foreign aid cargo.

Mr. Speaker, the correct amendment to section 107 is as follows: On page 6, after the comma in line 17, insert the following: "or for any expenses of transportation, directly or indirectly, by merchant marine ships of any nation whose ships are used to transport any military or economic supplies to that regime."

We believe that permitting these ships to carry our aid cargo represents the use of American foreign aid dollars to subsidize Communist shipping, and that the use of foreign ships in the carriage of Communist cargo releases Russian ships and permits them to concentrate on more strategic objectives. We can't understand why foreign ships that transport cargo for our enemies and jeopardize our security and the stability of Latin America should be rewarded by the U.S. Government with cargoes financed by American taxpayers.

We also urge you to support the investigation of shipping to Cuba that was launched over the past weekend by Senator MAGNUSON. We believe it is vital to ascertain which ships have been trading with Cuba and to reevaluate our unhealthy dependence on vessels sailing under runaway flags that are

presumably under "effective American control." We hope that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Maritime Administration will give Senator Magnuson their fullest cooperation.

Even if the Bonner amendment should be removed from the foreign aid bill in conference, we urge you to enforce the principle by Presidential directive. According to press reports, between 50 and 60 ships, including vessels flying the British, West German, Italian, Greek, Yugoslav, and Liberian flags have traded with Cuba recently, and at least one Yugoslav ship, the *M. V. Drzic*, is scheduled to load Government-financed foreign aid cargo in Houston on September 28. An unidentified German ship that was in Cuba recently also is bound for Corpus Christi to load aid cargo. We urge you to direct the Department of Agriculture to disapprove these charters, and any future charters for ships that carry military supplies or economic goods, other than drugs or medicines, to Cuba.

We understand documented information has been sent to you identifying the Yugoslav ship *SS Milet*, the Greek ship *SS Paean* and the Liberian-flag ship *SS Galicia* as recipients of American aid cargo despite the fact that they have been trading with Cuba, and the Greek ship *SS Pegasus* as another despite the fact that it has been trading with Communist China. Since the Department of Agriculture admittedly does not check to see whether foreign ships have been trading with Cuba or other Communist enemies of the United States when it assigns lucrative aid cargo to them, it is quite certain that other ships that have taken part in the Communist buildup in Cuba will be approved for American aid cargo unless a specific directive is issued banning them from our aid program.

While there is justifiable concern now over the use of NATO and runaway-flag ships in the Cuban trade, we should not overlook the extensive use of vessels registered under these flags in the Communist oil trade, a practice that has contributed to the Soviet economic offensive against the free world. The names and flags of registry of 145 ships that have sailed alternately in the Communist and the American oil import trades was reported to the President's Petroleum Study Committee by the American Maritime Association last April, along with the suggestion that these ships should be barred from carrying American oil imports. Nothing has been done yet to implement this proposal.

Since petroleum is a strategic commodity, it would seem to be in our interest to deny the Communists the use of free world tankers to carry oil, where possible. We suggest that a big step toward accomplishing this objective can be taken by blacklisting from the carriage of American oil imports all foreign tankers that have participated in the Communist oil trade.

The ships used in the oil import program are chartered by American oil companies with import rights. These include companies that have lost their holdings in Cuba and others whose rates and sales are threatened by Communist price cutting. Interestingly enough, though, the owners of some of the runaway-flag ships, like *Niarchos*, are operators who have built their vessels because they have been guaranteed import cargo by American oil companies.

We also wish to call your attention to the fact that countries receiving the U.S. aid, as well as several NATO countries, are building ships for the Soviet Union, thereby freeing Russian shipyards to construct submarines and other warships. According to the reliable maritime industry publication *Marine Engineering/Log*, 27 tankers, 4 freighters, and 6 miscellaneous vessels were

being built or were on order for Russia on March 1, 1962. Of these, Yugoslavia had contracted to build 14 tankers, Japan 6, Italy 6, and Sweden 1; Denmark had contracted to build 3 freighters and Japan 1; Denmark had contracted to build 4 miscellaneous vessels and West Germany 2. Since the Marine Engineering/Log survey appeared, the Soviet news agency Tass reported that Russia has signed a contract to build nine more tankers and five freighters in Yugoslav yards. According to recent press reports, Japan has signed a contract to construct another \$96 million worth of Soviet vessels—five 12,000-deadweight-ton freighters and twelve 35,000-deadweight-ton tankers.

