

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19089

ister the laws impartially and to apply them uniformly.

The tendency to legislate or to administer our laws, for the purpose of getting any one man is a dangerous one; one that threatens the very foundations of law by "due process"—by which the rights of the individual are protected by procedural safeguards.

When government looks the other way and permits a trampling of those rights, we have government by prejudice, by headlines and by political expediency.

The facts discussed on the floor yesterday portray an all-powerful government dragging a citizen away from his home to a hostile jurisdiction for the purpose of "getting him."

Mr. Speaker, in this regard I submit an editorial below from the Knoxville, Tenn., Journal of August 23, 1962. The editorial follows:

#### THOSE OVERLOOKED UNIONS

The Justice Department has announced that a grand jury in Chicago will make an investigation of the \$180 million Central States Pension Fund of the Teamsters Union. The obvious expectation on the part of the Department is to get at James E. Hoffa, who has been a target of the Kennedy administration. Criminal charges against the Teamster head will be tried in Federal court at Nashville in October. Subsequently another criminal action is planned against the union leader in Miami where he and a Detroit bank official are charged with fraud.

It is apparent that the Justice Department has been working intensively at its self-chosen task of sending Hoffa to the penitentiary, or unseating him from control of the Nation's biggest union, or both. The "war" between Hoffa and U.S. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy began prior to the election of the former's brother to the Presidency, at a time when the present Attorney General was counsel for the McClellan rackets committee.

We would certainly be the last to object if a case can be made out under the law against the Teamster chief. We would say that bringing him to book for any crimes of which he can be proven guilty is the duty of the Justice Department and that the Attorney General is on sound ground in prosecuting wherever he feels that Hoffa has broken the law.

What we do object to, however, is the studied effort which has been made all along by the Kennedy administration to make the public believe that Hoffa alone, of all the union bosses in the country, is guilty or has been guilty of acts hostile to both their followers and to the country as a whole. The administration's purpose, of course, is to take credit with the public for properly policing national union operations through nailing Hoffa to the cross, while at the same time being very careful to do nothing to alienate the political support of the union bosses come the congressional elections and the presidential contest of 1964.

Students of union operations during the past 30 years recognize that even if Hoffa is guilty of all the crimes with which he has been charged, he is not the only national union boss who does not smell like a lily. Some of us are old enough to recall that Socialist Walter Reuther, who customarily wears a synthetic halo around his head and by the Kennedys is regarded as a "labor statesman," clawed his way to power in the late 1930's by as violent and brutal application of Communist tactics as is recorded in labor's history.

Nor is he the only ruling czar of the union hierarchy who has unhesitatingly substituted force for reason when this was neces-

sary to gain or hold his powers. Furthermore, so far as this country and its institutions are concerned, Reuther is a more dangerous individual by far than is the Teamster Union chief. Hoffa may be proved any of the various things that Bob Kennedy has charged, but he has never, so far as the public has been informed, been enamored of the beauties of socialism.

He has never been in political business with the leftwing Americans for Democratic Action as Reuther has. Nor has Hoffa ever undertaken, as Reuther has, to become a figure in the business of Russian appeasement. We refer here to an ad sponsored by the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, Inc. Walter Reuther was listed as a sponsor of this organization which advocated giving the Russians what they want in Berlin, while his brother, Victor, was listed as a member of the board of directors. Finally, Hoffa has never advocated a system for having the union take over industry to run it on the approved Socialist basis.

This viewpoint is not advanced as a defense of Hoffa but in the hope of driving home recognition of the fact that the administration's assault on Hoffa and its canonization of Reuther and his crowd constitutes a brazen political operation, steeped in hypocrisy. When a choice has to be made between a suspected larcenist and a Socialist, we will take the accused thief every time.

#### *Cuba* THE CUBAN BASE OF RUSSIAN OPERATIONS—A CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the Cuban case has been heated up to crisis status by the imperial Russians. This they have done by a covert invasion of Cuba with thousands of Russian, Czech, and other Communist agents—the exact number yet unknown—and with modern weapons of war, from Russian Migs to ballistic missiles. Cuba today is a Russian base of military, political, and propaganda operations in the Western Hemisphere. No informed person can disagree with this conclusion. There is room for debate on the degree of imminent danger this situation now presents to the United States and all nations of this hemisphere, but there are no longer grounds for the slightest question as to whether Castro's Cuba is a base of Russian operations in this hemisphere.

There is a great deal of discussion and speculation concerning the number of Russian, Czech, Chinese, and other alien Communist personnel in Cuba. There is disagreement as to whether they are Red army units, whether they are in or out of uniform, and whether they are technicians, advisers, security police, doctors, or political agitators. On the matter of military hardware, there is speculation as to how many Russian Mig fighters are available in Cuba, whether the missiles supplied are short, medium, or long range types, how many Russian torpedo boats and submarines have been supplied the Castro regime. Still others speculate on the nature and amount of Russian electronic equipment now in Cuba, and

how effective it might be in disruptive actions against our Cape Canaveral operations.

But all this discussion and speculation has led to the point where it now beclouds the stark reality of a Russian base of operations in the Western Hemisphere. A Russian base of operations in this hemisphere, whether it be for military, political, economic, diplomatic or propaganda purposes is a clear and present danger to the security of the United States. That clear and present danger now exists.

The only question now open to debate by responsible Americans is the method, or methods to be employed to remove that clear and present danger.

The United States has the technological capability to level Cuba and everybody living there, all within a matter of hours. Such action, aside from the morality involved, would punish the Cuban people who are already being punished by the Russian controlled Castro regime. This we should not do.

The United States has the classical, orthodox military power to liberate the Cuban people from the tyranny of communism. Such a military operation could be very costly in terms of American lives sacrificed in the effort. But it could be done and completed in a very short period of time. But to so act would subject us to the same charges leveled against the Russian imperialists for their aggression against the East German people in 1953 and against the peoples of Poland and Hungary in 1956. I do not suggest that such charges should deter us from acting on the Cuban crisis or that such charges have any weight or importance in the world of our times. The Russians by their complete disregard of such charges and the failure of the West to make such charges meaningful in international affairs must be taken into account. But I do suggest that Cuba can be liberated without the direct use of our military strike capabilities.

Within the past few days Khrushchev and company made the threat that any U.S. attack on Cuba "will be the beginning of the unleashing of war." Intermingled with this Russian threat were the usual rattlings of nuclear bombs and intercontinental missiles. This bluff and bluster of the Russian despots has frightened no red-blooded Americans. More than anything else it has stiffened the determination of our people to do what must be done to rid the Western Hemisphere of Russian interference in the tranquility of our affairs. President Kennedy has made it clear that such Russian threats will not deter our Nation from doing what must be done in the global struggle between freedom and tyranny. The real irony of the Cuban case is that the Russians are engaging in massive interference in the affairs of the Cuban people, they are providing their stooge Castro with the means to cement his tyranny over the Cuban people, and, they are building for themselves an all-purpose base of operations in Cuba from which they can spread their special brand of terror and tyranny throughout this hemisphere. Bluntly stated, the Russians are now

19090

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 20

engaged in a massive but covert invasion of Cuba.

The Cuban case presents a classic example of the Russian policy of "liberation" in operation.

It will be recalled that N. Khrushchev, within a period of 10 days after a summit confrontation with President Eisenhower at Camp David, visited Peiping, China, to take part in the 30th anniversary of the Communist takeover of mainland China. When he arrived at the airport in Peiping, he delivered a policy speech in which he defined the Russian doctrine of liberation. He explained that Communist wars of liberation were just wars because they brought communism to peoples whom he claimed were exploited under the system of capitalism. At the same time he explained that any efforts of the free world to resist these Communist wars of liberation would be considered as acts of aggression. In other words, according to Khrushchev, the Communists are free to make war on the free world and the free world has no right to defend itself. This sort of upside down thinking is par for the Russian thought course in international affairs.

The Russian policy of liberation is being applied to Cuba today. Castro was the front man in the initial stages of this operation. The Cuban people were ripe for revolution—a revolution to bring justice to the social-economic order which had existed for too long in Cuba. Castro was built up as the agent of social justice—he announced a program of social and economic reforms which had powerful appeal among the Cuban people. When the handful of Castroites landed in Cuba the people rallied to his cause. There was no real opposition in a popular sense to the Castro liberation efforts. He was hailed as a man of the people. Batista fled the country after a few localized military skirmishes. Castro was soon in control of the country. And he soon put an absolute, Communist control upon the backs of the people he had promised to liberate into social justice.

The second phase of Communist liberation efforts was launched in Cuba by Castro and company. All opposition was subjected to the typical Russian process of liquidation. The press, radio, and television were put under control of the Castro regime and used by them as a tool of promise, terror, and agitation. All opposition political parties were outlawed. Marxism was introduced into the school system. The Catholic Church was persecuted and silenced. The courts were used as tools of persecution and tight control, rather than the promised instruments of justice. Soon the well trained and dedicated Communist agents in the Castro regime came out into the open and soon they made it clear to all that they were the ones who were in control of Cuba.

The people of Cuba were deceived—they were robbed of the just fruits of their revolution by Castro and company. Resentment by the people led to opposition without the support of the United States and other nations of this hemisphere led to a mass exodus of people

from Cuba. Today there are hundreds of thousands of freedom loving Cubans in the United States, the Caribbean area, Central and South America. Today these refugees are the seeds of Castro disaffection—tomorrow they must be the seeds of Cuban liberation from Russian despotism.

The third phase of Communist liberation operations then became necessary. A rising tide of opposition to the Castro regime in Cuba and growing resentment throughout this hemisphere confronted the Kremlin with a major tactical decision. To save Castro and company would require all out military support, but would action to satisfy this requirement arouse the United States and plunge the world into war? Action to save the Castro regime would, however, give them a firm base of operations in the Western Hemisphere if such action was successful. This was the Russian dilemma. It is now clear that the Russian ruling class decided to take the risks involved—but the risks should be reduced by covert methods of supply and support. This is precisely the pattern of action the Russians are applying to Cuba today; there can be no reasonable doubts about this.

A few days ago poet Robert Frost had an interview with Khrushchev and reported that Khrushchev told him that the United States was too liberal to fight for its rights. This is a dangerous assumption by Khrushchev no matter what circumstances or experience, past or present, led him to make it. It was that false type of assumption on the part of Hitler which led to World War II and will plunge us into World War III. This false assumption by Khrushchev must be corrected now, before issues on a broader plane get out of hand.

The fourth phase of Communist liberation operations from their Cuban base and bridgehead will follow soon after the covert military buildup now underway is completed. It will involve the use of Communist Cuban frontmen, much like the Russians are now using their German Communist frontmen in Berlin and in East Germany. Let us not forget that the Russians used non-Russian frontmen in the Korean war of Communist aggression and in the war now raging in Vietnam and Laos. They will do the same thing in the Western Hemisphere. This is not a guesswork judgment, it is simply based on a sound knowledge of how the Communist so-called wars of liberation are carried out. To suggest that the Kremlin will not use these tactics in Cuba is to turn our backs on reality. One thing we must credit the Russians with being consistent in—that is, the exercise of their time-proven imperial tactics.

I urge that steps be taken now to break up the well-laid Russian plans for Cuba and the Western Hemisphere. It is not too late to prevent the Russian military buildup in Cuba. If we act now, the cost of victory will be small compared to what it will be if we hesitate, if we wait until the Russians are prepared to launch phase 4 of their war against the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

There can be and no doubt will be honest disagreement as to the methods best suited to breaking up the covert Russian invasion of Cuba. There is no room for disagreement on the need for action now.

I propose the following courses of action by our Government, calculated to remove the clear and present danger of communism in the Western Hemisphere and to relieve Khrushchev of the serious miscalculation he has made concerning our will to fight in defense of our rights:

First, The regime of Fidel Castro be declared by our Government to be an agent of a foreign power, that is, imperial Russia, and as such charged with interfering in the internal affairs of the Cuban people.

Second, The Cuban exiles from Russian tyranny in their homeland be authorized by democratic process to establish a government-in-exile, such government to be accorded diplomatic recognition by the United States. This action will give practical support to the principle of self-determination, a right now denied the Cuban people in their homeland.

Third, A complete naval and air blockade be established around Cuba by the United States, for the declared purpose of excluding the entry into that occupied country of all persons residing in or citizens of any country or area behind the Iron or Bamboo Curtains and to confiscate all manner of arms, weapons, instruments, implements, and other supplies of war. A quarantine against the seeds of war and imperialism in the peaceful area of the Western Hemisphere accords with both the historic ideals of all the nations in this region and the realities of contemporary international affairs.

