

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17627

them are here today. No one has the power to speak for the art of music, but I would like to feel, and I believe, that if all my colleagues know Dick Rodgers as I know him, the artist and the man, and if they knew his music as well as I know it, and I mean literally hundreds of songs, including the verses, they would join me in the kind of salute that I want to give him, which is to thank him and to tell him of our respect and our affection.

Dr. PETER MENNIN. Through his music, through his efforts as an artist he has also contributed to the Juilliard School of Music in the encouragement and the help to young people who perhaps in the future will also one day be contributing to music.

We are all in his debt for these riches, and I hope that everyone will join with me in wishing him a very happy birthday with the highest degree of affection and sincerity.

BENNETT CERF. I'm sure there are a lot of people in this room who know Dick better than I do, but I am also sure that nobody knows him longer than I do, because, sons and cons ago, Dick's older brother Mortimer, Dr. Mortimer Rodgers, known as "Sunshine," because he hasn't smiled in 30 years—he and I were great friends at Columbia.

At that time, I remember a little, white-faced boy named "Richard" tagging after us. Well, there came a time when Dick turned 16 and wrote his first songs for the Columbia varsity show, and ever after that, Mortimer and I have been tagging after Dick, because in that first song that he wrote for the Columbia varsity show—I believe, of 1922 or somewhere around that time—the song, "Peeking, Peeking, Back in a Baby Bungalow." Now, it had the same liting joy, it had the same beautiful melody that Dick Rodgers puts into his songs today, and I am convinced, he will still be putting into them when he is 80 years old, as well as now.

Miss MARY MARTIN. It's almost impossible to express with new and different words how all of us of the theater feel about Richard Rodgers on this, his birthday, and every day, so I would like to say some old and familiar words to express how I feel about him:

"If they asked me, I could write a book About the way he walks, and whispers, and looks;

I could write a preface on how we met,
So the world would never forget;
And the simple secret of the plot
Is just to tell you that I love him a lot;
Then, the world discovers as my book ends
How Richard Rodgers and Mary Martin are friends."

STANLEY ADAMS. Dick, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, known as ASCAP, is the guardian and custodian of the performing rights of your 361 songs. In that guardianship, ASCAP enjoys this great responsibility. It is truly one of the outstanding and unique catalogs of the musical world, songs you wrote more than 30 years ago are as popular today as they were then.

The score of one of your new plays on Broadway is eagerly awaited on the other side of the globe. The songs of the American musical theater and your songs, Dick, are the greatest exports America has, accepted and loved wherever people gather to sing and to give their hearts to music.

As your songs poured out, year after year, gathering glory and gathering affection, they fit into a pattern, the pattern of a life in song. We know them, from "Garlick Galleties" to "No Strings."

Here, we hand you a life in pictures that parallels your life in song. It records how old you looked then and how young you look now. ASCAP and its 8,000 members from the whole field of music present this to you with deep respect and with deep affection. "The 60th Birthday Picture Book of Richard Rodgers."

DAVID M. KEISER. You are all familiar with "Oklahoma," "South Pacific," "The King and I," "The Sound of Music," and now, "No Strings."

How many of you also know "Victory of the Sea," and "Vallant Years," serious works for documentary motion pictures, that show another side of this versatile composer and that I recommend to you all as well.

To the Philharmonic Mr. Rodgers has brought many benefits and in ways in which no other director has done or probably can do. First of all, he has conducted the orchestra himself, with great ability. His works have been performed on numerous occasions in Carnegie Hall and at many Guggenheim concerts in the stadium, where the 15th Rodgers and Hammerstein night is scheduled for August 11 at 8:30 and will, as in the past, surely be one of the great popular nights of the summer.

Through the affection and esteem in which they hold Richard Rodgers, numerous great stars of the stage have helped our orchestra by appearing at our annual fund drive luncheons and elsewhere. One of the most recent is Mary Martin, who has just spoken to you so charmingly today.

On our board of directors since 1954, Dick's advice has been eagerly sought and cheerfully given; as a member of the important Musical Policy Committee, his professional knowledge has been invaluable.

Dr. LAWRENCE H. CHAMBERLAIN. They say that a man is known by the company he keeps. I think it is also true that a university is known by the kind of men it produces. Of course, we cannot claim all credit for things that Mr. Rodgers has done, but Columbia is very happy to be associated with him in the many things that he has done.

The word "creativity" has been used a number of times, and there is nothing that I can add to the musical side, but there is an aspect of Mr. Rodgers' work that is truly creative and, I think, is not generally fully understood. He has phrased it himself by saying that Broadway is a two-way street, and what he means by this is that if the theater and the musical theater is to have its greatest future, to realize its real potentiality, there must be closer and more continuous contact between the theater, itself, the professional theater, and the world of education; and I'll not take the time today to tell you all the things that he has done in this area.

But for those of us who have been inspired and who have caught something of his dream of what can be done, the announcement which I am about to make simply makes a fitting climax.

It is my observation that there is a very close connection between creativity and generosity because, really, creativity is the giving of one's self. Mr. Rodgers, throughout his career, has shown this generosity to the point that, on this occasion, when we are supposed to be celebrating his birthday, he himself has made a gift.

On behalf of President Kirk, who is in Europe and not able to be here today, I am happy to make the announcement that the Rodgers and Hammerstein Foundation has made an initial pledge of \$150,000 toward the principal theater of the projected Columbia University Art Center.

This, of course, is the culmination of the dream I mentioned a moment ago.

I have this additional message from President Kirk: The university is most grateful for this splendid action by the Rodgers and Hammerstein Foundation toward the principal theater to be incorporated in the new Arts Center in Columbia.

I have proposed that this theater be called "the Rodgers and Hammerstein." If that should come to be the case, nothing could give more satisfaction to me, to the Columbia community, or to the friends of

Richard Rodgers and Oscar Hammerstein everywhere.

The only thing I can add to that is to say, "Many happy returns of the day."

Mr. RODGERS. On a 60th birthday, I imagine it is mandatory to have a philosophy. Somebody once wrote Oscar a letter and said, "What is the saddest word that you know of?", and he replied, "But."

I have arrived at a philosophy, sitting here, and it is equally short, and what I have to say will be equally short. I have never done anything alone in my life. I had to be conceived by two people. I had to be nursed. I had to be brought up, I had to be taught. I was given a scholarship in music, I was sent to Columbia University by parents who were not rich but who could do it. I have shows but I have chorus girls dancing in them; I don't do the dancing. I have these men playing on the stage, they do my work for me.

I wish that this could be a model for what is going on. Then the walls, the barbedwire, would come down. People would not be running out of a country. They would be doing something for each other.

This morning I talked to Alan Lerner on the phone and he said, "You'll have to say something." He said, "For God's sake don't be humble."

Well, I'll come to my one-word philosophy. It's one I've lived by and one I expect to live by. And the word is: "Help."

Thank you.

THE TELSTAR ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is most interesting that the great scientific achievement of Telstar is the product of 2,000 small and large business firms in practically all of our States. The totality of their efforts made Telstar possible. I consider the development so important that I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a summary of the firms that participated in that great American achievement and where they come from. The number of participating firms in each State is provided in this list, and the names of the firms themselves are available in my office to any of my colleagues who are interested.

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

Telstar is the name of the Bell System's experimental communications satellite. This project has been specifically concerned with learning how a communications satellite gets along in outer space, how it works and how it can link earth stations. While it is not an operating system, Telstar has already provided much of the technical data and operational know-how such a system will require.

Project Telstar is unique. It is the first use of space for other than official Government purposes. And communicating by satellite may, for a long time, be the only direct contact most Americans will have with space-age technology. But it won't be just a novelty.

A satellite communications system is needed because people are making more and more oversea telephone calls. Today the American Telephone & Telegraph system operates more than 600 telephone-grade circuits for oversea communications. By 1965, it is said twice that many will be needed and that by 1970, the demand will have doubled again. And in 1980, it is estimated that 10,000 circuits will be needed for telephone use alone—with perhaps an addi-

Cuba file

tional 2,000 for more specialized communications.

Hopefully, a satellite communications system will be able to help meet this demand efficiently and economically.

The satellite corporation, as being set up by recent legislation, will not be ready for commercial business for some time, probably not before 1965, and even then satellite communications is an economic unknown.