The United States wisely prohibits the export of strategic materials to the Communist bloc. Many of our NATO allies observe a similar policy. Tanker tonnage, in our opinion, is as important strategically as many items on the prohibited list. In light of the danger to our security resulting from the construction of Soviet tankers in free world yards, we urge you to apply economic pressure on any country that accepts contracts to build Soviet merchant ships, including the suspension of U.S. economic aid, if necessary, to enforce this program.

The betrayal of our interests in Cuba by foreign shipowners casts new doubt on the wisdom of depending on runaway-flag ships for our security. While our military planners undoubtedly feel that if they can't have American-manned tonnage, they'll have to make do with American-owned runaway ships, there is reason to believe that some of those advising our Government to rely on flag-of-convenience vessels may have been motivated by the desire for personal profit, rather than by the best interests of the United States.

In this connection, we believe that a careful review of the past associations of some persons now holding high Government office will show active participation in runaway-flag operations, a fact that we believe to constitute a serious conflict of interest.

The use of NATO and runaway-flag ships for the Communist buildup in Cuba, the failure of our foreign allies and friends to stop this trade, and the construction in Italian and Japanese yards of Communist merchant ships, reinforces our conviction that when the chips are down, the only shipping the United States can depend on is the American merchant marine.

Policies that encourage the development of foreign fleets while restricting the development of American shipping is not, in our opinion, in the interest of the United States.

We therefore urge you to review our unfortunate dependence on runaway-flag shipping, the misadministration of the cargo preference laws, and the State Department's apparent partiality to foreign shipping at the expense of American-flag operations, and to order changes in existing policies that will guarantee the development of a strong American-flag merchant fleet.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. CALHOON,

Secretary-Treasurer, National MEBBA.

NOTE.—The context of the legislation amended by Mr. BONNER in section 107 is as follows: "None of the funds in this title shall be available for assistance to any country, the government of which sells arms, ammunition, or implements of war to the Castro regime, or which furnishes, by grant or loan, any military or economic aid to that regime, or for any expenses of transportation directly or indirectly by merchant ships of any nation whose ships are used to transport any military or economic supplies to that regime."

A7162

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 27

Alliance for Progress Is On the Move in
PanamaEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call to the attention of my colleagues an article from the Miami Herald under the date of September 8, 1962, which describes the soundly conceived and well-coordinated efforts of a group of Miamians to get the Alliance for Progress program underway in Panama.

The article follows:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Sept. 8, 1962]

IT TAKES PEOPLE, NOT JUST DOLLARS—MIAMI
TEAMWORK GIVES ALIANZA A PUSH
(By Bert Collier)

The Alliance for Progress is not merely dollars; it is people.

This is the proposition that guides a team of North Americans, nearly all of them Miamians, in getting the Alliance on the road to enthusiastic acceptance in Panama.

The team is headed by Norman Giller, Miami Beach architect appointed by the State Department last February, to direct a large segment of the Alliance program in Panama—the construction of schools, medical clinics and two major hospitals.

In Mr. Giller's mind, this was not to be a question of finding sites, drawing plans, letting contracts and making sure that specifications were met. The Alliance has a broader perspective than blueprints.

"We felt that perhaps our services might provide a little light in the guidance and development of the people of this country," he says.

"The schools and hospitals we had been commissioned to design and supervise were something that was going to represent the people. We were not building them as monuments of brick and mortar. To build a building that doesn't live is useless and a waste of money."

Before a plan was made or a drawing board bought, Mr. Giller and his 25 bilingual associates set out to know Panama and Panamanians. They have traveled hundreds of miles over some of the roughest country on earth—by jeep, horseback, motorboat, Indian canoe and on foot through the jungles. They have talked to hundreds from President Roberto Chirri to simple peasants and Indians in remote villages.

The Alliance program that is taking shape is a synthesis of the needs discovered in these intimate contacts.

Mr. Giller and the resident project manager, Sven Speyer of Coral Gables, visited one village in western Panama. "Word had gotten around that the Alliance people were coming," said Giller, "and it wasn't the written word. An Indian teacher had come down from the hills, a 2-day walk. He had heard we had something to do with helping the schools.

"He said the people had built a hut for a school and he was trying to teach the children, but had no books, no paper, no pencils."

Fortunately the Alliance had contributed 200,000 schoolbooks to Panama and a supply was on hand in the office of the district school superintendent. The Indian departed with a knapsack full of supplies.