Fourth, A public declaration by our Government recognizing the right of the Cuban people to liberate themselves from the tyranny of imperial Russian communism and the coequal right of Cubans in exile to advocate, assist and by other means to further the liberation of their homeland from the present alien regime which now controls and exploits it. A declaration of this character will, like the Declaration of Independence issued by our Founding Fathers, resound throughout the world as an announcement of our return as a nation to the active role of political leadership of freedom's cause.

Fifth, An invitation should be issued to all the nations in the Western Hemisphere to join with our Government in support of these courses of action, prior to their public promulgation but with a request for decision within a set period not to exceed 48 hours. This procedure will determine the dependability of our treaty allies in the Western Hemisphere and at the same time should establish a reliable priority index for the purposeful administration of our Alliance for Progress program. Those nations which subscribe to and agree to support the courses of action herein outlined should be guaranteed that the mountains of redtape about which they complain in connection with the Alliance, will be cut, those nations which do not subscribe to

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19091

and agree to support this action program should be reminded that we have an abundance of redtape artists in our Government anxious to review their plans for progress.

Sixth. An invitation should be extended to the United Nations to act as custodians for the people detained and for all weapons and supplies of war confiscated through the naval and air blockade established by the leadership of the United States. As to the people detained, the full provisions of the Geneva Convention pertaining to custody, care, and repatriation of prisoners of war and civilian internees should apply. As to weapons and supplies of war confiscated, the United Nations should be requested to establish an exhibit of same, open to the general public but with particular reference to the respective delegations accredited to that body.

Mr. Speaker, the political action program which I have proposed is by no means a new or novel one. All its elements are well known to students of the Russian problem and will surely merit the support of American scholars on the plague of imperialism and colonialism.

For too long the policies of our Government have been formulated and guided by that small but entrenched group of Sovietologists, sometimes called the Kremlinologists. That group has demonstrated an expertness in following the mythology of Marxism and that expertness has drenched our national security policies with such fantasies as the evolution theory, the escalation into nuclear war theory, and the delusion that time is on our side in the global struggle with the Russian despots. That same group has argued there is a finality to events which have taken place in that vast area of the world occupied by the Russian Communists, that there is nothing we can do to change the conditions of evil imposed upon one-third of the human family. Moreover, that group of entrenched Sovietologists has resisted and defeated all efforts within our Government to develop plans whereby the political exiles from the nations now occupied by the Russian Communists could take an active role in restoring freedom to their homelands. Twelve years ago Congress authorized such action by the President and provided up to \$100 million in support of it through the Mutual Security Act. Two Presidents made strong efforts to implement this intent of Congress, but the internal resistance of American Sovietologists thwarted their efforts. That negativism, that defeatism has infected our policy on Cuba and it is spreading rapidly to the conduct of our affairs with all our Latin neighbors.

Ten short years ago our Nation was preoccupied with the challenge of liberating the once free and independent nations of Central-East Europe from the yoke of Russian Communist imperialism. The initiative, the opportunity to act was placed in our hands. We talked much but we did not act. Time and the tide of human events would not await our consensus forming processes. In June of 1953 the East Germans rose in

revolt against Communist occupation. As a nation we stood aghast, politically paralyzed and the Russians seized the initiative by putting down this freedom revolt by brute force. Then in the spring of 1956 the Poles at Poznan revolted against their Russian occupier. Here again we stood aghast and politically paralyzed as Russian tanks restored their terrorizing peace of communism. In October of 1956 the Hungarian people rose as one against the Russian occupier, to rout the vaunted Red Army and to restore their national independence for 4 historic days. Here again we stood aghast, politically paralyzed. Our policymakers—the Sovietologists and Kremlinologists—were shocked at this unexpected reversal of their theories of evolution and finality. So shocked in fact that they allowed the victory of the Hungarian freedom fighters to escalate into a terrible defeat for freedom's cause.

At the time those world shaking events seemed a long way away from our tranquil life in the United States. A false sense of security was built upon the mirage of distance. Liberty-loving Americans were shocked at our failure to respond to freedom's call. But the soothing and false mirage of distance was applied in quantity to the moral revulsion which gripped our people. A belief that "it can't happen here" was nurtured in the public mind.

Mr. Speaker, how different things are these 10 years later. One hears little or no talk about liberating the nations of central-east Europe from the yoke of imperial Russian communism. In fact, such talk has been branded as warmongering and the brand has burned so deep on the official life of Washington that only the most courageous dares to raise his voice in support of the cause of the captive nations. And worse, the Department of State has vetoed the establishment of a Select Committee on the Captive Nations by the House on the grounds that such action would be prejudicial to delicate negotiations now underway with the Russian despots.

The battle of the cold war is no longer primarily in Europe. Today it is primarily in the Western Hemisphere—some 90 miles off the shorelines of Florida. Now, the American people are deprived of the soothing mirage of distance; for 90 miles is but a stone's throw away as distance and time are measured today. The clear and the present danger of Russian Communism is now in Cuba, 90 miles off the shorelines of Florida.

Mr. Speaker, it is not pleasant to think about what Americans 10 years from now will be faced with if the longstanding national security policies with regard to imperial Russia are allowed to continue in force. Those 10 years will fade into minutes if we stand by and allow the Russians to establish a secure and all-purpose base of operations in Cuba.

The clear and present danger in Cuba tells us that we must quickly assume any risks, pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardships and accept any sacrifices demanded of us to eliminate that threat to our security and to the tranquility of the Western Hemisphere.

The action program which I have proposed is the least we can do for ourselves and for future generations of Americans.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to my good friend, the very able gentleman from New York.

Mr. DULSKI. I congratulate the gentleman for a forthright examination of the Cuban crisis and for the realistic program of action which he has proposed. I agree the time is now for action to remove the clear and present danger to our security presented by the Russian base of operations in Cuba. My question is, Would action by our Government to establish a naval and air blockade of Cuba be regarded in law as an act of war?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Let me read you a definition of a blockade under international law. I quote:

An act of war carried out by the warships of a belligerent, detailed to prevent access to or departure from a defined part of the enemy's coast.

This definition appeared in an article by James Reston in the New York Times of September 16, 1962. There has been much talk about it since, particularly the "act of war" aspect. It is time we took an honest look at this definition. We are not in a court of law as Mr. Reston seems to suggest; we are confronted with a clear and present danger.

The facts are these, in the Cuban situation:

First. A war is already underway in the entire Caribbean area; an advanced phase of the cold war with the Russian engaged in a massive but covert invasion of Cuba. The hot phase of this war, like that in Korea and Vietnam, will follow unless this Russian invasion is stopped and the Russian base of operations isolated.

Second. No formal declaration of war was declared by the Russians, they never resort to such legal niceties. Law, whether international or any other kind, has no meaning to the Russians.

Third. The physical presence of Russian personnel and Russian military equipment anywhere in the Western Hemisphere is more than sufficient evidence to conclude that a state of war already exists. Castro and the Castroites are not a factor precedent to this conclusion—they are an accidental factor since they have publicly stated their attachment and allegiance to the global objectives of communism. Every American schoolboy knows what those objectives are.

Fourth. To suggest that the legalities of war, as observed by civilized nations, should apply to Castro's Cuba is to accept the Khrushchev definition of the Russian policy of liberation. That definition holds that Communists are free to undertake any and all actions to liberate the still free countries into communism, but the free world is prohibited from taking any actions to defend itself. This double standard of international behavior is a fixed and unchangeable part of the Russian Communist conspiracy.

19092

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 20.

Fifth. The United States is a belligerent in the Cuban crisis whether we like it or not. The Russians have forced us into this position. We are marked out as the target of the Russian buildup in Cuba and no niceties of law can remove this reality from our predicament.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. DULSKI. I agree with the gentleman when he says we are not in a court of law when dealing with the problem of imperial Russian communism. Speaking of legal agreements made with the Russians, former President Truman has time and again pointed out that the Russians broke every agreement with us as soon as it served their imperial purposes. It is dangerous for us to assure that precedents or opinions on international law would carry any weight with the Russians. We are, as the gentleman has so clearly pointed out, belligerents in the Cuban crisis because Russian actions there have forced us to that position.

I have this further question. Our colleague from Ohio is a recognized expert on the matter of captive nations and as an expert, does he regard Cuba as a captive nation under the terms of Public Law 86-90?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I most certainly do regard Cuba as a captive nation under the terms of Public Law 86-90. Cuba was once a free and independent nation. Cuba is no longer a free and independent nation. The people of Cuba have been robbed of their national independence by the intrigue, subversion, and terrorist regime of Fidel Castro, which regime is just as much a stooge of Moscow as is the Communist regime in Warsaw, Budapest, or any other country listed in Public Law 86-90. Similarly the people of Cuba aspire to regain their freedom and national independence. Those aspirations serve as a brake on the activities of Moscow's regime in Havana. Cuba is today nothing more than a colony of the Russian imperialists, and an exploited colony, to be sure.

Cuba is nothing more than a colony of Russian imperialists and an exploited colony, to be sure.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. DULSKI. In keeping with the spirit of international law I imagine that I could submit an amendment to Public Law 86-90 defining Cuba as a captive nation.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I concur in your astute observations and I hope the gentleman will do it.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman has made a very fine statement here, and it certainly describes the full ugliness of the Communist takeover of Cuba. I agree with him. I think it is a problem of profound interest to all Americans. I wonder if the gentleman would be good enough to elaborate what he means when he says that the United States is a belligerent. Mr. Castro has been making

this statement. As a matter of fact he has covered up the complete substitution of Communist economy in Cuba which has immobilized the Cuban people; he has them in a constant state of fear and literally hysteria, but he is trying to appease the Cuban people by saying that the United States is preparing an aggression against Cuba.

This afternoon in the United Nations the Communist puppet representative of Cuba challenged the statement of our own American Ambassador, Adlai Stevenson, when Adlai Stevenson tried to assure the Cubans that no aggression or invasion was planned. So in the light of this I wonder if the gentleman cares to explain what he means when he describes the United States as a belligerent vis-a-vis the Cuban Republic.

Mr. FEIGHAN. We are a belligerent against the imperialism of Moscow. The Government of Cuba is the stooge government of Moscow. I am taking a very realistic approach to this situation. We certainly are in a cold war. The activities of this cold war in Cuba have placed us in the position which I consider to be one of belligerence. The purpose of my proposals is to avoid a hot war, Korean style, in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the gentleman will permit an observation, I think perhaps the gentleman and I understand each other. The gentleman is correct that we are a belligerent against any kind of tyranny anywhere in the world, but he is speaking of a basic technicality that outsiders might misinterpret. I would not want the gentleman's perfectly sincere and proper words to be twisted around by the totally controlled Communist press in Cuba and have Mr. Castro's controlled press come out with headlines tomorrow that a Member of the American Congress admits that the United States is a belligerent. I am sure that is not what the gentleman means.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, I stand by what I said. If the Communists want to use that, let them do it. But I want to thank the gentleman very much for his interest.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. Did Mr. Reston in his article in the New York Times suggest that we refrain from the blockade against Cuba because it would constitute a violation of international law? Is that my understanding?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, as I read the Reston article that was his intent.

Mr. PILLION. Did Mr. Reston also state in his newspaper article that the Soviet Government and all satellite or bloc nations have never adhered to any part of international law as we know it? Did he state that in his article, I ask the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I do not recall exactly, but if he did he would be correct.

Mr. PILLION. That is right. And is it Mr. Reston's attitude or position that we abide by international law, the comity of nations, in spite of the fact that the Soviet and all Communist satellite nations have nothing but contempt for international law?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Reston, in his article made no mention whatever of the miserable Russian record on performance to the precedents of international law. In fact, his article expressed a complete lack of knowledge on this all-important consideration.

I disagree with Mr. Reston.

Mr. PILLION. I too disagree with him when the future of this Nation is at stake, when he would suggest resorting to refinements and technicalities of International law.

I might say I cannot help but recall it was Mr. Matthews, of the New York Times, and there were other writers of the New York Times, who created a great deal of the atmosphere in this country that encouraged, if it was not actually the principal cause of Castro becoming the dictator of Cuba and in turn Khrushchev taking over Castro and Cuba. I wonder about the advice that the New York Times keeps giving to the people of this country in the field of foreign policy and foreign relations. The Reston article reminds me of the job they did in seeing that Castro became the dictator of Cuba.

Mr. FEIGHAN. The gentleman's observations concur with the findings of the long and careful inquiry conducted by the Senate on the Communist takeover of Cuba.

