

done. The first thing to recognize is that whatever is done should not be done hastily. There must be no repetition of the incredibly inefficient intelligence analysis of the Cuban situation which preceded last week's fiasco. To those who knew the situation in Cuba and knew the formidable strength of the leaders and their regime, the outcome of such an invasion attempt was inevitable. And even had it succeeded, the CIA concept of putting in a right-wing government that would have been branded as a Yankee creation was dreadfully wrong. It is obvious that the first step must be to reorganize the personnel and methods of the Federal officials dealing with the Cuban problem today. Any policy, any action to be taken in the future must be based on an accurate assessment of the situation.

There are certain developments that would force the United States to act; and such action would be fully understood by the world at large. If the Russians, for instance, were to set up missile bases or move in with a dangerous degree of military support; if Americans were killed and the lives of the remaining Americans were jeopardized; if Premier Castro were to attack Guantanamo Bay or mount military invasions against his Caribbean neighbors—in such cases the United States would, of course, have to intervene directly, and presumably so would other members of the Organization of American States.

Barring such obviously dangerous, although unlikely, developments, the United States should not intervene. Why not? The grave political consequences; the blow to the moral standards and principles by which we live and which are a source of strength in the cold war; the fact that armed intervention without the clearest provocation would reduce our policies to a crude contest in power politics; the loss of needed allies; the perilous international complications—these are the results that would flow from such armed intervention by the United States in Cuba.

Even more basic than our differences in economic system is our philosophic difference with the Communists: We believe in freedom and the rule of law among individuals and among nations. This is the essence of what America stands for in the world, and it is our greatest source of strength. We must preserve it.

The hegemony of the United States in the Western Hemisphere is threatened for the first time in a century. It can only be defended by a positive, creative policy, one that builds. Of course, we are strong enough to crush the Castro regime, but to do so by force would lose us far more than we could gain. It is hard to be patient under such provocation and defeat as we have experienced. Yet it is the mark of true strength to take both defeat and victory in one's stride.

The chief danger to the United States and the rest of Latin America is not Cuba by herself, but Cuba as a possible model for other revolutions, and Cuba as a base for the spread of anti-Yankee or communistic doctrines. How to counter the creeping subversion of the totalitarians is the great problem for the free world, as President Kennedy has recognized. It cannot be done by adopting their methods. That would be to surrender.

Defend the security of the United States. Continue by all legal means to encourage the anti-Batista, anti-Castro Cuban exiles in their determination to establish a free and democratic regime with social justice. They must not be abandoned.

Above all, prove—by deeds not just words—that we are determined to support the demands for social reforms throughout Latin America; that we are not merely anti-Communist; that we will oppose right-wing-reactionary military dictatorships as we do left-

wing, communistic dictatorships; that we ask partnership and cooperation, not subservience. This is the only kind of intervention that can permanently succeed in Latin America.

#### FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I address myself to the subject of Federal aid to education. There are several bills pending, on this subject, and notwithstanding what a specific bill might be numbered or might contain, the end result will be eventual Federal domination of our system of public education and the absorption by the Federal Government of one of the last remaining privileges of home or self-rule and determination. For the Congress now to acquiesce to the pressure demands against which it has stood so firmly, and rightly so, for more than a century and a half will mean complete capitulation against the will of a vast majority of the citizenry of our Nation.

Mr. President, the record will clearly show that it is not local school boards, not the municipal or county governments, nor even the State governments that are demanding that the Federal Government wedge its way into this field. And for those few who have yielded and subscribed to the philosophy, "Let the Federal Government do it and relieve us of the cost," they speak with inconsiderate tongues and blindness over their eyes.

Mr. President, none but the blind will deny that, if the Federal Government is going to pay the piper, it is most certainly going to call the tune. There was a salutary lesson on this subject back in 1959, when several leading institutions of higher learning refused to accept Federal moneys under the National Defense Act of 1958 because of certain federally imposed requirements. Dr. Griswold, president of Yale, one of the universities involved, expressed the views of that university in this manner:

Such restriction partakes of the nature of the oppressive religious and political test oaths of history, which were used as a means of exercising control over the educational process by church and state.