PROJECT TELSTAR'S COST

Since its formal inception in 1961, about \$50 million has been spent on Project Telstar.

A satellite communications system is possible today because two streams of research have been fused: private research in communications techniques, Government-sponsored research in rocketry. Without the transportation provided by Government-developed rockets, Telstar would not have gotten off the ground. Without the communications industry research and development, there would have been no Telstar to get off the ground.

Bell Laboratories built five flyable Telstar satellites at a cost of about \$1 million apiece, including development expenses. Many more millions were spent on developmental models. Each satellite requires detailed attention by a corps of highly skilled scientists and craftsmen. It is not a process easily shifted to mass production. There are 3,600 sapphire covered solar cells set in the satellite's surface. Inside, there are 4,800 other parts; 2,500 of them are active semiconductor devices.

Telstar was shot into the sky by a Delta launch vehicle. This rocket was developed for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by the Douglas Aircraft Co.

About 2,000 suppliers had a role in the success of Project Telstar. They provided a good deal of equipment and services which the final production team at Bell Laboratories fashioned into the Andover earth station and the experimental satellites. Four out of five of them are small businesses, with less than 500 employees.

These suppliers are located in 37 of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. They range from a single firm in Janesboro, Ark., and Huntington, W. Va., to more than 550 businesses in New Jersey who had a part in the program.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The story really starts in the 1930's. That's when Bell Labs invented the sensitive horn reflector antenna and low noise receivers—equipment which plays a crucial role in satellite communications today.

Since World War II, the Bell Laboratories have produced the Bell solar battery, the transistor and the solid-state ruby maser.

These are some of the financial dimensions of the project. Telstar is not just the product of a lot of money and engineering skill. It's not just the contributions of 2,000 suppliers coordinated by the purchase orders and exacting specifications of Bell Labs. Telstar is principally the product of a way of thinking, a way of acting.

This is the intangible vitality that gives the private sector of the economy its perpetual modernness. It comes from the decision to look to the future; to see tomorrow's needs, and plan for the day after. This is the decision that produced Telstar.

The number of participating firms in each State is listed as follows:

Alabama.....	1
Arizona.....	1
Arkansas.....	1
California.....	100
Colorado.....	2
Connecticut.....	84
Delaware.....	5
Florida.....	25
Indiana.....	12
Iowa.....	3

Kansas.....	1
Kentucky.....	4
Maine.....	43
Maryland.....	22
Massachusetts.....	117
Michigan.....	20
Minnesota.....	12
Missouri.....	3
Nebraska.....	1
New Hampshire.....	10
New Jersey.....	468
New York.....	449
North Carolina.....	44
Ohio.....	73
Oklahoma.....	2
Oregon.....	4
Pennsylvania.....	202
Rhode Island.....	8
South Carolina.....	2
Tennessee.....	4
Texas.....	3
Virginia.....	5
Washington.....	3
West Virginia.....	1
Wisconsin.....	14
Washington, D.C.....	8

could destroy all of us in a situation of that character.

The issue is very clear, and the issue is only partially dealt with by the idea of containment, which is essentially what the President gave voice to the other day. The issue will still remain even if the Cuban Communist regime does not move out of its own area and into aggression against other states. Certainly it is now a base for subversion and a base for Communist infection—with the danger of aggression—for all of the Americas, and in a most vigorous and intransigent way that has been, is being and will be transmitted to the other American Republics.

One thing is clear to me. This is a challenge and a very grave emergency for our country which has been building up, as we all very well knew, for the last year and a half. But there is a great will in this country, in my opinion, to deal with it primarily in terms of agreement, at least with the great majority of the other American states.

If there is one thing I feel personally the American people are convinced of, it is that if it is humanly possible to do so, we should have a common policy and a common course of action with the other American States under the Charter of the Organization of American States and the treaties and agreements entered into, since it only takes a three-quarters vote to act. That is something which we must understand.

The vote may not be unanimous. But a three-quarters vote is a large vote, and to be truly effective, should include the principal countries of Latin America, the countries of great population, great territory, and perhaps in a somewhat more advanced state economically than some of the others. So that is what I meant a minute ago when I said this is an occasion when the countries of Latin America have an opportunity to do something for and with us.

The United States wants a common policy, in my view, with respect to Cuba, if action should be required, in order to insulate this menace or perhaps even to move against it in some appropriate way. The people of the United States know that the days of unilateral so-called "gunboat" diplomacy in Latin America by us are gone; they are obsolescent—but this does not mean inaction—it means, on the contrary, more effective action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. May I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The way in which our country could best move with the consent and approval of the great majority of its citizens is to obtain a consensus—and I use that word advisedly—among enough of the Latin American nations so that our action would be, even if mainly implemented by us as their agent, a group action. Such action is extremely desirable. So as one American and as one Senator, I would address a plea to our Latin American neighbors on the basis of the presentation made yester-

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on the question of Cuba we have heard a great deal and we are told a great deal about what the United States should do for Latin America. I feel that I have been as forward looking and as active in that area as anyone in the Congress in all the years I have been in the other body and in this body.

As often happens in life, however, the tables are sometimes turned. For, the question now is, What will Latin America do for us? I think that this should be a very welcome moment to the people of Latin America. The people of Latin America do not have to give us aid to build up our industry, or technicians to develop our resources, or medicine, medical help, universities; or even the exchange of fellowships, though we welcome that and it is a very exciting educational activity in which to participate. But what Latin America will have to give us right now is understanding and support—and support which may be of a very material kind—for as a result of what has happened in Cuba, not only we, but also all the Americas are faced with a grave challenge.

Notwithstanding the very reassuring words of our President and his legal interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, the fact is that Chairman Khrushchev has said the Monroe Doctrine is a dead letter. President Kennedy has said that the Monroe Doctrine still remains the binding policy of our Nation. Both cannot be right and they are not. As I understand, the Monroe Doctrine relates to the establishment certainly of any military base in any country of the Western Hemisphere by any foreign power which was not there when the Monroe Doctrine was announced.

Whether technically or not, those who are on Cuban soil as soldiers begin to establish the impression clearly that the U.S.S.R. has set up a military base in the Western Hemisphere in Cuba. The President may be perfectly correct. I agree with him about our not being precipitate and hotheads in the situation; yet improvidence or lack of decisiveness

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17629

day to them by our Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, and in the spirit of the bipartisan foreign policy which I think is the most noble spirit Congress has developed in modern times.

I feel deeply honored that it is the spirit of Senator Arthur Vandenberg which would appeal to our Federal legislators in the other Latin American countries, as the leaders of their people, to give guidance and leadership to their people so that in this hour, which I think is getting more and more serious in the eyes of the American people, we may have their good will, their cooperation, their backing and support in the action which would appear to be indicated with respect, first, to the insulation of the Communist menace in Cuba, and perhaps in consultation with the other American states in some effort to protect even more the Americas against the Communists.

The details for implementing that will, I am sure, be the subject of discussion. I have my ideas; others have theirs. But for the purpose of my remarks today I hope very much that we may speak in this way as people to people with the understanding and plea that this is one time that the Latin American peoples can do something for us to back and support us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

In the spirit of bipartisanship referred to by the Senator from New York, I wish to join him in his discussion of Cuba. I join him in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. I would have the Record show that I completely agree with the steps which have been taken by the President of the United States thus far in connection with the Cuban danger. I heartily endorse the appeal of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to our American friends and allies to the south of us.

This is, as the senior Senator from Oregon has said in regard to the Cuban matter for many months, a joint problem which confronts our Latin-American neighbors as well as the United States. In a very real sense it is a greater threat to our Latin-American friends than it is to the United States.

I, along with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] attended the Punta del Este Conference earlier this year. At Punta del Este, as the Senator knows, we adopted a series of resolutions which were combined into the Act of Punta del Este. One of those resolutions, unanimously adopted, made very clear that the free nations of the Western Hemisphere intend to stand together against the threat of the spread of communism into the hemisphere from Cuba.

I would only add to what the Senator from New York has said that it is highly to be desired that there be some action through the Organization of American States in regard to the Communist threat to the Western Hemisphere from the Russian buildup in Cuba. I hope that very soon a Conference of OAS of the foreign ministers of Latin American countries and the United States will be called for a dis-

ussion as to the modus operandi that ought to be adopted in meeting the Communist buildup by Russia as a beachhead in Cuba.