Mr. PILLION. Was it Matthews on foreign policy that created the crisis we are facing, this desperate crisis we are facing in Cuba today? I think the dishonor and discredit for that can in substantial measure be given, allocated, and pinpointed with the New York Times.

I would like to say to the gentleman that his perceptive presentation is proof of his full comprehension of the Soviet Communist complete war. I give my unqualified support for the positive actions recommended by the gentleman from Ohio. This Nation cannot afford to continue to deal with Cuba or the threat of Soviet Communist world civil war in pious platitudes or vague generalities. Positive, effective, courageous action must be taken now by the United States. We can no longer temporize or postpone the difficult decisions necessary to abruptly and finally end the blackmailing Soviet aggressiveness everywhere in the world, including Cuba.

I wish to commend the gentleman for everything he has said and for the work he has done in the past in trying to awaken this country to the dangers that this country is undergoing at the hands of the Soviet and its satellites, including Cuba and Castro.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman very much. I am also mindful of and appreciative of the tremendous work the gentleman has done to alert the American people and Members of Congress on the imminent danger we are in at the present perilous time in our history.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have heard this colloquy between the gentleman in the



1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19093

well and the previous speaker. We hear about editorials and discussions on the whole subject. I thought I had been listening very attentively to the debate, but I have not heard from either of the two previous speakers any concrete, precise suggestions as to what we should do. People say that we ought to take action. What does the gentleman mean? What is meant by the people who want to engage in this discussion? Certainly no one can minimize the extent of the problem, and I think we ought to narrow our views as to what exactly can be done.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I say to my colleague from Illinois, that the program which I have presented could not be more definitive, more complete, or more realistic. What I have proposed is for the consideration of those who have responsibility for defending our policy on Cuba. The program I have proposed speaks for itself.

Mr. PILLION. Had the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], been present last night, I talked about this question for about an hour. I gave a listing of positive actions which we could take, and not generalities. I propose, when the Cuban resolution is presented to the House, to present amendments to the resolution which will provide for positive action on the part of this Government, everything short of nuclear war, to see that the blackmail Soviet missile-based threat in Cuba is not completed, because this Nation cannot live under the blackmail threats of missiles 90 miles away.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### THE ENEMY AT OUR GATE

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on many previous occasions, I have addressed this body concerning significant aspects of the mounting crisis in the crucial Caribbean, long ago recognized by our celebrated naval historian, Admiral Mahan, as "the Mediterranean of the Americas."

It gives me no satisfaction to state that, with the current landings in Cuba, of Soviet ships, personnel, and munitions of war, my verified predictions have been realized, probably in a greater degree than is now apparent. But it is, indeed, gratifying to note in the RECORDS of September 6 and 7 that the danger is being realized in both Houses of Congress, and that there are strong demands from widely separated sections of the Nation for action necessary for full protection of the national interests and the security of the Western Hemisphere.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would commend the gentlemen in this body from California [Mr. HOSMER], Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], California [Mr. LIPS-COMB], Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLIN], and

Florida [Mr. FASCELL] for their illuminating statements in the RECORD of September 6. Furthermore, I urge that they be read by every Member of the Congress. I would also urge the careful study of my address, "Khrushchev Doctrine Versus Monroe Doctrine," in the RECORD of April 12, 1962, which supplies a plan of action in the way of a definite program for the United States that has deep roots in American history, which need not be traced here.

When examining the geopolitical events since 1945, one matter that stands out in crystal clarity is that the world revolutionary movement, known as the international Communist conspiracy, has operated with well-designed plans for securing control of strategic areas of the world.

In the Far East, this fact is illustrated by the takeover of Indonesia with its island barrier dominating the communications between the Pacific and Indian Oceans and forming an avenue from Asia to Australia. In the Mediterranean, it is shown by the indirect control of the Suez Canal and present threats to the Strait of Gibraltar. In the Caribbean, the same process has resulted in making Cuba a Soviet satellite and in the establishment of revolutionary beachheads in British Guiana and Venezuela, areas which cover both flanks of the Atlantic approaches to the key target for the conquest of that strategic area—the Panama Canal.

The steady, systematic acquisitions of these objectives without open warfare is one of the most brilliant achievements in military and naval history, which simply could not be accidental. Instead, such conquests reflect the guiding hand of a directing general staff of transcendent ability, rendered more effective by its conspiratorial and secret apparatus and operations that are linked with known international socialistic elements within our own governmental circles.

The problem of meeting the threat in the Caribbean, therefore, rises above personal, party, group, or any other special considerations and must be handled on the highest plane of statesmanship with but one end in view—the security of the United States and protection of the Western World.

Already, we have delayed too long for our safety. Daily we receive alarming reports of the strengthening of communistic revolutionary power at our back door, conveniently located for firing missiles with atomic warheads into key areas in our country.

Nor should it be overlooked that for many months Soviet trawlers have been "fishing" along our coasts—quite a fishy story. If they are seeking fish in Western waters, they would be where the fish are, that is to say, such spots as the Grand Banks off Newfoundland. Instead, these vessels have undoubtedly been engaged in extensive reconnaissance for the operation of nuclear submarines against our seaboard States.

In speaking so strongly, Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize that I, like other Americans, am no enemy of the Russian people, but their friend. They have long been unfortunate victims of alien in-

vaders who, in the most brutal fashion, have not hesitated to use them in conflicts with our own and other countries. Let us not wait until the trap is sprung and our coastal cities destroyed, but let us take adequate precautionary measures now before the situation becomes more critical and altogether out of hand.

As to the necessity for such action, there can be no doubt, for Communists have traditionally disdained to conceal their aims and have openly declared their purposes of world revolution. Their ultimate objective is the United States.

I fully realize that there are many, some of them in high positions, who would not take the necessary precautionary measures until some so-called overt act occurs. What could be more overt than the military buildup now taking place in Cuba? Do Miami and Cape Canaveral have to be destroyed before we realize that our country is marked for destruction? Under the vastly increased power of modern weapons of war, the overt act is constantly receding into the background and, in this regard, we must be realistic or we shall be doomed for destruction.

Since the proper precautionary measures, if taken now, would serve to avert the threatening dangers and world war III, I urge the following program:

(a) Make definite and reaffirm by resolution of the Congress the Monroe Doctrine as applying to intervention through infiltration and subversion with greater emphasis on the need for maintenance of this most vital policy for the salvation of the Western World; and

(b) Make definite and reaffirm our historic, indispensable, and time-proven policies for exclusive control in perpetuity over the Panama Canal and Canal Zone; and

(c) Liberate the people of Cuba from alien revolutionary dictatorship and assist them in the restoration of constitutional government through free elections; and

(d) Reactivate the special service squadron, augmented as may be necessary during emergencies, on a permanent basis to serve as a symbol of liberty and as an assurance of security.

The program for the liberation of Cuba, Mr. Speaker, should be taken by any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense, to forestall or combat intervention, domination, control, or colonization in whatever form, by the subversive forces known as international communism and its agencies in the Western Hemisphere.

Such actions, as comprehended in this program, Mr. Speaker, will supply a foundation of strength, so essential for the formulation of policies derived from a reasoned line of thought that aim to improve conditions as seen and understood. Besides, it would enable us to avoid the tragedies that always follow from crisis decisions.

Mr. Speaker, and fellow Members, I have given these subjects my most earnest study through the years of my service here and have sought to act and speak in

19094

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 30

an objective manner. I have sensed these perils coming and, on various occasions, have ventured the judgment which might avert them. All we need is leadership of positive character which will prove inspirational to our people.

The hour has now arrived when we must act, and act quickly in full force and effect, if we are to survive. While we temporize and hesitate, the enemy is at our gates probing for spots of weakness through which to enter. Ghengis Khan and Tamerlane, in all their ruthless actions, were never more cruel, more savage, and relentless than are the bloody monsters of the Kremlin, who are fanatically and avowedly committed to the complete destruction of our country, the great citadel of freedom.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, the people of our country know, and they are deeply agitated and concerned. They wish not for war and renewed sacrifice of the priceless youth of our land. On the other hand, they desire avoidance of such dreadful result, and are ready to support all immediate action required for its prevention.

Today, they are far ahead of the legislative and executive agencies of our Government in appraising the peril confronting us and what should be done to combat it. We must not dally, we must not hesitate; but in the face of impending disaster, we must act in clear, direct, and positive manner to drive from Western shores the greatest, most powerful, and most cruel foe of liberty that the world has ever known.

Why stand we idle while that enemy is knocking at our gates? Mr. President of the United States and fellow Members of the Congress, let us unite, in the spirit of our great, historic past to repel this great threat. Our cause is just and clothed with moral might. With prompt, united action we shall succeed.

Let others do as they may; as for me, I am ready to perform my duty to the utmost to stay the march of despotism throughout the stricken world.

As supplementary to the above, I quote the full text of my address to the House on April 12, 1962, together with its documentation, and urge that it be read by all concerned with the subject of hemispheric security.

The indicated address and documentation follows:

#### MONROE DOCTRINE OR KHRUSHCHEV DOCTRINE?

Mr. Flood. Mr. Speaker, over a period of years I have made many statements in the Congress concerning various aspects of U.S. policies in the Caribbean area. These have included discussions of the world revolutionary program for conquest of that hemispheric crossroads in which the Panama Canal has long been a key target.

Certainly, a matter so charged with serious implications as the control of the approaches to the Panama Canal, which are essential for its successful operation and protection, cannot remain unchallenged. The perspective afforded by prolonged study and close observation has enabled me to predict important events in the Caribbean and to give timely warnings of them to the Congress and the executive branch, including the introduction of measures to reaffirm and make definite our policies. It is indeed regrettable that those warnings were not heeded and measures not adopted, but any satisfaction

that might be derived by me from having been right is a barren one, for my foremost concern is the security of my country at this time of peril.

As much of what will follow relates to the Republic of Panama, I wish to stress at the outset that I am in no sense an enemy of that country, or of its people. On the contrary, I am devoted to the best interests of both and believe that those interests can be served only by the unhampered control of our Government of the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal in accordance with our historic and tested Isthmian policies as embodied in basic canal treaties.

To the task of clarification of what is an explosive situation in our own backyard, I now address myself, with the request not to be interrupted by questions until my statement is completed.

#### PANAMA REACTS TO CUBAN INSULTS

In the crisis now mounting in the Caribbean, significant events requiring decisive measures have thronged upon us.

But, as so often happens in a storm, a rift in the clouds shows some blue sky. This appeared in Panama on December 14, 1961, when the Government of that country under the leadership of President Roberto F. Chiari reacted to studied insults from Fidel Castro and broke diplomatic relations with Soviet Cuba, retroactive to December 9. Thus, once again world attention, despite preoccupations with Berlin, the Congo, Goa, Indonesia, Laos, and other distant trouble spots, has focused on the crucial Caribbean. Long ago recognized by Admiral Mahan as the Mediterranean of the Americas.

#### UNITED STATES—ULTIMATE OBJECTIVE

What is the nature of the sinister force which, through expertly conducted centralized direction, is exerting its pressures in so many strategic points in the world today? It is not a political party in the generally understood sense but pervasive action and intelligence arms of communistic revolutionary imperialism, which constitute conspiratorial fifth columns in every key spot, some government agencies, and influential sections of the mass news media. Its objective in warfare is destruction of the will to resist in advance of possible hostilities.

Emboldened by a long train of successes resulting from its calculated aggressiveness and encouraged by Western policies of placation and vacillation, this destructive force has taken over tremendous areas and great masses of population and imposed despotic governments of the most violent communistic character. These successes have indeed fanned the fires of communistic revolutionary fanaticism and immeasurably strengthened the zeal and effort to bring the entire world under the yoke of despotism.

As has been aptly stated by an eminent theologian, "its cure for poverty is to increase it. Its cure for oppression is to universalize it. Its cure for injustice is to legalize it. Its cure for evil is to systematize it."

In every way, Mr. Speaker, Communist parties all over the world serve as Trojan horses, filled with trained and disciplined revolutionaries dedicated to the overthrow of all constitutional governments by force and violence, with the United States as its chief and ultimate objective.

For this aim, the conquest of the Caribbean is but the first stage in the long-range program for encirclement of our country—the bastion of constitutional liberty.

#### CRISIS IN THE CARIBBEAN

What is the record of the mounting crisis in the Caribbean? Some of its factors will be enumerated:

1. Failure and refusal by the Organization of American States to castigate Soviet Cuba for its lawless and violent actions against life and property.