The Miamians inspected a proposed school site 100 miles outside Panama City. "For the last 40 miles the jungle was so thick we went by horseback," said Giller. "When we ar-

ived, we were greeted by a large group of townspeople. They had formed an 'Asociacion de Padres de Familias,' a sort of jungle PTA. They had recruited volunteers to cut down trees so that trucks could bring building materials to the site."

At another village where the Alliance people arrived on July 3, they found the teacher displaying the American flag and instructing her small charges in the meaning of July Fourth in the United States.

In yet another the townspeople declared a holiday and halted all activity so they could properly welcome "Los hombres de Alianza Para El-Progreso."

As a result of all this grassroots preparation, the program is rapidly taking form. Alliance funds will build about 60 schools, Panama furnishing the land, preliminary site preparation and some materials.

There soon will be medical facilities, ranging from small clinics where a nurse or medical aid can "live in" and supervise patients in a few beds, to large regional hospitals and health centers specializing in maternal and child care. (Some parts of Panama have infant mortality rates as high as 50 percent.)

There will be agricultural institutes where peasants may learn improved farming methods.

There are blueprints for these buildings now, and architectural renderings. The trucks are beginning to roll and the sound of the bulldozer is heard in the Panama back country. In the minds of the people it is associated with the Alianza, a means of helping them to a better life. The progress in Panama is making this a pilot program for other Latin countries.

"This project is so vast," says Mr. Giller, "that it takes a large amount of planning before it can be pulled together and work can begin."

"But in Panama it is beginning to move so that the ordinary citizen can see things happening in his village and on his street."

"This is when the Alliance will begin to bear fruit, when people can visualize its meaning in terms of what is happening to them."

Arab League Discriminates Against
American EntertainerEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 31, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the September 26 issue of Variety contains an article relating to the Arab League's ban on the records and films of Frank Sinatra. I am compelled to protest the completely unwarranted action of the League in singling out for abuse and damage a prominent American citizen whose only objective was to help needy children.

The news article follows:

[From Variety, Sept. 26, 1962]

SINATRA DISAPPOINTED HE MIGHT BE PENALIZED
FOR AIDING CHILDREN

Following a report that the Arab League has banned Frank Sinatra's films and disks in Arab countries because of his activities in Israel during a recent world tour, Sinatra yesterday issued the following statement.

"If it is true, I am deeply disappointed that statesmen anywhere would condemn anyone for aiding children of whatever faith or origin.

"In Israel, my recent tour there was to raise money for an interfaith youth center in Nazareth, a primarily Arab center, where the recipients will be primarily Arab children.

"My world tour, which included Israel, was dedicated to benefiting children of all faiths. I had hoped that adults everywhere had one thing in common—a love for all children."

Sinatra visited Israel during April, May, and June of the tour last year at his own expense. He raised more than \$2 million in benefit performances.

Scholarly Findings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the House Armed Services Subcommittee No. 3 headed by the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT rendered a report on its study of the military Reserve posture. This outstanding work was prepared after lengthy and detailed hearings which uncovered deficiencies in the Reserve program. Instead of agreeing to a reduction in strength of the Reserves, as the Pentagon recommended, the subcommittee urged in the national interest that the Department of Defense correct the deficiencies in the program. I believe with the members of the committee that the Reserves should be kept at full strength because of the critical world situation which finds Berlin a powder keg and the Communists in Cuba only 90 miles from my home State. In connection with the Hébert study, the Reserve Officers Association, the No. 1 supporter of the Reserves, carries in its monthly magazine, The Officer, for October the following editorial which praises the honesty and intelligence of the report:

SCHOLARLY FINDINGS

Several rather shrill editorials indorsing the Reserve cutback program offered by Secretary McNamara strengthen us in our conviction that the scholarly and fully documented report of the Hébert committee is a national defense epic.

From the beginning we were convinced that Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, whose record reveals him as a legislator equipped by nature, training and inclination to be fully objective and independent, would produce a factual study.

Mr. HÉBERT represents an intelligent constituency and he has so well established himself politically that he needed to court or appease neither voters nor the party leaders. He had experience on his side, and his long service as a newspaperman equipped him peculiarly to cope with the propaganda with which every critic of the great and would-be great in Washington is usually deluged.

Furthermore, Mr. HÉBERT had available to him for sage counsel the House's one real expert in military legislation, Representative CARL VINSON who for 48 years has sat on the committees dealing with the military and who, it is said, "has forgotten more about the military than most people learn in a lifetime." Of course, Mr. VINSON has not forgotten what he has learned; his remarkable memory is favorably comparable