I am satisfied, if such a conference is had, and the modus operandi are discussed, that we will reach not only a three-fourths vote, but I would be very much surprised if we did not reach a unanimous vote. It is crystal clear that the free nations of the hemisphere must stand together against this threat.

Let us assume, unpleasant as the thought is, for even a fleeting moment that a three-fourths vote is not had. Then the United States will still have the responsibility, to take what course of action the facts show may be necessary to take, to protect the security of the American people from the threat of a Russian Communist beachhead almost on our very shores. Whatever action we take to protect our own national security we will likewise thus take to protect the national security of every free nation to the south of us.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. I associate myself with his views as he has expressed them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I ask the minority leader if he is willing to share the time on the quorum call.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the time be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the acting majority leader a question. Will Senators be ready to proceed with their speeches?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; but first I have items to place in the Record.

Mr. MORSE. The quorum call has been taking place with the understanding that there would be an equal division of the time required for the call. If it is necessary to have another quorum call, I feel that I have a duty to make certain that Senators will be here to speak at some length on the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have asked the aids of the Senate to communicate with two Senators who wish to speak. They will be here promptly. If it is necessary to have another quorum call, I shall ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally between the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Such consent cannot be requested at this time; but if there is no objection, the call for the quorum may be rescinded, and the renewal of that request may be made at the proper time.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Minnesota is agreed to.

HOPE IN THE CONGO

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate a very important and encouraging sequence of events which has just taken place in the troubled Congo, an area which has been of great concern to us all.

Acting U.N. Secretary General U Thant 2 weeks ago proposed a plan for national reconciliation in the Congo which provides for a sound basis for bringing about Congolese unity. This plan contains the following principal points:

First, the adoption of a Federal constitution which contains necessary powers delegated to the Federal Government and all other powers reserved to the provincial governments.

Second, the development of a fiscal program including Federal and provincial revenues, a program of foreign exchange control, and a unified currency.

Third, integration of the military.

This plan was publicly endorsed by many governments of the free world including those of Belgium and Britain. Our own Government gave full support to the plan. Significantly, the Soviets attacked it. Prime Minister Adoula immediately accepted the plan in all its detail as a just and honorable basis for national reconciliation. President Tshombe of Katanga Province substantially accepted the plan.

The important thing, however, is not to haggle over the language of Mr. Tshombe's reply but to move forward immediately on implementing the practical details of the plan as the Acting Secretary General has urged. It will serve the world well if both Prime Minister Adoula and President Tshombe approach these steps in good faith. If this is done and done promptly frustration, despair, and danger may give way to peace and hope.

I think it is important at this critical juncture to give full credit to the United Nations which by its patient and untiring efforts may have opened a door which many thought was closed forever. The difficult part may be yet to come but I wish to assure the Acting Secretary General and his staff that they have the full support of the American people in this endeavor.

Mr. President, I don't want to go into the Congo situation in detail today because we are now in a delicate moment where the real work must be done behind closed doors by those on the spot and not on the public forums of the world. If the job at hand is tackled in earnest the time may soon come when the Congo crisis will be nothing but a bad dream of the past.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record a recent speech by Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams, which explains in substantial detail the program proposed by the U.N. Acting Secretary General, U Thant, as a plan for reconciliation in the Congo and a basis for Congo unity.

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

17630

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 6

THE UNITED NATIONS PLAN FOR THE CONGO
(Address by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, before the Jewish War Veterans National Convention, Detroit, Mich., Thursday, August 30, 1962)

Fellow veterans, I am pleased to address a veterans' group today because I want to speak about a country balanced between strife and progress—the Republic of the Congo. I can think of no more timely or more important topic to discuss with you who have experienced past failures to find peaceful solutions.

A United Nations plan for Congo unity was announced on August 20 by Acting Secretary General U Thant, and its early acceptance was indicated by Congolese Prime Minister Cyrille Adoula. Last Friday, Robert Gardiner, chief of the U.N. operation in the Congo, presented the United Nations plan for uniting that unfortunately divided country to representatives of Katanga Province.

Since its presentation to the Katangese provincial government of Mr. Moïse Tshombe, Mr. Adoula announced that his government had studied the Secretary General's plan and gave its agreement to it. He noted that his government's only criterion for judging the Congo problem was in the context of 14 million human beings aspiring for a better life, and added:

"We hope all countries will adopt this view and support in all phases the Secretary General's plan, which takes into account our observations and is in accord with the Government of the Congo's point of view. If all of these conditions are realized, we do not doubt an era of peace and prosperity would begin for the Congo, which could, in fruitful cooperation with all nations make its contribution to the international community."

Over this past weekend, the U.S. Government also announced its support of the Acting Secretary General's efforts to reach a settlement in the Congo.

The U.S. announcement pointed out that the U.N. plan offers a reasonable basis upon which Congolese leaders can settle their differences. Our Government said that the plan offers compelling reasons for other nations to lend their support and that statesmanship in the Congo can put that nation on the road to federal unity and progress.

Such progress, the United States concluded, will enable the United Nations and countries like the United States to devote greater resources to economic and technical assistance in the Congo.

It is gratifying to be able to say today that many interested nations have indicated their firm support for the U.N. plan. For example, last weekend, Britain announced its support of the plan and on Tuesday the Belgian Government issued a statement of support.

While there has not yet been time for an official acceptance of the U.N. plan from the provincial government of Katanga, provision for a federal system of government for the Congo enhances the possibility of its acceptance by Katanga. Evariste Kimba, who handles foreign affairs for Mr. Tshombe, said in a letter to Secretary General U Thant following his announcement of the plan on August 20 that the plan "contains a number of positive elements." There is considerable reason to hope that Mr. Tshombe will support the plan. On August 1 and August 21, he stated his belief that Katanga was ready to join a Congolese federation.

On the initial evidence, then, we are hopeful that the U.N. plan is the basis for Congolese unity and can put an end to Katanga's secession.

The resolution of this problem is naturally one which the Congolese themselves must achieve. You will recall the United Nations was invited into the Congo by the Congolese

Government to assist that new nation in overcoming postindependence disorders, in safeguarding Congolese unity, and in rebuilding the nation's administrative and economic health. The United Nations prevented unilateral Soviet intervention and succeeded to a large extent in keeping order. It has helped maintain Congolese administrative services and assisted in the reestablishment of parliamentary government.

The principal block to Congolese unity and economic progress today is this Katangan problem. Prime Minister Adoula's government was established under orders from Parliament to end this secession, and no Congolese Government can long hope to remain in office without demonstrating progress toward this goal. Until this is achieved, Congolese resources, both human and material, will be diverted from the essential long-range task of nation building and economic progress. Until unity is achieved, the threats of chaos and renewed Soviet intervention are ever-present dangers.

We welcome the plan put forth by Acting Secretary General U Thant, because it offers a reasonable way to achieve these goals and head off these dangers.

Because this U.N. plan was not widely publicized at the time of its announcement, I would like to take a few minutes this morning to point out its salient features. There are seven principal points in the U.N. plan:

1. The National Government, after consultation with the Provincial governments and interested political groups, will present a Federal Constitution to the Parliament in September. The United Nations is providing legal experts to assist in drafting this document. Under present law, this constitution cannot become law without a two-thirds vote of the Parliament, in which all Provinces and parties are represented, plus approval by the Provincial assemblies. Under the proposed Federal Constitution, certain powers will be delegated to the National Government. These include—

- (a) Foreign affairs.
- (b) National defense (other than local police functions).
- (c) Customs.
- (d) Currency, exchange control, and fiscal policy.
- (e) Interstate and foreign commerce.
- (f) Taxing powers sufficient for National Government needs.
- (g) Nationality and immigration.
- (h) Post and telecommunications.

Powers not delegated to the National Government will be reserved to the Provincial governments.

2. The National Government, after consultation with the Provincial governments and interested political groups, will present to the Parliament a new law to establish definitive arrangements for division of revenues between the National and Provincial Governments, and regulations and procedures for the use of foreign exchange. U.N. experts also will assist in the preparation of this law.