2. Display, under Executive order of September 17, 1960, by the United States, of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone territory, against the overwhelming opposition of the House of Representatives, formally expressed.

3. Withdrawal by the United States of recognition of Communist Cuba.

4. Removal by the United States of restrictions on the importation and distribution of subversive literature in our country.

5. Issue in April 1961 by the Department of State of a white paper indicating U.S. support of "authentic and autonomous revolution" throughout the Americas, which action is certainly not a valid function of our Government.

6. Failure on April 19, 1961, of the attempted liberation of Soviet Cuba under circumstances indicating subversive penetration of the U.S. security agencies.

7. Declaration on May 1, 1961, by Premier Castro, following capture of the liberators, that Cuba is a Soviet satellite and his later admission that he has long been a secret Marxist-Leninist and that he had deliberately concealed this fact from the Cuban people during the course of the recent Cuban revolution.

8. Establishment of a Communist beachhead in British Guiana by Cheddi Jagan, the newly elected Communist premier.

9. Assent on November 2, 1961, to Communist-stimulated demands of Panama for new treaty negotiations, despite our generous concessions in 1936, 1942, and 1955.

From this cursory summary, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Caribbean is well on its way to becoming a Red lake, with Cuba and British Guiana, now admittedly Soviet satellites, covering both flanks of the Atlantic approaches to the Panama Canal, itself under Bolshevik-inspired juridical attack.

#### PANAMA FLAG ENDANGERS CANAL ZONE SOVEREIGNTY

Of the long series of events contributing toward the present crisis in the Caribbean, the precedent set by Executive order on September 17, 1960, directing display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone territory, is transcendent.

In Panama, this action was taken as a complete reversal of the U.S. position on the question of sovereignty and as formal recognition of basic sovereignty of Panama over the Canal Zone, as well as a lever for wringing future concessions, including setting a time for the transfer by the United States to Panama of the canal as a gift, pure and simple. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the implications of this demand from a country whose very creation grew out of the movement to construct the Panama Canal.

In other countries, the action of the President made the United States a diplomatic laughing stock and it encouraged an extraordinary display of arrogance by Premier Castro in Cuba and alarmed shipping interests that have to pay tolls.

In our own country, it raised questions as to the identity of the influences in the Department of State that led to signing the ill-advised order and to constitutional issues of the highest importance for the future conduct of our foreign policy. Certainly, every realistic consideration demands that the order to raise the Panama flag over the Canal Zone must be disavowed.

For such disavowal, Mr. Speaker, recent studies by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs (H. Rept. 2218, 86th Congress, Aug. 31, 1960) supply ample justification. Further reasons of more compelling character will be found in our diplomatic history in the period immediately following World War II, when Alger Hiss was in charge of the Office of Special Political Affairs, in the Department of State.

Transmitting a 1946 report of the Governor of the Panama Canal to the United Nations, this office, which is to say, Alger Hiss, erroneously described the Canal Zone as

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19095

"occupied territory." (Senate Int. Sec. Subcom. hearings on "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments," pt. 19, Mar. 25 and Apr. 6, 1954, p. 1365.)

Enraging patriotic Panamanians, who oppose any move toward "internationalization" of the Panama Canal, this strange action gave the chairman of the Panamanian delegation to the United Nations an unexpected opportunity to declare in an address to the Political Commission of the General Assembly that Panama retains its sovereignty over the Canal Zone. More important, however, is the fact that the official listing of the zone by our Department of State as "occupied territory" played into the hands of the Communist revolutionaries whose ultimate aim since 1917 has been "internationalization."

**RADICAL DEMANDS ADVANCE COLOMBIAN OCCUPATION OR INTERNATIONALIZATION**

If there is any force whatsoever in the argument for Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone, it must relate back to the parent country, Colombia, from which Panama seceded in the political developments preceding the actual building of the Canal. It may be safely predicted that if the United States should ever be so unmindful and recreant of its solemn treaty obligations for the maintenance and operation of the Canal for the entire world as to attempt to transfer the Canal to Panama as a gift, Colombia will promptly follow such action with a reassertion of its complete sovereignty over the entire territory of Panama and claim the Canal as its own. Nor should it be overlooked that Colombia has important treaty rights with respect to the Panama Canal and Railroad, as well as Panama.

As I have often stated and emphasized, Panama, in its ever increasing effort to wrest control of the canal from the United States is not serving its own best interests, but, on the contrary, strengthens Soviet policy and advances the movement for the internationalization of the canal. Even the advocates of these excessive Panamanian demands declare that it would be far better for Panama to deal with the United States as regards the operations of the canal than with an international organization. This undoubtedly is true.

It is strange indeed that, though our Government during recent years has made many important concessions to the Panamanian demands, it has never required any compensating Panamanian concessions. On the other hand, Panama has accepted the great benefits as signals for making new and greater demands. The latest are listed in a resolution of the Panamanian Assembly on November 16, 1961, which is quoted in documentation appended to my address.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, no revolutionary influence in our Government, determined on a piecemeal liquidation of our sovereign rights, power, and authority on the Isthmus, could have done a better job than has been accomplished over a long period of years.

**CHARLES EVANS HUGHES AND ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICY**

In this general connection, Mr. Speaker, it is highly pertinent to consider what one of our country's ablest and most forthright Secretaries of State, Charles Evans Hughes, once stated.

In a conversation with the then Minister of Panama to the United States on December 15, 1923, in response to formal demands by Panama for increased sovereignty and increased sovereignty attributes over the Canal Zone, Mr. Hughes spoke with a refreshing degree of candor and vigor. He declared that our country "would never recede from the position which it had taken in the note of Secretary Hay in 1904. This Government could not, and would not, enter into any discussion affecting its full right to deal with the Canal Zone and to the entire exclusion of any sovereign rights or authority on the

part of Panama." ("Foreign Relations," 1923, vol. III, p. 684.)

To this Secretary Hughes added that "It was an absolute futility for the Panamanian Government to expect any American administration, no matter what it was, any President or any Secretary of State, ever to surrender any part of these rights which the United States had acquired under the Treaty of 1903." That is the type of statement that should be forthcoming from our statesmen today, especially from those in executive authority over the Canal.

On another occasion, Mr. Speaker, when writing about the Monroe Doctrine, Mr. Hughes made this telling statement about Isthmian canal policies, namely:

"The construction of the Panama Canal has not only established a new and convenient highway of commerce but has created new exigencies and new conditions of strategy and defense. It is part of American policy not to yield to any foreign power the control of the Panama Canal, or the approaches to it, or the obtaining of any position which would interfere with the right of protection on the part of the United States or would menace the freedom of its communications." (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1957, Vol. 15, p. 738).

All the exigencies foreseen by former Secretary Hughes, in clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine and our solemn treaty obligations with respect to the Canal, have now come to pass. The questions that now face us are what steps should be taken to protect our country against the loss of its undoubted rights in the Caribbean and against the chaos that will inevitably follow if the United States ever abandons its operation and control of the Panama Canal.

**JOHN F. STEVENS ALERTED US TO MARXIST DANGERS**

At this point, Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate to examine some important historical antecedents of the world crisis, which show that current problems are not new, but old.

It was John F. Stevens, famed "Basic Architect of the Panama Canal," who, while serving as head of our railroad missions in Russia and Siberia, 1917-23 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 29, 1956, p. 9285) had a unique opportunity to observe the early years of the Russian Bolshevik revolution. He was thus able, in his reports and during periodic visits to Washington, to alert important leaders in our country, among them Ira E. Bennett, great editor of the Washington Post, to its internationally organized conspiratorial nature and the dangers thereby involved.

Ideas about communistic subversion that Stevens started through Editor Bennett still reverberate.

**KARL MARX FORESAW SOVIET IMPERIALISM**

Before Stevens there was Karl Marx who, from 1853 to 1856, was European correspondent of the New York Daily Tribune. Among his perceptive writings are found these startling statements:

"\* \* \* Russian imperialism \* \* \* is not a movement that strives for national independence, but a movement which, directed against Europe, would destroy all cultural values that history has created through thousands of years. This could not be achieved without eradicating Austria, Hungary, Turkey, and a major part of Germany from the (political) map."

"There is only one way of dealing with absolute power like Russia and that is by absolute fearlessness."

These telling words give the key to withstand aggressiveness: absolute fearlessness must confront absolute power.

**COMMODORE PERRY FORESAW EAST-WEST CONFLICT**

Mr. Speaker, by far the most revealing of all the prophetic statements on the question of East-West conflict is that of Commodore

Matthew C. Perry, after return from his famous voyage to Japan.

Speaking before the American Geographical and Statistical Society on March 6, 1856, he expressed views that should ring through the centuries and I quote:

"It requires no sage to predict events so strongly foreshadowed to us all; still 'Westward' will 'the course of empire take its way.' But the last act of the drama is yet to be unfolded; and notwithstanding the reasoning of political empirics, westward, northward, and southward, to me it seems that the people of America will, in some form or other extend their dominion and their power, until they shall have brought within their mighty embrace multitudes of the islands of the great Pacific, and placed the Saxon race upon the eastern shores of Asia. And I think too, that eastward and southward will her great rival in future aggrandizement (Russia) stretch forth per power to the coasts of China and Siam; and thus the Saxon and the Cossack will meet once more, in strife or in friendship, or another field. Will it be in friendship? I fear not. The antagonistic exponents of freedom and absolutism must thus meet at last, and then will be fought that mighty battle on which the world will look with breathless interest; for on its issue will depend the freedom or the slavery of the world—despotism or rational liberty must be the fate of civilized man. I think I see in the distance the giants that are growing up for that fierce and final encounter; in the progress of events that battle must sooner or later inevitably be fought."

These words, Mr. Speaker, so meaningful today, were uttered more than a century ago. Surely no one who has studied world history should be surprised at what has happened in eastern Asia, the Southwest Pacific, Africa, or in Cuba.

The last, being closest to our shores and located near one of the historic invasion routes of North America, the valley of the Mississippi, and in a position to menace the communications of the Panama Canal, is of prime importance.

The domination of Cuba by a fanatical Communist power is a clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine and cannot be safely ignored or tolerated. Cuba can serve not only as a base from which to launch atomic missiles against vital points in the continental United States, but also as a beachhead from which to conduct further conquests through subversion. Such conquests would occur first in remaining Caribbean countries and later throughout Latin lands.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, it should ever be borne in mind that Premier Khrushchev declared with exultation that the Monroe Doctrine is dead. The failure to make an adequate reaffirmation of this historic policy and the succession of recent Communist victories in the Caribbean can only mean that the transcendent issue on our fourth front has become the Monroe Doctrine versus the Khrushchev doctrine.

**SUBVERSIVE PERSONNEL MUST BE REMOVED**

What are the explanations for the collapse of our Caribbean policies? Of course, there are many but basic to any sustained deterioration in policy matters there is always the question of the character of the personnel conducting these policies. Who were they?

Among them were William A. Wieland, formerly in charge of the Caribbean area in the Department of State; Phillip Bonsal, former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba; Herbert L. Matthews, correspondent of the New York Times, who was used to indoctrinate U.S. officials on their way to Cuba and has been widely identified as the principal architect of the "Castro image" that enabled him to seize power; and Roy R. Rubottom, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American affairs.

19096

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 20

Where are they now? Wieland is still being paid by the taxpayers' money and is now in training for a new State Department assignment; Bonsal is Ambassador to Morocco; Matthews is still with the New York Times; and, believe it or not, Robottom is on the staff of the Naval War College at Newport as the State Department's representative in the great institution that trains our naval officers in the art and science of war. I wonder if he also undertakes to indoctrinate these officers with his own views on Castroism.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, so long as men of this character are in positions of power and influence with respect to the conduct of our foreign policies, we may expect continued retrogression. The personnel situation presented is not one that can be corrected by a mere shifting of personnel or changing of official titles under procedures known as reorganizations. It is one that calls for the identification by investigating committees of the Congress, of the individuals in the Department of State, and the mass media who are responsible for our tragic failures in policy and their removal from positions of power.

Regardless of whether those responsible for these tragic failures in American foreign policy have been well-meaning but stupid or definitely subversive, the results are the same and our Nation has suffered accordingly. Such individuals should be absolutely eliminated from any position of power in our Government and public opinion should prevent their employment in mass media operations.

#### PARALYSIS AND CONTRIVED CONVICTION MUST BE OVERCOME

In considering the ways to meet the challenge in the Caribbean, can we rely on the Organization of American States for remedial action? The answer is "No."