Until that process is completed, the National Government and Katanga should agree to share revenues, duties and royalties equally, and all foreign exchange earned by any part of the Congo will be paid to the Monetary Council of the National Government or an agreed-upon institution.

The Monetary Council should control use of all foreign exchange and make available for essential needs in Katanga at least 50 percent of the foreign exchange generated in that province. This provision is of particular importance because upon Congolese independence Katanga generated 50 percent of the Congo's foreign exchange earnings.

3. The National Government will ask the International Monetary Fund to help with a plan for national currency unification, which

will be implemented within the shortest possible time.

4. Rapid integration and unification of all military units must be accomplished. A commission composed of representatives from the National Government, Katanga and the United Nations should prepare a plan within 30 days to go into effect within the following 60 days. Provision is made, however, for the Provinces to retain control of their local police forces.

5. There should be a general amnesty.

6. All Congolese authorities—national, state and local—should cooperate fully with the United Nations in carrying out U.N. resolutions.

7. The National Government should be reconstituted to provide a suitable representation for all political and provincial groups.

The U.S. Government believes that this program is eminently reasonable and necessary. It provides for full consultation and hearing of interested groups, and the plan provides for democratic approval of the Constitution and other laws. We believe that if prompt action is taken on this plan by all Congolese authorities, it will get the Congo back on the road to a peaceful and viable future.

This, then, is the Congo situation as it stands at this moment. It is delicate; it is difficult; but it is by no means devoid of hope.

In some respects, the current Congo situation is reminiscent of the young, radical America of 1783, when the Dean of Gloucester said:

"As to the future grandeur of America and its being a rising empire under one head * * *, it is one of the idlest and most visionary notions that was ever conceived * * *. The mutual antipathies and clashing interests of the Americans, their difference of governments, habits and manners, indicate that they will have no center of union and common interest. They never can be united into one compact empire under any species of government whatever."

However, as our Constitution led us to unity and an integrated nation, so the U.N. plan offers a path to peaceful reconciliation of differences in the Congo. And this country has pledged its full support to that plan.

Today, I want to call on you and all other Americans to back your country's support of the United Nations on this important issue. I know you share our hope and our desire that reason will prevail over ruin in the Congo. And there really is no alternative to Congolese unification except chaos and civil war.

If the United Nations is unable to achieve unity in the Congo, there is a strong possibility that country will be plunged into a destructive civil war as the rest of the Congo seeks to reintegrate Katanga by whatever means available or necessary. These conditions, in turn, would breed external subversion and loss of true independence.

This is the principal reason why the United States is so concerned with the Congo situation. This is why our policy continues to be to help establish a unified and stable Congo—a Congo on good terms with the West and able to resist extremist and Communist influence and penetration. This is why we continue to welcome all steps toward political reconciliation of the Congo.

Since the beginning of the crisis, both the United States and the United Nations have looked on reconciliation as one of their major tasks. This is why we look so favorably on the plan drawn up by Secretary General U Thant.

Once a peaceful reunification of the Congo is achieved, then all parties involved can turn to the really important job of helping the Congo build itself into a strong, viable nation. The U.N. plan offers real promise for a settlement under which the United Nations can work itself out of the expensive

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17631

job of peacekeeping and policing the country and into the constructive job of economic and technical assistance.

Once this transition is accomplished, we will have made a major contribution toward lasting peace and security, not only in Africa but throughout the world.

This is what we hope will be achieved through the United Nations Congo plan of reconciliation. And this is why we are giving our full support and best efforts toward making this plan succeed.

We hope you will join us in support of this endeavor.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield me 1 minute?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we all recognize the ever-increasing importance of college education and post-graduate work in this advanced technical age in which we live. The need for advanced education is not only limited to a person's advancement but there is also a direct relationship between education and economic growth. This is a subject recently discussed by the able president of Montana State College, Roland R. Renne, in an article he prepared for the September edition of Montana Education, the official publication of the Montana Education Association.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HIGHER EDUCATION AND ECONOMIC GROWTH (By Roland R. Renne)

Quality education and research are essential to the future sound growth and prosperity of Montana and the Nation. The best proof of this is our record to date. There is no doubt that great natural resources, a capitalistic form of enterprise, freedom of trade and movement of products, services, and people among the 50 States have all contributed significantly to our record of growth and power. But these three factors are not unique with America.

What is unique and undoubtedly the most important single factor accounting for our progress is our system of universal free public schools. The emphasis on individual attainment and the opportunity to develop one's abilities to the fullest possible extent through publicly financed schools from kindergarten through college have raised the standards and increased the wants of our people, and have at the same time provided the means of fulfillment by increased productivity and invention.

The record is perhaps best exemplified in the field of agriculture. Just 100 years ago, the Congress of the United States created the Department of Agriculture and, by passage of the Morrill Act, authorized the establishment of at least one land-grant college of agriculture and mechanic arts in each State. Grants of land for the endowment of such colleges were authorized and annual appropriations made to meet part of the costs of instruction. Later (1887) an extensive system of agricultural research through experiment stations was set up to uncover new scientific facts and develop improved methods of production and mar-

keting agricultural products. Still later, in 1914, a system of adult education was established and financed by joint contributions of Federal, State, and county governments. This cooperative extension service takes the latest discoveries of the agricultural experiment stations and passes them on to farm and ranch operators who put them to practical use. In Montana, the main station is at Bozeman and the seven branch stations are spread over the State to meet the varied soil, weather, and other production influences peculiar to the different areas of Montana.

So effective has been this three-way system of resident instruction, research, and adult education that today American agriculture efficiency and achievement are the envy of the entire world. Only 8 percent of our population is required to produce all the food and fiber we need, with considerable to spare to help feed and clothe people in other lands. In some countries, over 90 percent of the population is required in agriculture and even the more advanced nations have about half of their labor force engaged in farming. Only one-fifth of our income is spent for food while in most other leading nations 40 to 50 percent is required.

This progress in agriculture has released millions of people from farming to do other things and has made possible our highly diversified, industrialized, and powerful Nation. In other words, we can have a high standard of living and at the same time spend billions on military strength. We can and do have both "guns and butter."

If there ever was a convincing record of the contributions of quality higher education and research to economic growth, it is plainly before us in what has happened and is happening in American agriculture, and Montana is high among the States in the dynamic growth and progress of its agriculture.

It seems strange, therefore, in the face of such convincing evidence, that the percentage of our national income spent on education, both public schools and higher education, has declined steadily for more than a decade and that Montana public education and research are suffering a serious dollar crisis. Today, less than 1 percent (nineteenths of 1 percent) of our gross national product is spent on higher education and only 3 percent on elementary and secondary education. The figures for Montana are quite comparable.

In the meantime, business and industry have stepped up their expenditures for research and development. In fact, in American industry competition has become "a race in innovation." Talk with businessmen in almost any field and you find them convinced that growing research budgets are a necessity for companies who want to survive. They say "Just stop your research for a year while your competitors keep right on. You'll be dead. Research fosters steady growth even in times of recession."

In the electronics industry, for example, it is estimated that products unknown 10 years ago account for 80 percent of its current sales. Chemical companies expect 60 percent of their 1975 sales to be based on new products which are now in the introductory stages or still to be invented. The National Science Foundation reports that during the decade 1945-55 the rate of growth of industrial research was about 14 percent per year, greater than that of any other major economic activity.

The scientists for this expanded research program and increased economic activity come from our college classrooms and laboratories. If the job of the colleges is poorly done, it will result in our inability to maintain an effective rate of growth and cause a serious lessening of our economic and national strength.

For the past several years, we have been living with shortages of chemists, physicists, engineers, and other physical scientists. For many years, we have known that we need more doctors and other medical personnel, including nurses, than have been available to maintain a desirable standard of health services. Shortages of qualified school teachers have constituted a serious problem since World War II, especially in the fields of mathematics and science. The expansion of college enrollments, with prospects of even greater numbers just ahead, has given us fair warning that there will soon be acute shortages of competent college and university teachers. We have also been hard pressed to provide adequate numbers of skilled workers and technicians in many fields.

This demand for an ever-growing number of scientifically educated and trained people seems to be built into our American system of free enterprise and economic growth. The availability of trained manpower hastens economic growth; its absence acts as a brake on advancement. There would be compelling reasons for our concern over a shortage of trained manpower, even if the Communist threat to freedom did not exist.