That agency, I regret to say, is nothing but an instrument for paralysis. Moreover, we should not delude our people by pretending to rely on an organization for the performance of tasks that we know are beyond its desires, intentions, or powers.

#### GUATEMALA OVERCOMES THREAT

Mr. Speaker, in viewing the problems now facing our country, it should be borne in mind that everywhere in Latin countries where, under a false notion of liberty, communism has been permitted to infiltrate, trained, and disciplined Soviet agents have meddled in the affairs of those countries and plotted for the overthrow of all legally constituted authority.

In executing their designs for conquest, these agents have constantly resorted to bloody violences to attain their ends. The governments involved too often seem to have become unnerved and paralyzed when faced with the deadly peril.

A recent example of the Communist policy of violent overthrow of constitutional government was the effort on June 11, 1961, in Guatemala to drive the administration of President Miguel Ydigoras from power and to supplant it with one like that in Cuba, which is completely subservient to orders from its Kremlin overlords.

In contrast to what has taken place in some other Latin countries, the effective reaction of the Guatemalan Government to that threat was highly commendable and encouraging.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I voice the view of all patriotic Americans, North, central, and south, when I publicly praise, on the floor of the House, President Ydigoras and his administration for their alertness to the danger and for their success in surmounting that threat. They contributed to the security of all the Americas.

#### OUR PEOPLE DEMAND ACTION

Unfortunately, too much time has passed without our own Government taking proper action. Subversive forces in Cuba are becoming consolidated in their beachhead and preparing for their next moves. The well-publicized moves of our Department of State in Dominican affairs and the Congo stands out in stark contrast to its silence about Cuba, which is a storm center for American subversion. In this connection, the Organization of American States has been proved absolutely impotent.

Indeed it is fortunate that the people of our country are far ahead of our agencies of Government, both legislative and executive. They perceive the hazards of neglect and are demanding immediate remedial action. This I know, not only from observations and discussions during my travels, but also from numerous letters from thoughtful men and women in various parts of the Nation.

They are also demanding remedies in line with our historic policies and the inherent right of self-defense. They will not tolerate supplanting the Monroe Doctrine with the Khrushchev Doctrine in any part of the Americas.

#### MONROE DOCTRINE MUST BE REAFFIRMED

World War II ended more than 15 years ago with the peoples of all lands, including the Soviet, yearning for a "lasting peace." But instead of peace, the two strongest nations in the world today face each other in undisguised hostility. This makes it imperative that our country look first to its own vital interests, for it is the only hope of the free world to remain free.

In the first quarter of the 19th century, when our country was weak, it faced a crisis of the gravest character. Not only was the United States threatened by European imperialism from across the Atlantic, but also by Russian penetration from the Pacific Northwest, which had reached as far south as Fort Ross just north of San Francisco.

American statesmen rose to the occasion and, on December 2, 1823, President Monroe, in a message to the Congress, issued a diplomatic warning to all nations that our country would resist any further conquests in the Western Hemisphere. Monroe did not wait until strategic spots in the Caribbean had been occupied, but, by a forthright declaration, made our position unmistakably and effectively clear. Such realistic treatment is sorely needed today.

To this end, I urge the Congress to take immediate steps to correct the dangerous legislative and executive delinquencies which have diverted the conduct of our foreign policies from their destined course. In 1823 we were weak; today we are strong, but losing in relative strength. Why wait until the strength ratio is further reduced? Why wait for another Goa to demonstrate more dramatically the futility of relying for protection on nations which proclaim peace, but practice aggression, or on an international organization dominated by Soviet controlled vetoes or votes? We must act now!

#### FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION IS SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. Speaker, underlying the Panama Canal sovereignty question is a fundamental principle. Our country is in the Canal Zone properly and lawfully, as of right, fully, and explicitly defined in basic treaty agreements between two sovereign states, or else it is occupying territory to which it has no flawless title, territory upon which its armed forces and civil employees have been squatting since 1904, territory for which it pays a mere rental, so that it might be permitted to maintain, operate, and protect the inter-oceanic waterway.

If time permitted going into the early history of the negotiations which led to the acquisition of the Canal Zone, it could be shown that the United States could have rented the required strip across the Isthmus from Colombia for construction of the canal, if mere leasing of the territory from another sovereign state was what our Government had intended nearly 60 years ago.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized, Mr. Speaker, that the idea of sovereign jurisdiction over the Canal Zone, subject to no limitation in time or substance, was the prime objective of our Government.

The reason for this is the basic fact that the United States could not afford, and was therefore, unwilling to undertake the great obligation to build the Panama Canal at the expense of the American taxpayers and to maintain and operate it in a land of endemic revolution and political instability except on the basis of exclusive sovereignty in perpetuity. This consideration was fully recognized by both Panama and the United States in the formulation of the 1903 treaty and any other judgment is absolutely naive except to the extent that it may be influenced by communistic revolutionary forces.

Our obligations to the other countries involved and with which we had to deal in regards to the canal enterprise require that our country have untrammelled sovereignty and authority. A divided sovereignty would make fulfillment of our treaty obligations to operate the canal for world shipping on terms of equality utterly impossible. Our country is not a mere tenant on the Isthmus nor a squatter, but a grantee of sovereignty in perpetuity for the perpetual maintenance, operation and protection of the Panama Canal.

#### CANAL ZONE—TARGET OF REVOLUTIONARY AGGRESSION

In the perspective that is now possible, the argument of Alger Hiss that under article 73 of the United Nations Charter, the United States should file administrative reports with the Secretary General of that organization, because the Canal Zone is an "occupied area," was a monstrous aggression of Communist revolutionary conspiracy upon our valid and unblemished title to that part of the constitutionally acquired domain of the United States.

As was clearly foreseen by competent students, for more than 15 years our Nation and its Government have been harassed by those who aim to make the flag of the United States a symbol of imperialistic exploitation. Some of them, unfortunately, enjoy the status and heritage of citizenship in our Republic.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, many have wondered whether the 1960 Executive order to hoist the Panama flag over the Canal Zone was a cleverly planned move to validate the 1946 declaration by Alger Hiss of the zone as "occupied territory." To this question the only answer is that, regardless of the intent of its signer, the result was to that effect, and our sovereign status has been clouded.

At last, Mr. Speaker, the time has come for our country to settle once and for all how it intends that its tenure in the Canal Zone is to be regarded by our own people, by Panama, by our other America Republic, and by the world at large, including the Soviet empire and its satellites. No bland generalities will suffice: a categorical and unequivocal reaffirmation that our exclusive sovereign rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal are not open to challenge, and nothing less, must be proclaimed. For the Congress to fail in this would be tantamount to adopting the Khrushchev doctrine by default.



4962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19097

## PLAN FOR ACTION

Mr. Speaker, as previously stated to this body on many occasions, the conduct of our Caribbean and Isthmian policies over a long period of time has been indecisive and lacking in consistency. Our innate courtesy and self-restraint have been mistaken for weakness and the forces of subversion have been advanced into the vacuum created by our own fumbling.

To meet this situation where we face absolute power, we must show absolute fearlessness as the only way to meet this power.

Accordingly, I urge the following program:

(a) Make definite and reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine as applying to intervention through infiltration and subversion;

(b) Make definite and reaffirm our historic policies for exclusive sovereign control in perpetuity over the Panama Canal and Canal Zone;

(c) Liberate the people of Cuba from alien dictatorship and assist them in the restoration of constitutional government through free elections; and

(d) Reactivate the special service squadron on a permanent basis to serve as a symbol of liberty.

Mr. Speaker, only by such a forthright line of action by our Government—prompt, courageous, and effective—can the sadly impaired prestige of our great country and its leadership be restored and the cause of Western freedom be strengthened.

To these ends, I would appeal to the President of the United States when dealing with hemispheric crises to act in the spirit of Cleveland and Theodore Roosevelt, when they were faced with foreign attempts to destroy the authority and integrity of our Latin neighbors in disregard of the Monroe Doctrine.

A decision thus to act may be difficult to make; but it must be made if the cause of Western civilization is to be sustained. In no finer way can our President in his own right establish a profile of courage.

As partial documentation for this address and commended for study, resolutions on these matters previously introduced by me follow; also the recent exchange of letters between the Presidents of Panama and the United States with attendant publicity from the Isthmian press, which lists Panamanian aspirations.

## HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 225

(In the House of Representatives, 87th Cong., 1st sess., April 26, 1961)

Whereas the subversive forces known as international communism, operating secretly and openly, directly and indirectly, threaten the sovereignty and political independence of all the Western Hemisphere nations; and

Whereas the American continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, are not subject to colonization or domination by any power; and

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly or indirectly, or however disguised, in any American state, conflicts with the established policy of the American Republics for the protection of the sovereignty of the peoples of such states and the political independence of their governments; and

Whereas such a situation extended to any portions of the Western Hemisphere is dangerous to the peace and safety of the whole of it, including the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* (1) That any such subversive domination or threat of it violates the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, and of collective security as set forth in the acts and resolutions heretofore adopted by the American Republics; and

(2) That in any such situation any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance may, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense, and in accordance with the declarations and principles above stated, take steps to forestall or combat intervention, domination, control, and colonization in whatever form, by the subversive forces known as international communism and its agencies in the Western Hemisphere.

## HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 33

(In the House of Representatives, 86th Cong., 1st sess., January 9, 1959)

Whereas there is now being strongly urged in certain quarters of the world the surrender, by the United States, without reimbursement, of the Panama Canal, to the United Nations or to some other international organization for the ownership and operation of the canal; and

Whereas the United States, at the expense of its taxpayers and under, and fully relying on, treaty agreements, constructed the canal, and since its completion, at large expenditure, has maintained and operated it and provided for its protection and defense; and

Whereas the United States, following the construction of the canal, has since maintained, operated, and protected it in strict conformity with treaty requirements and agreements, and has thus made it free, without restriction or qualification, for the shipping of the entire world; and, in consequence of which, with respect to the canal and the Canal Zone, every just and equitable consideration favors the continuance of the United States in the exercise of all the rights and authority by treaty provided, and in the discharge of the duties by treaty imposed: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That (1) it is the sense and judgment of the Congress that the United States should not, in any wise, surrender to any other government or authority its jurisdiction over, and control of, the Canal Zone, and its ownership, control, management, maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal, in accordance with existing treaty provisions; and that (2) it is to the best interests—not only of the United States, but, as well, of all nations and peoples—that all the powers, duties, authority, and obligations of the United States in the premises be continued in accordance with existing treaty provisions.

## HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 450

(In the House of Representatives, 86th Cong., Jan. 11, 1960)

Whereas, the United States, under the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 with Panama, acquired complete and exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone in perpetuity for construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

Whereas all jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone ceased on exchange of ratifications of the 1903 treaty on February 26, 1904; and

Whereas since that time the United States has continuously exercised exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal; and

Whereas where responsibility is imposed there must be given for its effectuation adequate authority; and with respect to the Panama Canal the treaty of 1903 so provided; and

Whereas the United States has fully and effectively discharged all its treaty obligations with respect to the Panama Canal and the only legitimate interest that Panama can have in the sovereignty of the Canal Zone is one of reversionary character that

can never become operative unless the United States should abandon the canal enterprises; and

Whereas the policy of the United States since President Hayes' message to the Congress on March 8, 1880, has been for an interoceanic canal "under American control," that is to say, under the control of the United States; and

Whereas the grant by Panama to the United States of exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for the aforesaid purposes was an absolute; indispensable condition precedent to the great task undertaken by the United States in the construction and perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, for the benefit of the entire world: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* (1) That the United States, under treaty provisions, constitutionally acquired, and holds, in perpetuity, exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

(2) That there can be no just claim by the Republic of Panama for the exercise of any sovereignty of whatever character over the Canal Zone so long as the United States discharges its duties and obligations with respect to the canal; and

(3) That the formal display of any official flag over the Canal Zone other than that of the United States is violative of law, treaty, international usage, and the historic canal policy of the United States as fully upheld by its highest courts and administrative officials; and would lead to confusion and chaos in the administration of the Panama Canal enterprise.

[From the Star & Herald, Panama, Republic of Panama, Nov. 16, 1961]

## TEXTS OF LETTERS

CHIARI'S

PANAMA, September 8, 1961.

To His Excellency, JOHN F. KENNEDY, President of the United States of America, The White House, Washington, D.C.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: Relations between the Republic of Panama and the United States of America have been governed, basically, since 1903, by the Isthmian Canal Convention, signed in Washington on November 18 of that year, by the Secretary of State, Mr. John Hay, and the French citizen, Philippe Bunau Varilla who was acting temporarily as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Panama.