The investment we make in education is the heart of the solution to our manpower needs. Strengthening and improving educational institutions is the most important means of securing adequate numbers of highly trained people needed in numerous fields of activity. Aside from health, education constitutes society's major investment in people. We have reached the point where education must be recognized as an investment in quite new and different terms.

Whenever private enterprise or a business corporation sees an opportunity to expand, to increase its output and make a larger profit, it does not hesitate to increase its capital investment and enlarge its plant. Investment proceeds automatically by plowing back funds from earnings into capital expansion. Where such earnings are inadequate, borrowing occurs either through banks, issuance of bonds, or issuance of stock, but investment in people (education) is largely undertaken by the community from public funds.

Support for this public investment, of course, is dependent upon decisions by taxpayers or their elected representatives to transfer funds from other uses. However, the process by which the investment need or the relative investment needs are weighed is not automatic. Frequently, it is a much debated controversial subject because there are many who through ignorance, selfishness, misinformation or for other reasons, are not convinced that a tax dollar can be spent as efficiently for public investment as a dollar can be spent in the private sector of our economy. The result, too often, is that the tax cost is not related to benefits received, immediately or over the longer pull, but is branded as wasteful, so the public investment is not made.

The hour is late. Indeed it is later than we think. In a year or two much larger numbers of Montana high school graduates will be knocking at our college doors to be prepared for more effective service in our highly scientific and technological age. If our Montana economy is to grow and develop as it could and should, her leaders in business, agriculture, labor, and government must see to it that her higher educational institutions—the university system—receive adequate financial support. Only with adequate financial support can these institutions render services vital to growth and development.

The degree to which this responsibility is met will determine, more than any other single factor, the degree of Montana's future economic and cultural progress.

17632

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 6

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO SENATOR MORSE, SENATOR ENGLE, AND SENATOR KEATING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] for the consideration they showed last night in allowing the Senate to proceed to the third reading of the tax bill before they made their speeches and remarks. They held them in abeyance until that was done; and I thank them for the consideration they have shown.

REVENUE ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10650) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property, to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to renew my request of a few minutes ago for unanimous consent that there be a quorum call, and I call it to the attention of the minority leader. I ask unanimous consent that there now be a quorum call, and that the time required for it be divided equally between the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then, Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] would like to speak on the tax bill, and I will yield 15 minutes to him.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, any revenue measure which comes to the Senate or the House should meet, above all, the standard of justice and equity. It is important that it provide adequate revenues; but justice and equity should be the prime criteria for judging any revenue measure.

The tax bill before the Senate as it emerged from the administration was designed to do a number of things, but two primarily: First, to stimulate investment in plant and equipment; second, to plug a number of loopholes in our tax laws. As designed by the administration, it was expected to increase revenues by some \$500 million. This was the estimate of the Treasury.

The kind of tax bill now pending does not meet either the criteria of justice

or the criteria of revenue adequately. Furthermore, it will not achieve either of the two purposes for which the administration designed it. It will not stimulate investment. It will not significantly plug loopholes.

Mr. President, last year our Government's mammoth deficit was some \$6 to \$7 billion. In the coming year virtually everyone expects that we will suffer another heavy deficit. Under these circumstances it is unwise for the Congress to adopt a revenue measure which would sharply reduce revenues.

This is especially true in view of the fact that only a few weeks ago the administration acted to modify depreciation schedules to reduce, in effect, the tax liability of American business by \$1½ billion. This was a wise and necessary action. But it means that in the present year the big deficit previously predicted will be increased another \$1½ billion.

RED-INK BILL

The bill which is before the Senate cuts even deeper into red ink. The \$500 million surplus which the bill would have provided, as originally designed by the Treasury and the administration, now turns out to be a \$700 million revenue loser.

Mr. President, I want very briefly to run through the reasons for that revenue loss and point out how thoroughly and completely unjustified each of these cuts below administration recommendations is.

The issues I am going to discuss have to do with the actions taken by the Congress in contradicting the position originally taken by the administration and the President.

UTILITY GIVEAWAY THOROUGHLY UNJUSTIFIED

The administration recommended that utilities not be given an investment credit. Secretary Dillon made a very comprehensive study, one of the finest and most scholarly studies I have read, showing that the investment credit could not possibly increase the investment by utilities in plant and equipment.

I comprehensively documented the case against this utility giveaway by putting into the Record two superlative scholarly studies nailing the case to the mast in detail. The studies were made by higher competent economists. The credit for utilities is going to cost the Government of the United States \$225 million, and the testimony is overwhelming on the part of competent economists who have studied the subject that it could not increase the investment by utilities in plant and equipment. As a matter of fact, not only economists, but competent businessmen who are closest to this situation, even though they would benefit greatly, have said so. The vice president and comptroller of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. testified that in the experience of this great company this investment credit provision was unwise and would not increase the A.T. & T. investment in plant and equipment, although A.T. & T. would get a \$75 million annual windfall, one-third of all the benefits going to utilities.

ADMINISTRATION'S PLUGGING FOREIGN INVESTMENT LOOPHOLE PLUGGED

In the second place, the Senate acted to eliminate the action which the administration recommended which would have ended the deferral of taxes. And in its other action on foreign investment it reduced by \$175 million the revenues designed to be obtained originally by the administration.

GAS PIPELINE GIVEAWAY

In the third place, probably the least justifiable provision in the bill is that gas pipelines are given, not an investment credit of 3 percent as all other utilities are given, but an investment credit of 7 percent. Of course, the administration recommended that gas pipelines be given no investment credit whatsoever, and Secretary Dillon was very specific in pointing out that there was no excuse at all to give gas pipelines an investment credit, since they build their pipelines on the basis of certificates of convenience and necessity, and since they have been expanding very rapidly indeed, and every pipeline is going to be built without any relation to their corporate income tax or any modification of their corporate income tax.

BUSINESS EXPENSE LOOPHOLE KEPT OPEN

In the fourth place, Mr. President, the Senate acted to refuse to close business expense loopholes significantly. It acted against the recommendations of the administration, and it acted in doing so in a way that loses virtually \$200 million of revenue which otherwise would have flowed to the Treasury.

As the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] pointed out so eloquently, this was not only a matter of raising revenues which should be raised and of having people pay taxes which should be paid, but also a very real and definite moral issue. One of the most unfortunate aspects of American economic life is the expense account racket, which we all recognize. It is one of the most morally degrading aspects of American life. Businessmen themselves in many cases recognize it is wrong, but Congress has decided not to take effective action against it, although there was a minor improvement in the law.

TWIN CITIES RAPID TRANSIT GETS FREE-VETO-PROOF RIDE

In addition to these actions, the Senate insisted on loading onto the tax bill special interest legislation for the Twin Cities Rapid Transit System. One company is to be given relief in the tax bill, a relief which the President refused to approve in a bill submitted to him last year. In fact, the President specifically vetoed the bill because it was unjustifiable. The Senate acted to put that relief for the Twin Cities Rapid Transit System onto the tax bill to make it vetoproof.

Mr. President, any Senator who conscientiously acts on the proposed legislation should be inclined to vote against the bill if only on the grounds of the special interest legislation for one company, and the precedent it would provide.

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17647

inter-American security system through the Organization of American States.

"Specifically the OAS Charter and the Rio Treaty (Sept. 2, 1947) provides the means for common action to protect the hemisphere against the interventionist and aggressive designs of international communism."

Later—on August 24, 1960—President Eisenhower said:

"The Monroe Doctrine has by no means been supplanted—it has been merely extended."

President Kennedy reaffirmed the position taken by preceding administrations relative to the Monroe Doctrine when, after the failure of Cuban exiles to invade Cuba in April 1961 he said:

"Let the record show that our restraint is not inexhaustible. Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of non-interference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction—if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration—then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations which are to the security of our own Nation."

Now the situation has reached a point of decision. Shall the governments of Central and South American countries be gradually infiltrated and taken over by the Soviets? The Communist apparatus and agents already have begun to infiltrate every country, from Mexico down to the tip end of South America. If the Organization of American States does nothing and if the United States is acquiescent, the Communist foothold in Latin America will be strengthened and the Monroe Doctrine will be dead for all time.