The provisions of that Convention have been, from the moment of its signature, and will continue to be, as long as they remain in force, a source of constant frictions, disagreements and conflicts between the two Governments and between the Panamanian people and the North American population residing in the Canal Zone.

In 1936, thanks to the dedicated efforts of the then President of Panama, Dr. Harmodio Arias, and his advisers, Drs. Ricardo J. Alfaro and Narciso Garay and thanks also to the clear understanding, ample spirit of fairness and the great kindness of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Panama succeeded in abolishing three rights which the 1903 Convention granted to the Government of the United States, namely: (a) The right of intervention in the internal affairs of the Republic of Panama when in the judgment of the United States this became necessary to maintain order; (b) the right to occupy any Panamanian lands or waters which in the judgment of the United States were necessary for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and defense of the ca-

19098

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 20

nal; (c) the right of "construction" of a canal through the Isthmus of Panama.

In 1936, and again in 1942 and 1955, Panama obtained other amendments as to detail in the interpretation and implementation of certain provisions of the 1903 Convention.

But there still remain in full force the provisions of that Convention which in practice have had and still have the effect of having divided the Republic of Panama in two parts separated by the Interpolation, between them, of a zone in which the Government of the United States considers that it has the right of exercising full sovereign authority and jurisdiction, notwithstanding that all of the rights which were granted it by Panama are limited to the purposes, expressly agreed upon, of the "maintenance, operation, sanitation, and defense of the canal."

The real cause of all the vices and errors of the 1903 convention lies in that such convention was never negotiated. When, immediately following the proclamation of Panama's independence, the Panamanian representatives who were sent to negotiate the treaty arrived in Washington they faced the tragic surprise that on the previous day, just as they landed in the port of New York, Secretary of State John Hay and the Frenchman Bunau Varilla had hurriedly signed the Isthmian Canal Convention, with no previous negotiation, but after a quick confabulation between them both, handing over the new Republic of Panama, bound hand and feet, to the mercy of the Government of the United States, in perpetuity, as if there could be perpetual human things.

For these reasons, the Isthmian Convention of 1903 carries within it the causes of its own extinction.

It is not necessary for me to go into details on the manner in which that wholly unfair convention was drafted and signed, because the turn of this century saw the peak of the colonialist expansion of strong states to the detriment of nations rendered weak by the ignorance and submission of the popular masses. At that time, no voice was raised in support of countries subjected by brute force or by unsurmountable causes to the domination of a powerful state.

After half a century and two world wars, the panorama is wholly different: Colonies are on their way out, respect for the personality of each state is now an axiom in international law, the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of another state has victoriously surged forward, and the structure of the world organization of nations is showing ever more effectively, the influence of united small nations on international problems and conflicts.

There is no place in the mentality of man in this second half of the 20th century for the proposition that a state, no matter how strong, can exert sovereign rights over any part of the territory of another state, no matter how small or weak.

This does not mean, however, that two sovereign and independent states having common interests cannot reach understandings which, without being detrimental to the sovereignty and the dignity of either one, enable both to defend and protect their fair interest and rights without disregarding or damaging the fair interests and rights of the other.

It was for these reasons that, in the face of the indissoluble community of interests between Panama and the United States; in the face of the increasingly urgent need for establishing and maintaining reciprocal relations on a basis of sincere friendship, mutual respect, and well-reciprocated consideration; and in the face of the permanent source of discord which is the 1903 convention, that I took the liberty of forwarding to you, through your personal representative at the Conference of Foreign Ministers and Economy held in Tegucigalpa in July of this

year, my personal message suggesting how convenient and necessary it is for Panama and the United States to converse without prejudice, without resentment, setting aside past problems and offenses, as nations sincerely friendly and sincerely determined to search for fair solutions, to analyze and discuss their present-day relations in the light of the doctrines which now govern the world, with a view to attaining permanent understandings, on just bases, which will assure to each party the attainment and enjoyment of what in justice and fairness is due each one, without a prior agenda, so that each may openly place the cards it wants on the table.

I have the deep personal conviction that if Panama and the United States were to cast aside the interminable and up to now almost fruitless discussions on what should be the correct interpretation of existing treaties, and disposed themselves to undertake the analysis of existing relations between both with a realistic approach and in the light of the principles and norms of international law, already universally recognized, they will find adequate formulae to resolve, once and for all and for all time, a stable and lasting association which will enable them to carry out harmoniously the common destiny set out for them by the Panama Canal. The bias—whether justified or unjustified—that such results are either difficult or impossible of attainment, should not be an obstacle for the attempt.

The Alliance for Progress you have so wisely proposed, which was set in motion in Montevideo with the cooperation of all the American nations, could find no better realization in the relations between Panama and the United States through a formula that will place these relations on a level of clear and just understandings permitting Panama a fuller use of its economic potential, without diminishing the consideration that is due to the interests of the United States by reason of the canal enterprise made possible by both countries and in whose operation both have a common interest.

It is a source of real pleasure for me to reiterate on this occasion the sentiments of my highest consideration and great appreciation.

ROBERTO F. CHIARI,  
President of the Republic of Panama.

KENNEDY'S  
THE WHITE HOUSE,  
November 2, 1961.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have read with great interest your letter of September 8, 1961, which your brother delivered to me on September 15. I am also very pleased to have had a personal conversation with your brother at that time.

I agree with you that an unusual community of interests exists between the Republic of Panama and the United States. Our respective Governments and peoples have been closely associated since the very beginning of your nation. The Panama Canal has been an important element in the development and growth of the relationship between our two countries, and has also contributed to the bonds of unity which link all the American Republics.

The Government of the United States hopes to maintain and strengthen the relations between our two nations on the basis of mutual respect and sincere friendship. I feel sure that the Government of Panama shares this objective.

Once again on behalf of the Government of the United States, I reaffirm our willingness to cooperate wholeheartedly with the Government of Panama to insure the full enjoyment of the various benefits which the canal should afford to the two nations that made possible its construction. We also wish to make these benefits available to all nations interested in international trade.

As I pointed out to your brother on Sep-

tember 15, I realize that the historic friendship and cooperation between our two countries has sometimes been marred by differences concerning the interpretation of the rights granted to the United States by the Republic of Panama. In past years these problems have been resolved in various ways—sometimes through formal treaty negotiations and sometimes through friendly discussions and the subsequent implementation of specific measures agreed upon by representatives of the two Governments.

My Government recognizes that differences will inevitably arise between even the friendliest nations, and believes that these differences must be discussed thoroughly and frankly, in order to clarify the interests and attitudes of both parties. It seems clear therefore, that when two friendly nations are bound by treaty provisions which are not fully satisfactory to one of the parties, arrangements should be made to permit qualified representatives of both nations to discuss these points of dissatisfaction with a view to their resolution.

I have instructed the various responsible departments and agencies of the U.S. Government to make a complete reexamination of our current and future needs with respect to Isthmian Canal facilities. I expect this study to be completed within a very few months, at which time my Government will communicate promptly with the Government of Panama. I am confident that representatives of our two Governments, after a frank exchange of views and a careful assessment of our mutual needs and interests, can reach fruitful conclusions which will promote the mutual welfare of both countries.

With cordial good wishes,

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

[From the Panama Star & Herald, Nov. 16, 1961]

KENNEDY AGREES ON NEED FOR RP TALKS—  
NEGOTIATIONS APPEAR ASSURED DURING  
1962

President John F. Kennedy has agreed with President Roberto F. Chiari that differences between their two nations must be discussed thoroughly and frankly. In a reply to the Panamanian Chief Executive, Kennedy announced he has called for a complete reexamination of U.S. current and future needs with respect to Isthmian Canal facilities prior to entering into negotiations with Panama.

"I expect this study to be completed within a very few months, at which time my Government will communicate promptly with the Government of Panama," Kennedy wrote Chiari. "I am confident that representatives of our two Governments after a frank exchange of views and a careful assessment of our mutual needs and interests, can reach fruitful conclusions which will promote the mutual welfare of both countries."

Thus, new negotiations over U.S. rights in the Canal Zone and Panamanian benefits from the Isthmian Waterway appeared assured for 1962.

President Kennedy answered the Panamanian President's letter of September 8, calling, in effect, for negotiations from scratch.

"I have the deep personal conviction," Chiari had written Kennedy, that if Panama and the United States were to cast aside the interminable and up-to-now almost fruitless discussions on what should be the correct interpretation of existing treaties, and disposed themselves to undertake the analysis of existing relations between both with a realistic approach and in the light of the principles and norms of international law, already universally recognized, they will find adequate formulae to resolve, once and for all for all time, a stable and lasting association which will enable them to carry out

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19099

harmoniously the common destiny set out for them by the Panama Canal."

And he added: "The bias—whether justified or unjustified—that such results are either difficult or impossible of attainment, should not be an obstacle for the attempt."

Chiari's letter was hand delivered to President Kennedy at the White House on September 15 by his brother, Riccardo Chiari. Kennedy's letter was hand delivered to President Chiari at the Presidencia by Philip Clock, Acting Chargé d'Affairs of the United States in Panama, Tuesday afternoon.

Announcement of the text of the Presidential correspondence was made simultaneously yesterday afternoon in Washington and Panama City.

Press Secretary Fabian Velarde, Jr., distributed copies of both letters to newsmen at 4:30 p.m., at the Presidencia. In answer to a question, he said President Chiari is pleased by the answer he has received from President Kennedy. He declared that Panama most likely will continue the appraisal of its position during the time that the United States takes for the study of its current and future canal needs.

Velarde also said that the Panama Government will appoint its negotiators soon and they will work closely with the National Council of Foreign Relations in the presentation of Panama's claims.

When a newsman raised the point that the time mentioned in President Kennedy's letter for the U.S. study of its canal needs might be 1 or 2 years, Velarde pointed to the phrase "within a very few months" and added that while every one was entitled to his own interpretation, he thought this means less than 6 months.

Chiari's letter revealed that the Panamanian President made his first approach to Kennedy on the subject of new negotiations as far back as July. At that time an emissary of President Chiari met with the personal representative of President Kennedy at a meeting of Central American Foreign Ministers held in Tegucigalpa, Honduras. This was followed by the September letter.

The Panamanian Chief Executive made one major point in his personal letter to Kennedy—that the 1903 treaty, which has governed basically, relations between the two countries since Panama became independent was not negotiated by Panamanian representatives, but was hurriedly signed (by a quick confabulation) between the Secretary of State of the United States John Hay, and Philippe Bunar Varilla, a Frenchman, temporarily acting as Panama's envoy. Chiari pointed out that this was done at the "peak of the colonialist expansion of strong states."

But times have changed, Chiari said, in effect.

"After a half century and two World Wars," he wrote President Kennedy, "the panorama is wholly different: Colonies are on their way out, respect for the personality of each state is now an axiom in international law; the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of another state has victoriously urged forward, and the structure of the world organization of nations is showing, ever more effectively, the influence of united small nations on international problems and conflicts."

And with a pointed reference to the key question between Panama and the United States—sovereignty over the Canal Zone—the President of Panama added:

"There's no place in the mentality of man in this second half of the 20th century for the proposition that a state, no matter how strong, can exert sovereign rights over any part of the territory of another state, no matter how small or weak."

But, he went on, there is nothing to prevent two sovereign and independent states from reaching understandings providing acceptable arrangement for the fair interests and rights of each.

President Kennedy's letter matched the cordial tone of President Chiari's approach. "Once again," Kennedy wrote, "on behalf of the Government of the United States, I reaffirm our willingness to cooperate wholeheartedly with the Government of Panama to insure the full enjoyment of the various benefits which the canal should afford to the two nations that made possible its construction. We also wish to make these benefits available to all nations interested in international trade."

He added: "My Government recognizes that differences will inevitably arise between even the friendliest nations and believes that these differences must be discussed thoroughly and frankly in order to clarify the interests and attitudes of both parties. It seems clear, therefore, that when two friendly nations are bound by treaty provisions which are not fully satisfactory to one of the parties, arrangements should be made to permit qualified representatives of both nations to discuss these points of dissatisfaction with a view to their resolution."

There has been no official announcement by Panama of what specific issues it proposes to raise when normal negotiations are undertaken. But an official listing of unfulfilled Panamanian demands in previous negotiations carried in the Foreign Office's 1961 report to the National Assembly included these major points:

1. The display of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone.
2. Implementation of the principle of equality of wages, of treatment, and of opportunity for employment among Panamanian and North American citizens in the Canal Zone.
3. Increase of the canal annuity to 20 percent of the gross revenue with a guaranteed minimum of \$5 million. The present annuity is \$1,930,000.
4. Cessation of grant in perpetuity.
5. Mixed courts in the Canal Zone.

[From the Panama (Republic of Panama) Star & Herald, Nov. 17, 1961]

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA ASSEMBLY CALLS FOR BRANDNEW TREATY—DEPUTIES FAVOR SCRAPPING OF PREVIOUS PACTS—RESOLUTION, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY, ADVOCATES TREATY REAFFIRMING REPUBLIC OF PANAMA SOVEREIGNTY IN ZONE

The Panama National Assembly went on record yesterday for the scrapping of all previous treaties with the United States and for a new treaty reaffirming Panamanian sovereignty in the Canal Zone.

The resolution, introduced by nationalist leader, Aquilino Boyd, in behalf of himself and 11 other assembly deputies, was approved unanimously after a brief discussion.

In addition to the sovereignty demand, the assembly listed 13 other points as minimum aspirations of the Panamanian people. These points are almost identical to the list of Panamanian demands not met by the United States in previous negotiations, issued earlier this month by the Foreign Office.

The assembly acted within 24 hours of the release of the text of the correspondence between Presidents Roberto Chiari and John F. Kennedy on the subject of new treaty negotiations. President Chiari, in a letter dated September 8, told President Kennedy that the two countries should make another attempt at resolving their longstanding differences, starting this time from scratch. President Kennedy, in a letter dated November 2, agreed that such differences must be

discussed thoroughly and frankly, and indicated that the United States will be ready to enter into talks in 1962 after a reexamination of its current and future needs with respect to Isthmian Canal facilities.

The assembly said yesterday that Kennedy's letter "evidences the good will of his Government to arrive at satisfactory agreements on the questions deriving from the Inter-oceanic Canal embedded in our territory."

The resolution also pointed out: That the 1903, 1936, and 1955 treaties have not succeeded in "cementing the relations between the two countries in a satisfactory manner."

That the 1903 treaty is manifestly unfair and that the grant is made to the United States in perpetuity is not in keeping with the principles of international law.

That Panama is not deriving fair benefits from the Panama Canal.

The resolution provides as follows:

"Be it resolved—

"1. That (the assembly) express its most fervent desire that the 1903 Treaty on the Inter-oceanic Canal and the treaties subsequently entered into in 1936 and 1935 be totally replaced and that a new treaty be drawn up which will reaffirm Panamanian sovereignty in the Canal Zone and satisfy the minimum aspirations of the Panamanian people.

"2. That the following are recognized as the minimum aspirations of the Panamanian people:

"(a) Elimination of the in-perpetuity clause and reversion to Panama of the canal installations on a fixed term.

"(b) Fair sharing of the canal revenues (the Foreign Office had listed increasing the canal annuity from the present \$1,930,000 to 20 percent of the gross revenue, with a guaranteed minimum of \$5 million).

"(c) Establishment of mixed courts and revision of the present legislation in the Canal Zone.

"(d) Recognition of Spanish as an official language in the Canal Zone.

"(e) Cooperation by Canal Zone authorities to enforce Panamanian laws in the Canal Zone.

"(f) Establishment of Panamanian jurisdiction over the ports of Balboa and Cristobal.

"(g) Raising of the Panamanian flag on all public buildings and on all ships transiting the canal.

"(h) Use of Panamanian postage stamps in the Canal Zone.

"(i) Elimination of the issuance of ex-equaturs (written official recognition) by the Canal Zone to foreign consuls.

"(j) Effective equality of opportunity and treatment for Panamanian and North American workers in the Canal Zone.

"(k) Inclusion of a clause on arbitration as the means of resolving controversies. (The Foreign Office has listed acceptance of the mandatory jurisdiction of the World Court over controversies between the two countries.)

"(l) Cooperation by the U.S. Government for the defense of the Panamanian civil population against possible nuclear attacks.

"(m) Regulation of commercial activities in the Canal Zone through a treaty of commerce, bearing in mind at all times the objective of insuring for Panama the full enjoyment of all types of benefits deriving from the operation of the canal."

Cosignators of the resolution with Boyd were Deputies Azael Vargas, Thelma King, José Agustín Arango, Enrique Jiménez, Jr., Jacinto Lopez y León, Jorge Fernández, Sidney Wise Arias, Rafael Grajales, Juan B. Arias, Raúl Arango, Jr., and Demetrio Océrega.

19100

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 20

## INTERLOCKING SUBVERSION IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

U.S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS, OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,

Washington, D.C., March 25, 1954.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 324, Senate Office Building, Senator William H. Jenner (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Jenner, Watkins, Welker, and Butler.

Also present: Charles P. Grimes, chief counsel; J. G. Sourwine, associate counsel; Benjamin Mandel, director of research; Dr. Edna R. Fluegel and Robert C. McManus, professional staff members.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Let the record show this is a continuation of a hearing with Ambassador Braden that was started December 22, 1953, in New York, and I will ask Mr. Grimes to connect the two and to clarify the record.

Mr. GRIMES. Thank you. I think that would make a more orderly record.

There will be some repetition, but simply by way of amplification.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Witness, do you swear the testimony you will give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BRADEN. So help me God, I do.

TESTIMONY OF SPRULLIE BRADEN, NEW YORK, N.Y.

The CHAIRMAN. State your full name.

Mr. BRADEN. Sprullie Braden, and I live in New York, 320 East 72d Street.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your business or profession?

Mr. BRADEN. Presently as a consultant to various firms mostly on foreign investments and particularly in Latin America.

The CHAIRMAN. When were you with the Government of the United States?

Mr. BRADEN. I was with the Government of the United States more or less continuously—there were in the first couple of years a few intermissions—from the end of 1933 until June 28, 1947.

The CHAIRMAN. In what capacities did you serve?

Mr. BRADEN. I began first as a delegate in charge of all the economic and financial discussions of the Seventh International Conference.

Yes. Going back to 1941, when I was in Colombia, I began scounding warnings to the State Department about the menace of communism in this hemisphere and during the war—1943 and 1944—there were repeated dispatches in which I said that this is the gravest peril we face and that after the war it is going to be most serious.

The CHAIRMAN. That was in your written reports?

Mr. BRADEN. Written reports and telegrams, all kinds of things.

Mr. GRIMES. What was the Russian Communist Party line at that time?

Mr. BRADEN. More or less simultaneously with that, we had the opening that fall of the first United Nations Assembly meeting in New York. They had a San Francisco meeting and a London meeting, but here the Assembly met in New York for the first time.

Mr. GRIMES. They were about to meet at the time this took place?

Mr. BRADEN. This all took place after V-J Day, August 6 or August 7.

Mr. GRIMES. The agitation began?

Mr. BRADEN. It began promptly and it grew rapidly in volume.

Mr. GRIMES. You knew this through reports that reached you?

Mr. BRADEN. I had all kinds of reports and telegrams, everything coming in from Panama. The Army had the same thing. The newspapers carried it.

Mr. GRIMES. But your knowledge is based on the official reports made to you as Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin American affairs; is that correct?

Mr. BRADEN. Exactly.

Mr. GRIMES. That is the position you occupied, then?

Mr. BRADEN. That is the position.

Mr. GRIMES. Will you state, please, what the Russian Communist Party line was? I think I interrupted you.

Mr. BRADEN. I was going to say that for the first time the Russians at that time at that Assembly in New York, made the attack on us that we had aggressive intentions—that we were aggressive and the proof of the aggressive intentions we had was our establishing bases all over the world.

Mr. GRIMES. Did they at that time mention Panama bases?

Mr. BRADEN. Subsequently during the discussions in the Assembly they did, not at the beginning, as I recall.

Mr. GRIMES. So they used the Panama bases as proof of our aggressive intentions?

Mr. BRADEN. Well, you say they used it. We gave them the ammunition.

Mr. GRIMES. Let's get to that later, but that was the party line?

Mr. BRADEN. Sure.

Mr. GRIMES. We were the aggressors. The proof is we have the bases, the military bases, all over the world, including Panama; is that right?

Mr. BRADEN. As I recall, the Russians made the point specifying Panama later.

The CHAIRMAN. They were not referring to the Canal Zone, they were referring to the Republic of Panama, 134 bases?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes, the 134 bases I am talking about. But the Canal Zone was brought in implicitly.

Mr. GRIMES. Did you have an experience in connection with the agitation in Panama and the Communist Party line with Alger Hiss?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes.

Mr. GRIMES. What was it?

Mr. BRADEN. There were two instances.

Mr. GRIMES. What was Hiss doing at that time?

Mr. BRADEN. Hiss was in charge of the Office of Special Political Affairs.

Mr. GRIMES. In the State Department?

Mr. BRADEN. In the State Department. That office today is headed by an Assistant Secretary of State. It is the office for United Nations affairs. He was the head of that office, although he did not have the rank of Assistant Secretary of State.

The first thing that happened was that, in the routine performance of his duties, the Governor of the Canal Zone submitted his annual report.

Mr. GRIMES. To whom?

Mr. BRADEN. On the operations of the Canal Zone. I think that is submitted to the War Department. I am not sure of that, but in any case, it was published, as it usually is.

Mr. GRIMES. You say routine operations. Would you describe it, briefly, please?

Mr. BRADEN. I can't do a good job of describing it. I don't think I read it.

Mr. GRIMES. What sort of report was it?

Mr. BRADEN. How many boats are going through the canal in different directions, the tonnage, et cetera; what were the operations of the stores in the canal, what was the labor operation, everything.

Mr. GRIMES. Population, matters of that sort?

Mr. BRADEN. I think population was probably in it. I don't recall.

Mr. GRIMES. This is a report by our Governor down there on operations in the Canal Zone and a report which he submits annually; is that correct?

Mr. BRADEN. Exactly.

Mr. GRIMES. He had been submitting it to the American Government; is that right?

Mr. BRADEN. Since 1903, I assume.

Mr. GRIMES. Go ahead, please. What happened in connection with that report?

Mr. BRADEN. My office, represented by Mr. Cochran, Mr. William Cochran, who was in charge of that whole area in the Caribbean, and Mr. Wise, who was on the Panama desk, became involved in an argument with the Office of Political Affairs, because the latter wished to submit this report by the Governor of the Canal Zone to the United Nations.

My officers immediately got in touch with the legal adviser's office where Miss Ann O'Neill, a very competent lawyer, and a very sturdy soul, I may say—I have a great admiration for her—supported the thesis of my officers that under no circumstances should this report of the Governor of the Canal Zone be submitted to the United Nations.

Finally, Mr. Hiss himself—

Mr. GRIMES. What was your reason for that?

Mr. BRADEN. I was going to say what Hiss' reason was first, because I think that makes it clearer.

Alger Hiss and his office claimed under article 73(e) of the United Nations Charter, it was our obligation to submit that report. I don't know whether you would like to have article 73 reviewed now, or not.

The CHAIRMAN. Let it go into the record and become a part of the record, without reading.

(The material referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 357" and is as follows:)

"EXHIBIT NO. 357—CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS—CHAPTER XI, DECLARATION REGARDING NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

## "Article 73

"Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose people have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and, to this end:

"a. to ensure, with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social, and educational advancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses;

"b. to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement;

"c. to further international peace and security;

"d. to promote constructive measures of development, to encourage research, and to cooperate with one another and, when and where appropriate, with specialized international bodies with a view to the practical achievement of the social, economic, and scientific purposes set forth in this article; and

"e. to transmit regularly to the Secretary General for information purposes, subject to such limitation as security and constitutional considerations may require, statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social, and educational conditions in the territories for which they are respectively responsible other than those territories to which chapters XII and XIII apply."

Mr. BRADEN. My officers maintained that was perfectly ridiculous; that article 73(e) anticipated self-government. That was the phraseology used in it.



1982

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

19101

The Canal Zone, so far as the Republic of Panama is concerned, is self-governing.

We had a special agreement as to the operation of the Canal Zone. There was no rhyme or reason, in my opinion, nor in the opinion of my officers, why that should be presented to the United Nations.

Moreover, we knew that if it were presented that it was just going to enrage the Panamanians. It was going to play into the hands of the Russians with their allegations about our bases scattered all over the world, and particularly in Panama.

It was going to alienate a lot of the other Latin Americans, who would say, "See what the United States is doing in the Canal Zone?"

It was a thoroughly bad move to make and particularly with the Assembly starting up in New York.