It has been suggested that, if the United States takes forceful action in Cuba, this will cause the Soviets to raise questions about Western military bases in various parts of Europe. But this, too, would be merely a smokescreen, because Moscow knows that not a single group of military advisers or technicians from the West is today based in any of the Communist bloc countries. There is no parallel, therefore, and the issue remains whether the aggression via Cuba and the Soviet threat to Central and South American countries shall be ignored or some military and economic action shall be taken to nip it in the bud now before the buildup becomes a real menace to the security of the United States.

For in Cuba—just 90 miles from Florida—the Soviets have established their military advisers "to train Cuban servicemen," as the official Moscow communique describes it.

In accordance with precedent and custom, Mr. Kennedy may decide to ask Congress for a joint resolution authorizing him to take whatever military steps are deemed necessary to uphold the Monroe Doctrine. Since the present session of Congress may adjourn soon, such power might well be given to the Chief Executive as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces so that he may be able to act promptly in whatever emergency may suddenly arise in Cuba or anywhere else in Latin America.

WILL CUBA BE ANOTHER "WALL OF SHAME"?

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, during the last 6 weeks the Soviet Union made a fateful decision to supply large-scale, industrial-military aid to Cuba. This decision by the Soviets to strengthen their foothold in this hemisphere has gone unchallenged by our Government.

Statements have been made on the Senate floor that the Soviets have landed troops in Cuba. The President

has responded that "we have no evidence of troops." The State Department admits that 3,000 to 5,000 Communist bloc "technicians," some of which are military specialists, have arrived in Cuba, along with military hardware. Whether these are "troops" or "technicians" is a matter of semantics. The clear fact is, the Soviet Union has reinforced its base within 90 miles of our shores with surface-to-air missiles, missile-equipped torpedo boats, trucks, munitions, radar and other electronic equipment, and the men who know how to use them. Moreover, while our attention has been focused on the recent arrival of 20 Soviet ships, the fact is, that over 60 ships, many of them leased from Great Britain, Greece, Norway, Italy, and West Germany—all NATO allies of the United States—have delivered Mig fighters, tanks, and artillery.

The present faltering and mismanaged Cuban economy and trumped-up fears of an American invasion have provided an excuse for the Soviets to furnish the Castro regime with these supplies and troops. The Soviet interest, however, is not concerned with the welfare of the Cuban people but with strengthening its base in this hemisphere; a base which will be costly for the United States to neutralize; a base from which it can export the Communist revolution to Latin and South America; a base from which it can apply leverage to offset U.S. activity in other areas of the world.

Cuba has thus become a strategically placed pawn in the cold war.

The next move is up to the President.

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE MONROE DOCTRINE?

The Monroe Doctrine was the result of an earlier attempt by Russia to push its domination into North America. It was announced by President Monroe in 1823 and has become a keystone of American foreign policy. President Monroe stated:

We owe it therefore to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those (European) powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portions of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety.

The President reaffirmed this policy on September 4, 1962, but only insofar as it applies to the use of military force by Cuba to extend communism into South America. To date the President has preferred to consider the Soviet-supplied arms as defensive weapons, but recognizing their offensive potential has warned that "the Castro regime will not be allowed to export its aggressive purposes by force or threat of force."

If the Monroe Doctrine is in fact a part of our foreign policy, then it must apply to the Cuban situation in a broader sense. It must restrict nonmilitary as well as military aggression. We have learned from costly experience that a Communist aggression utilizes devices much more subtle than outright military action and granted a militarized base in the Western Hemisphere, the Soviets will export revolution to all of the Americas.

Failure to give this full meaning to the Monroe Doctrine, in this particular case,

as difficult as this might be, will make of Cuba a Western-Hemisphere Berlin wall, a wall of shame, a symbol of uncertainty and indecision.

SOLUTIONS—OPPORTUNITIES LOST

Invasion, or support of invasion, of Cuba by the United States has been ruled out by the President as antagonistic to some 220 million Latin Americans and untold millions in the undecided nations of the world. Yet it is a painful paradox to recall American military intervention in South Korea, Lebanon, and the Dominican Republic, and to observe current action in South Vietnam, Laos and Thailand, while we verbally sidestep the Soviet takeover of Cuba at our very doorstep.

The American policy of unilateral economic isolation was doomed at its inception because many members of the Organization of American States refused to cooperate. Any possibility of imminent internal Cuban collapse has now been eased by Russian economic aid.

Rebellion within a police state, heavily armed with Soviet weapons, is virtually impossible, as the Hungarians learned so violently.

Who would suggest that Castro could be wooed back to the hemisphere fold of free nations as a reformed neighbor?

MY POSITION

The responsibility for the administration of foreign affairs is vested by the Constitution in the President. Congress cannot, therefore, initiate the negotiations required to meet this deadly challenge to the sovereignty of the nations of this hemisphere. Numerous Members of Congress have warned of the danger of playing down the threat which Soviet intervention in Cuba poses. The failure of the "Bay of Pigs" invasion has apparently cooled administration enthusiasm for sponsoring a positive policy in this case.

These four positive successive steps could be taken:

First. The President should call upon the Organization of American States to condemn Cuba for its military buildup. At the same time the member countries should assure Cuba that they will not be parties to an invasion of Cuba if that country's militarizing ceases and if it abstains from subversive activities in the Americas.

Second. The President should call upon the members of NATO to discontinue the use of their ships for transporting military supplies and personnel into this hemisphere.

Third. The President should inform the Soviet Union that further shipment of military supplies to Cuba will be considered an aggressive act in violation of the Monroe Doctrine and ships carrying such supplies will be stopped and turned back.

Fourth. The President should call upon the Organization of American States to notify the Castro regime that unless free elections under OAS supervision are conducted in Cuba within a reasonable time, the threat of the Communist dictatorship to the welfare of the people of Cuba and to the security of

this hemisphere will require a full blockade of the island.

These are harsh steps with recognized dangers. Our past is dotted with the errors resulting from timidity and indecision which handed the Communists priceless victories—the Rhine, the 38th parallel, the Berlin wall. We will not be secure if Cuba is added to this list.

REVENUE ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10650) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property, to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes of my time to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall vote against the tax bill. This has been a very difficult decision for me to make, because there are some good provisions in the bill which I would like to see put into the law, and there are some provisions in the bill of which I do not approve. In my opinion, it is a marginal bill, and for that reason it is a very difficult decision to determine how to vote on it.

The sections I would like to see become law, and which I hope will become law in any tax revision that is submitted at the first of the year by the President, concern:

First, revision of existing law with respect to the bad debt reserve provisions applied to mutual savings banks, domestic building and loan associations, and certain cooperative banks.

Second, correction of an imbalance which exists in the treatment of mutual fire and casualty insurance companies as compared to stock fire and casualty insurance companies.

Third, revision of the tax treatment of cooperatives and patrons.

Fourth, elimination of some tax havens abroad and lobbying abuses.

These are all provisions which would be helpful, and I would like to see them included in a tax revision bill.

Contrasted with these favorable provisions, is the question of the provision for investment credit. I voted against this section when it came before the Senate as an amendment, which, as I understand, would result in an annual revenue loss of approximately \$1,300 million. This provision is not fair, as I see it, because it will help some industries, but not others which are in the same category and in the same position.

I am in favor of a proper allowance for depreciation that will not be limited to a specific period of time. If industries have a proper allowance for depreciation, they will have a greater opportunity for improving their plants.

In addition, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have watched the appropriation bills this year. I cannot see that we have been able to effect any substantial decrease in appropriations to any of the departments; certainly we have not been able to do so up to the present time. We know that with

the problems we have in relation to our national security the Defense Department appropriations are going to increase over the next few years, rather than decrease.

So this issue involves the question of constant Federal deficits and a constant drain on our gold supply.

These are very fundamental reasons for opposing the bill. Although, as I have said, it does contain some good provisions, it is still a marginal bill. If the Senate passes the bill, it will then go into conference. There are more provisions in the House version of the bill that I would oppose. The Senate conferees will be in a position of having to yield something to the House conferees, which may result in the version of the bill containing certain provisions which I might strongly oppose.

We are also told there will be a new tax bill submitted for our consideration next year.

The bill, as amended by the Senate, would decrease governmental revenues on a full-year basis by \$585 million, and I believe perhaps even more.

For all the reasons I have stated, I shall vote against passage of the bill. As I say, I do it with considerable hesitation because of the good features in the bill; and because we know certain tax provisions should be improved. The overall balance is against the bill, and I shall vote against its passage.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

INFORMING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ON WHAT IS REALLY HAPPENING IN CUBA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in his September 5 statement on Cuba, President Kennedy said that the administration would "continue to make information available as fast as it is obtained and properly verified." All Americans, I am sure, received this assurance with much relief. The American people become very restless if facts to which they are entitled, without danger to our security, are not made promptly available to them so that they can understand the policies of their government. To a certain extent, the assurance by the President of a steady flow of facts will do much to prepare the American people for developments in our foreign policy.

It should be noted that revelations to date with regard to the very serious crisis in Cuba have come on the initiative of the press and of the Congress. Revelations have been made by the press which were not made to the American people by the State Department and which were not the subject of statements by the President. They were revealed by such eminent Members of each body as the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the distinguished Representative from California, Mr. HOSMER, and several others.

Right now, many Americans are worried about published information which has not received verification from the administration. Especially numerous are reported facts of this sort

about the Cuban situation. American fears could be alleviated if President Kennedy would fill the information vacuum concerning Cuba by "obtaining and properly verifying" the following news reports:

First. Is the international brigade of Communists in Cuba now numbering in the thirty-thousands? Is this brigade partially composed of 1,500 Ghanaian troops, 900 Red Chinese, 200 Algerians, and numerous Communist contingents from other Latin American countries? Are other troops from Asia and Africa billeted in Cuba? Where are these troops located? Are the Russians in Las Villas Province, the Red Chinese on the Isle of Pines, and the Ghanaians near Cienfuegos and Mariel? How many other Communist countries have military and technical personnel and in what numbers?

A dispatch by a writer for the London Daily Mail points out, for example, that from 5,000 to 8,000 Russians have arrived so far. The writer states:

A Western ambassador in Havana told me categorically:

I should like for Senators to note this quotation, because if the Western ambassador could talk to a London newspaperman, I ask whether anybody is talking to our State Department about the same things. And if they have been talking to our State Department, why have the American people not been told?

I read what the Western ambassador said:

I have reported to my government, despite all denials, that many of these men are Soviet troops, that they are arriving in increasing numbers, and this is all part of a carefully planned military operation to underwrite the Castro regime.

The writer of the article also says:

Arrivals of the Russians in large numbers is seen by many diplomats in Havana as driving a final nail into the coffin of the Monroe Doctrine—the statement of U.S. foreign policy which established, over a century ago, the "hands off" attitude to outside powers with ambitions in the American hemisphere.

This much is certain from what I have just seen in Cuba:

No large-scale attempt to overthrow the Castro regime could now be launched by the United States or Cuban exiles without Russian blood being spilled in the process.

I watched the Russians in two separate encampments—after being told they were a "ghost army" existing only in the imagination of Americans.

They looked pretty healthy ghosts to me.

That has to be contrasted with the President's press conference statement of "no troops," and with the incredible letter received by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], on the 30th of August, stating that we have no information that any Soviet bloc troops have landed in Cuba.

However, I wish to congratulate the Senator from New York for hearing from the State Department, in reply to his letter of August 14, by letter of August 30, which is only a 16-day lapse in the reply to a minority Member of this body. I think that establishes a record. I hope that someday we may hear from them in even as brief a period of time as 13 days, or perhaps even 14

days after we address a communication to them.

I hope the President will have an opportunity to obtain the reports and to properly verify them.

Second. Is the Soviet Union setting up a base in Cuba for the tracking of space experiments? I refer to our space experiments off Cape Canaveral.

Third. How many missile sites are in being or are planned for the near future, using Soviet missiles? What is the range of such missiles?

Fourth. Is the Soviet Union supplying Cuban Communists with diversified late-model weapons? Is there a ring of such weapons—heavy artillery and anti-aircraft guns—surrounding the U.S. base at Guantanamo? Are all the Russian arms shipments payments or base rights given to them by Castro?

Fifth. How large is Castro's army? Does it now contain in the neighborhood of 300,000 troops? Is this the largest army in Latin America?

Sixth. Have Soviet Migs replaced the United States and British warplanes in the Cuban air force? Are there more than 100 jet fighters at 14 bases in Cuba?

Seventh. What is the significance of the arrangements for establishment of regular airline service between Havana and Moscow?

Eighth. Are the Russians handling all the installment of modern military equipment in Cuba? Is the operation of all such equipment in the hands of the Russians also?

Ninth. What is the precise number of Red Russian-owned or leased ships now docking at Cuban ports? Is the increase considerably higher than the 60 ships observed since mid-July?

Mr. President, all the above facts, if verified, clearly point to a violation of the Monroe Doctrine by the Soviet Union. I believe that most, perhaps all, can be verified. The Doctrine warns greedy foreign powers that "we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." Mr. President, Khrushchev has already said that the Monroe Doctrine is dead. Castro has called the Doctrine a worthless document. Plainly both of these Communists are taking themselves seriously and acting as if the Doctrine did not exist.

But the Monroe Doctrine does exist. The big question is whether the United States intends to implement it. On this point, the President of the United States has again assured us that our Government "will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are to the security of our Nation." But the news items I have gathered do raise the question "when is the security of our country threatened?" When Communist infiltration of the magnitude now going on in Cuba takes place, many Americans feel that a definite threat already exists. President Kennedy could well allay these fears by acting as quickly as possible in examining, verifying publicly and mak-

ing available to the American public the whole story of this Red base of operations 90 miles from our shores.

If the facts are true, then a number of steps are open to the United States to deal with the Communist menace. Among the most feasible is to convince the Organization of American States to deal firmly with Castro. Mr. William S. White in his September 5 column has this to say:

We should try one more time to persuade the Organization of American States to act in honesty and honor against the Soviet cancer in the Caribbean.

The Secretary of State has called a conference of Latin American ambassadors. I suggest that we request all of our neighbors in this hemisphere to join with us in convening the Organization of American States, that we take the lead in securing the consent of as many of them as will join us in a multilateral warning to the Communist States to cease the arming in Cuba. I propose that we set a deadline, after which we should proceed, multilaterally if possible, unilaterally otherwise, to declare foreign military exports to Cuba to be contraband and subject to blockade. If we do so proceed, we can stop Communists from exporting revolutions to this hemisphere. If we do not, we will be long faced with Communist dictatorships elsewhere in Latin America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a report known as an uncensored, eyewitness report entitled "Russians in Cuba Are Real," appearing in the Harrisburg Patriot and the article by Columnist William S. White, to which I previously referred.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMN BY WILLIAM S. WHITE

WASHINGTON.—The Soviet Union's publicly boasted military penetration of the Western Hemisphere in Castro Cuba is many things, apart from the most insolent menace to the New World that the United States has ever tolerated.

It destroys forever the airy assurances of pseudo-liberals that revolutionary movements are fine things indeed—so long as they involve leftwingers.

It places a terrible responsibility before history upon all those Americans who cheered Fidel Castro on in Cuba long past the point where it was plain that he was transplanting the evil fungus of armed international communism to within 90 miles of our Florida coastline.

It bankrupts the whole evangelistic theory, parroted with religious fervor, that communism results from capitalistic injustice, et cetera, and will vanish at once, given the spreading of sufficient welfarism among the masses.

Cuba, before Castro, was never half so underprivileged as dozens of other lands which have never sought the lethal embrace of Moscow.

It fully supports what has long been fully obvious—that communism, like Hitlerism

before it, is a movement of bandit ferocity and cannot be explained by old-lady minds as simply springing from too little milk for the kiddies and too little free land for the workers and peasants.

It brings into the gravest question the practicality of the vast effort being made by the United States through the Alliance for Progress to cure all the ills of Latin America with economic aid.

Foreign aid is a sound and splendid thing—when it is given to nations willing and able to use it for freedom's strength and openly and unashamedly against communism.

But the bulk of the more powerful Latin American nations, while avidly ready for our economic aid, have repeatedly refused to follow us in any total quarantine of Castro Cuba. It is fashionable to say that we, the United States, should never force our views upon the recipients of our aid.