I knew that Mr. Alfaro, the former President of Panama, and Minister of Foreign Relations, a leading politician, already faced this terrific problem about the bases outside of the zone, and would be terrifically annoyed by this report being presented.

Mr. GRIMES. In addition, would it complicate our relations insofar as operation is concerned by giving the United Nations a voice?

Mr. BRADEN. It would complicate us with the Republic of Panama. It brought the United Nations into something where they had no right to be.

Mr. GRIMES. It might give them a claim to some stake in the operation of the Panama Canal?

Mr. BRADEN. Exactly.

Mr. GRIMES. Was that part of the argument?

Mr. BRADEN. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator WATKINS.

Senator WATKINS. Is it not true we also made reports on Alaska?

Mr. BRADEN. That was not in my sphere, so I haven't any idea about that. I think we did. I don't know whether we did on Hawaii or not, but I think we did, now that you mention it. But I wasn't concerned about that. I had enough troubles of my own with Panama.

Senator WATKINS. The reason I call your attention to it was the fact I entered a protest about reporting from Alaska.

Mr. BRADEN. I vaguely remember that was true.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Chairman, may I have a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Welker.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Ambassador, you were fortified by your counsel's opinion and the opinion of yourself and others, that you were permitted not to submit this information as requested by Mr. Hiss under the limitation of security; is that correct? That is subsection (e) of article 73.

Mr. BRADEN. That I can't give you an opinion on as a lawyer. I know that the procedure was totally out of order. There was no justification for that; aside from all of the issues that counsel has brought up in regard to our relations.

Senator WELKER. Notwithstanding the fact that you did have the security defense in mind, it was still insisted by Mr. Hiss?

Mr. BRADEN. It was still insisted by Mr. Hiss that it had to be submitted to the United Nations.

Finally, Mr. Cochran and Mr. Murray Wise, my assistants on this matter, came to me and said, "You have got to enter this fight. We can't get any further on it."

At that point we got Mr. Hackworth, the legal adviser to the State Department, in on it.

My boys reported to me they were quite concerned. They feared Mr. Hackworth was veering over to the side of Alger Hiss, but I stormed around quite a bit on this problem and finally Mr. Hackworth would not give a decision.

At that point it was appealed to the Under Secretary of State.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was that?

Mr. BRADEN. Mr. Acheson.

I remember very vividly that I went in to see Mr. Acheson. I think Mr. Hiss had already been there for some time.

This was all 7 years ago, so my memory may be a bit off, but I think it is substantially accurate.

When I tried to state my case, Mr. Acheson, as a lawyer, agreed with Mr. Hiss, and I didn't even have a chance to state my case. I remember that I came out of that meeting boiling with rage at what happened.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Hiss was present there?

Mr. BRADEN. Oh, yes. The only thing we got out of Mr. Hiss' office was an expression which today I don't understand very clearly, and he said this—he put in a phrase that this was submitted to the United Nations, this report of the Governor, on a pragmatic basis for this year, for the year 1946. What that means, I don't know, but that was supposed to take care of our objections, which needless to say, it did not.

As we predicted, the Panamanian Foreign Minister made a speech in the United Nations. I have a copy of this if you wish to have it in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it should go into the record and become a part of the record.

(The material referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 358" and is as follows:)

"EXHIBIT NO. 358—PANAMA CANAL ZONE IS NOT LEASED TERRITORY

"(Dr. Ricardo J. Alfaro Explains Payment of \$430,000 Annuity by the U.S. Government)

"(Speech by the president of the Panamanian delegation, Dr. Ricardo J. Alfaro, during the session of the Political Commission of the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 14, 1946, in respect to the international status of the Panama Canal Zone.)

"The Panamanian Delegation has been informed that by virtue of a resolution adopted on February 9, 1946, by the United Nations Assembly, the United States has presented a report concerning the territories under its administration and has included the Panama Canal Zone among those about which it had to report to the General Secretariat, in accordance with article 73(e) of the United Nations Charter."

Mr. GRIMES. Would you state what his points were?

Mr. BRADEN. The substance was that here we were talking about the canal as if we had it under lease, and we did not; that it was a special agreement beginning in 1903 between Panama and the United States; that Panama had given the United States certain facilities and we had in return made certain payments in regard to—I think it was \$10 million to Panama, plus an annual rental of \$250,000 a year.

Subsequently we went off gold, raised it to \$430,000 a year.

There were the various quid pro quos back and forth that the submission of this to the United Nations was an outrage both to Panama and to the agreement.

Mr. GRIMES. In other words, it was none of the business of the United Nations that he came out very much on the side of the United States on this?

Mr. BRADEN. He came out very much on the side of my office, not of the United States, because we had submitted it.

Mr. GRIMES. That depends on what the U.S. interest is.

Mr. BRADEN. Of the true interest of the United States, yes.

Mr. GRIMES. The report was then submitted to the United Nations?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes.

Mr. GRIMES. Did another incident take place in regard to Panama?

Mr. GRIMES. What was that?

Mr. BRADEN. At that time, and you have to get the picture of the United Nations, the Russians making their speeches about our being aggressors, and the proof being the bases, the Panama bases, 134 outside of Panama Canal Zone, being brought in as proof positive of our aggressive intentions, and I desperately trying and praying that I would be able to keep the lid on everything until the Assembly was over in New York.

And that we could get Mr. Alfaro down to Washington, and quietly and calmly, in luncheons, and in our offices, work out an agreement with him about these 134 bases which the military informed me were vitally necessary for the security of the Panama Canal—therefore, of the United States.

You can, therefore, imagine my utter astonishment when one morning I picked up the Washington Post at my apartment and here on the front page was an announcement that we had reported to the United Nations on the Canal Zone as an occupied territory. When I read that, I realized that was really putting the "fat in the fire" in our relations with Panama in the substantiation of the Russian allegations and in our relations with all of the American Republics; it was such a nasty situation.

Mr. GRIMES. In other words, our State Department had officially reported it to the U.N., that Panama was one of our occupied territories?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes. The only thing, my memory is a little hazy on whether that came along at about the same time as the submission of the report by the Governor, or whether it came subsequently, but my best recollection is it came subsequently.

Mr. GRIMES. This was a matter under your jurisdiction as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs?

Mr. BRADEN. Exactly.

Mr. GRIMES. You learned about it for the first time in the newspapers?

Mr. BRADEN. I learned about it for the first time in the newspapers.

Mr. GRIMES. What did you do?

Mr. BRADEN. I dropped the newspaper, and I tore down to the State Department. I called in the Director of the Office of American Republics Affairs, Mr. Briggs, who presently is our American Ambassador in Korea; and my first special assistant, Mr. Wright; and Mr. Murray Wise was then called in as the officer on the Panamanian desk.

I may say I was using some pretty strong language around the place at this outrage. None of them knew any more about it than I.

They also had read it in the newspapers.

We then tried to run it down, and we found that this report had been submitted and the employment of the words "occupied territory" by the Office of Special Political Affairs, that is to say, Mr. Alger Hiss.

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

[Mr. ROGERS of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

## CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 230 I note that I am recorded as having voted in the negative. I answered "aye" when my name was called, and prior to the completion of the roll-call, I inquired of the desk if I had been recorded. This inquiry was misunderstood.

19102

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

September 20

stood, and I was erroneously recorded as changing my vote. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and the Journal be corrected accordingly, and that I be properly recorded as having voted "aye."

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

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have until midnight Friday to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

## CARIBBEAN AND ISTHMIAN POLICIES—SEQUEL

(Mr. FLOOD at the request of Mr. ROBERTS of Texas) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House in the RECORD of September 14, 1962, pages 18409-18410, I outlined a three-point program of action for the Congress with respect to the mounting crisis in the Caribbean and mentioned that I had introduced three resolutions to support the program.

The first of these resolutions, House Concurrent Resolution 225 to reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine, was quoted in the September 14 statement; along with my testimony on that subject in hearings on January 12, 1960, before the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The other two resolutions, House Concurrent Resolution 525, which relates to the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the Canal Zone, and House Concurrent Resolution 526, which relates to the surrender by the United States to any other authority of its ownership, control, and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal enterprise, follow:

## H. CON. RES. 525

Whereas the United States, under the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 with Panama, acquired complete and exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone in perpetuity for construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

Whereas all jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone ceased on exchange of ratifications of the 1903 treaty on February 26, 1904; and

Whereas since that time the United States has continuously exercised exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal; and

Whereas where responsibility is imposed there must be given for its effectuation adequate authority; and with respect to the Panama Canal the treaty of 1903 so provided; and

Whereas the United States has fully and effectively discharged all its treaty obligations with respect to the Panama Canal and the only legitimate interest that Panama can have in the sovereignty of the Canal

Zone is one of reversionary character that can never become operative unless the United States should abandon the canal enterprise; and

Whereas the policy of the United States since President Hayes' message to the Congress on March 8, 1880, has been for an interoceanic canal "under American control," that is to say, under the control of the United States; and

Whereas the grant by Panama to the United States of exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for the aforesaid purposes was an absolute, indispensable condition precedent to the great task undertaken by the United States in the construction and perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, for the benefit of the entire world: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* (1) That the United States, under treaty provisions, constitutionally acquired, and holds, in perpetuity, exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance operation, sanitation, and protection; and

(2) That there can be no just claim by the Republic of Panama for the exercise of any sovereignty of whatever character over the Canal Zone so long as the United States discharges its duties and obligations with respect to the canal; and

(3) That the formal display of any official flag over the Canal Zone other than that of the United States is violative of law, treaty, international usage, and the historic canal policy of the United States as fully upheld by its highest courts and administrative officials; and would lead to confusion and chaos in the administration of the Panama Canal enterprise.

## H. CON. RES. 526

Whereas there is now being strongly urged in certain quarters of the world the surrender, by the United States, without reimbursement, of the Panama Canal, to the United Nations or to some other international organization for the ownership and operation of the canal; and

Whereas the United States, at the expense of its taxpayers and under, and fully relying on, treaty agreements, constructed the canal, and since its completion, at large expenditure, has maintained and operated it and provided for its protection and defense; and

Whereas the United States, following the construction of the canal, has since maintained, operated, and protected it in strict conformity with treaty requirements and agreements, and has thus made it free, without restriction or qualification, for the shipping of the entire world; and, in consequence of which, with respect to the canal and the Canal Zone, every just and equitable consideration favors the continuance of the United States in the exercise of all the rights and authority by treaty provided, and in the discharge of the duties by treaty imposed: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That (1) it is the sense and judgment of the Congress that the United States should not, in anywise, surrender to any other government or authority its jurisdiction over, and control of, the Canal Zone, and its ownership, control, management, maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal, in accordance with existing treaty provisions; and that (2) it is to the best interests—not only of the United States, but, as well, of all nations and peoples—that all the powers, duties, authority, and obligations of the United States in the premises be continued in accordance with existing treaty provisions.

## SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES

(Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. ROBERTS of Texas) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills designed to further strengthen the program so successfully being carried on by the small business investment companies of America. It is my understanding that similar bills are being introduced today by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN. I am proud to be associated in this way with Senator SPARKMAN, who has been such an able and effective champion of the small businessman.

Small business investment companies have compiled an impressive record during the relatively short time that they have been in existence. They have grown in number until today there are over 600 small business investment companies. The vitality of their program gives proof that the American free enterprise system can respond to the financing needs of its small businessmen. This means of stimulating private investment in small businesses has already achieved great success. It has a potential for even greater success in the future.

These two bills are designed to help small business investment companies more adequately and effectively meet the financial needs of small businessmen. In so doing, these bills can indirectly strengthen the fabric of our entire national economy.

One bill offers amendments to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. The bill makes certain technical amendments which in general enlarge the amounts which may be loaned by SBIC's and, in some instances, increases the period of time for which funds may be available to them.

The other bill offers amendments to the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the income tax treatment of SBIC's. It authorizes a 20 percent loss reserve on all loans and investments. The bill also permits all SBIC's to elect to be taxed as regulated investment companies and exempts them from investment limitations governing regulated investment companies. Additionally, the bill removes the attribution rule from applying to SBIC's transactions with small business firms and allows ordinary loss treatment for all types of equity securities and empowers SBIC's to hold stock in certain corporations.

I realize that it is too late in the present Congress for these bills to be given serious consideration at this time. However, it is my intention to reintroduce them upon the convening of the 88th Congress. It is my hope that, in the meantime, my colleagues will be able to study their provisions, consider their merits, and possibly discuss the bills with officers of the small business investment companies in their districts.