This is the line even when precisely our views are essential to maintain that freedom from "foreign domination" for which the Latins so endlessly clamor—especially those who have snuggled up closest to international communism.

Brought into question, too, is the very validity of the Organization of American States. This association of the nations of this hemisphere was created to prevent just the kind of foreign penetration which is and long has been so openly involved in Castro Cuba.

But an effective majority of the OAS has thus far been unwilling to take any fully rational step against Castro Cuba. The most ironic of all excuses is given by the nation closest in geography to us, Mexico. She has said that while she would like to help, she just can't find any precedent for it in international practice. There is a sour taste in this—for Mexico, of course, is famous for its scrupulous respect for both law and justice.

So what is now left to the United States? We should try one more time to persuade the Organization of American States to act in honesty and honor against the Soviet cancer in the Caribbean. Failing this, we should raise a new collective military organization from among the minority who are our real friends in Latin America.

Much the same was done in 1949, when we created the North Atlantic Treaty Organization from within the United Nations when it became clear that the U.N. would do nothing about Soviet aggression in Europe.

And failing this, the United States should act alone to clear the Soviet military apparatus from Castro Cuba, come what might.

UNCENSORED, EYEWITNESS REPORT—RUSSIANS IN CUBA ARE REAL
(By Keith Morfett)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Keith Morfett, roving Latin American correspondent, for the London Daily Mail, has visited Cuba eight times during the past 2½ years, most recently last week. He flew to Miami to write the revealing, uncensored story which the Patriot presents here because of its significance in the light of the Soviet buildup in nearby Cuba.)

Thousands of strapping young Russians are moving quietly into tented military encampments close to the outskirts of Havana in a vast Soviet buildup that is causing deep concern among diplomats in the Cuban capital.

From 5,000 to 8,000 Russians have arrived so far.

A Western ambassador in Havana told me categorically:

"I have reported to my government, despite all denials, that many of these men are

Soviet troops, that they are arriving in increasing numbers, and this is all part of a carefully planned military operation to overthrow the Castro regime."

Many of the Russians are in their early 20's. All have reached Cuba aboard three Soviet passenger liners.

At the same time, a continuous armada of cargo ships is now stretched out between Russia's Black Sea ports and Cuba, carrying trucks, jeeps, machinery, food, guns—and ground-to-air missiles for Fidel Castro's armed forces.

Arrivals of the Russians in large numbers is seen by many diplomats in Havana as driving a final nail into the coffin of the Monroe Doctrine—the statement of U.S. foreign policy which established, over a century ago, the "hands off" attitude to outside powers with ambitions in the American hemisphere.

This much is certain from what I have just seen in Cuba:

No large-scale attempt to overthrow the Castro regime could now be launched by the United States or Cuban exiles without Russian blood being spilled in the process.

I watched the Russians in two separate encampments—after being told they were a "ghost army" existing only in the imagination of Americans.

They looked pretty healthy ghosts to me. Hefty, athletic, and looking a lot better fed than their Cuban hosts, they crowded up to barbed-wire fence at the first camp I found near the village of El Cano.

They appeared to be members of the kind of unit usually moved in advance of regular fighting troops to set up camps, establish communications networks and accomplish other related chores.

In the tropical heat they looked unhappy and homesick. They had cloth caps and denim trousers and clustered together for comfort like sheep on the range in a rainstorm.

The contrast between the El Cano crowd and the next lot I looked at was so great that it became clear Cuba's Russians fall into two distinct categories.

The El Cano Russians were recruited into "labor battalions" rather like the British Army's Pioneer Corps. They will dig ditches, lay cables and do all the donkey work.

A few miles away, down a rutted side road the whole countryside was suddenly swarming with Soviets. This time they were obviously on different business. Hundreds of them moved around among military vehicles parked under trees, in fields alongside hedges and between row upon row of khaki-colored tents.

Nearby, anti-aircraft guns in freshly dug pits were manned by Cuban militiamen. Machineguns were mounted at all approach roads into the camp. By the tasks they were doing, checking their equipment on radio trucks, command vehicles and signal equipment, these Russians appeared to be military technicians such as signal, staff, and electronic engineers.

REVENUE ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10650) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property, to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, H.R. 10650 is important urgent tax legislation. At a time when we are concerned with the rate of growth of our economy, it offers

effective stimulus to that growth. At a time when we are concerned with the continuing deficit in our balance of payments, it offers significant help to reducing and eliminating that deficit—and thus reducing the chronic drain on our gold reserves. At a time when we are concerned with the effect of our tax system on our society and our economy, it offers a solution to a number of long-standing tax problems. The provisions of this bill have been voted by the Senate after more than a year of careful consideration in the Congress, after 5 months of hearings and work by the Senate Finance Committee, and after more than a week of debate in this Chamber.

H.R. 10650 is a sound bill. Its provisions correct inequities and remove loopholes which have defied solution for years—the taxation of business income earned abroad, the taxation of personal income earned by nonresident citizens, the collection of taxes on interest and dividend income, the tax treatment of entertainment and travel expenses, the taxation of cooperatives, mutual thrift and mutual fire and casualty insurance companies, and the taxation of proceeds from the sale of depreciable property.

H.R. 10650 taxes those who have escaped taxation in the past, but, in no case is it punitive in intent or effect. Throughout the long process of shaping this bill both the Congress and the Treasury have met with responsibility and with understanding the needs of American business.

The main provision of the bill—the investment credit—will, I am convinced, in years to come, be viewed as the most important single measure to strengthen and revitalize the American economy enacted by the 87th Congress. It will provide American producers with the stimulus they need both to modernize to meet foreign competition and to accelerate expansion of our domestic economy. In addition, the foreign income provisions are designed to prevent any possible interference with productive American business operations overseas, and one particular section is specifically designed to assure that no additional burden is placed on firms primarily engaged in the sale of American-made products.

The sections of the bill covering taxation of income earned abroad are not aimed at capturing every possible dollar of tax revenue. They are aimed at ending tax abuses which harm this country by discouraging the return flow to our shores of dollars earned overseas. For balance-of-payments reasons, it is vitally important that we remove these tax barriers against the repatriation of money earned abroad by American citizens and American businesses.

Two other provisions deserve mention: The reporting requirement on dividend and interest income may not be as effective as withholding, but it represents a significant step forward in an area in which tax evasion has long been widespread.

The provision covering travel and entertainment expenses, as voted by the

Senate, puts us in a good position to work out in the conference committee an effective means of curbing disgraceful abuses without interfering with genuine business travel or entertainment.

Finally, the bill is one which reflects a high degree of fiscal responsibility. While some initial revenue loss is possible, the fact remains that over the long run, enactment of H.R. 10650 will contribute immeasurably to the growth of the American economy. This will mean larger tax collections, without higher tax rates in the years to come. Now there are estimates that the full year revenue loss under the bill as amended would be as low as \$240 million. The highest estimate—the one made by the staff of our Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation—reaches \$585 million. My own estimate is that the loss even in the beginning would be much less than either.

The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], in offering his reporting amendment to the bill, stated that in his judgment it would be as effective in collecting taxes as the withholding amendment would have been. I say that if it is half as effective, there will then be no deficit by reason of the enactment of the bill.

Will anyone seriously argue that this is too high a price to pay for legislation to increase the growth and vigor of the American economy, to strengthen our Nation's economic position in the world, and to improve the fairness of our tax system?

In summary, this bill gains ground in almost every single area sought by the President. It provides a critically needed source of new vitality for our domestic economy. It contains significant help to our balance of payments position. It plugs a number of tax loopholes, it removes a number of tax inequities, and it does these things without imposing hardship on any single taxpayer or on the taxpaying American public as a whole.

It is a good bill, and I believe it deserves the support of every Member of this body who would help build a stronger, healthier, revitalized American economy.

The bill as it is before the Senate has the support of the administration through the Treasury Department. That is a well-known and significant fact. I hope that it will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. On page 17367 of the Record for September 4, I ask unanimous consent that the language beginning at the figure (3) down to and including the equation designated as "(4)" be printed in the Record.

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

(3)

$$I_t = a[AP_{t+1}/S_{t-1} - (P/S)_t]$$

where I_t is investment, in real terms, in a given year t ; AP_{t+1} , output anticipated in the given year for the next year, $t+1$; S_{t-1} , the