I do not wish to take sides in this past controversy, but simply to use it as an illustration. It does seem that both parties were acting within a reasonable concept of duty. The two universities, on the one hand, were perfectly within their rights to reject the funds and to guard jealously their freedom from the political dictates of the State. But on the other hand, the State was certainly also well within its rights in saying that it will not use its governmental power to lay taxes upon all the people and then use the money collected to subsidize those people who believe in or teach the overthrow of the very Government that is supporting them.

In any event, it is foolish to suppose that the State will do such a thing. Sometimes it might be reasonable in what it asks; sometimes it might not be, but again, if the State is going to pay the piper, it is most certainly going to call the tune.

The vision of the great many who advocate that the Federal Government come to the aid and succor of our educational system runs only so far as to see that the system is in need of money and that the Federal Treasury is large. They delude themselves into thinking that somehow they can tap this cornucopia and pay no price for it.

The community of taxpayers throughout the Nation has provided well for elementary and secondary education. The diversity of local school boards, of local governmental bodies, provides that these schools shall not be run on monolithic lines; some have more reasonable restrictions put upon them by those who support them than do other like institutions, but all of them, let it be noted, are beholden to the public that pays the local taxes, and therefore to the political agents of the local public. Manifestly a great danger lurks in a single state, the Federal Government, providing money for all schools over the Nation. For them diversity will be lost, all eventually must conform to a national standard, and there will be lost that freedom which is most prized.

#### FEDERAL CONTROL UNAVOIDABLE

Now Mr. President, there are those who decry the suggestion that Federal aid to education will bring about Federal control and restrictions. Let us examine just two of the proposed bills. In one, S. 1021, I read that funds would be provided for teacher's salaries and school construction and, now hear this, and penalties would be provided for States whose school effort does not increase each year at a predetermined national percentage. In S. 8, if my interpretation of the language is correct, funds would be available for teacher's salaries and school construction and, now here it is again, penalties for States whose school effort falls below the national average. Mr. President, rightly so, the Federal Government cannot be expected to make loans, grants, or gifts of money for any program without placing restrictions according to national goals or national standards; and in what other light or manner, Mr. President, can anyone but the blind see that these national goals and standards are nothing more than Federal controls? The majority of these pressure groups who so strongly advocate Federal aid to education say they are shocked by such accusations and statements. They say, have no fear, the Federal Government will not dictate to us and our schools will continue to operate in complete local independence and freedom. But now, Mr. President, let us look at the record and listen to their mouths. Increasingly, there have been voices within the educational profession that say "local control of education has clearly outlived its usefulness on the American scene" and that "the United States is inexorably moving toward a national system of education." An editorial in a leading journal of school administration stated that "the national welfare demands the national system of education." And yet, Mr. President, these very same people say Federal aid

Mr. President, the will of a great nation should not be manifested by precipitate action. Instead, its will must be shown with wisdom, as well as with power and purpose, as befits a great nation. The administration must have an opportunity to do this. It is already clear that the administration will not yield to any temptation that will interfere with that opportunity, and will not renounce, as the President reminded our neighbors, freedom of action essential to our "primary obligations which are the security of our Nation if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration." So the first lesson is that at this time our Nation should act wisely—not precipitately—at a time which we choose, not at a time when we may feel that we are being rushed to take action.

Second, it would be unwise and would hamper our own national interests if Congress were to undertake a public investigation of the CIA. The President has acted with propriety in the appointment of a high-level review body "for a governmentwide study of paramilitary operations within the Government" to be heavily concentrated on the CIA. General Taylor, Attorney General Kennedy, Admiral Burke, and CIA Director Dulles comprise a body which should adequately assure the country that the review will be thorough and meaningful and will, I believe, be undertaken without reservations.

This certainly does not exclude the consideration of the desirability of a joint congressional committee, similar to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to oversee the operations of the CIA, subject to the full safeguarding of security. That, too, should be done without our engaging in a process of washing our linen in public, with the accompanying embarrassment arising from a public investigation. This means that the CIA should not be made the subject of a public investigation.

In addition to this self-examination, I believe there are two areas in which we can also help meet with vigor and vision the Cuban challenge.

First. We must concentrate our efforts on activities that will implement the President's Latin-American development program, the Alliance for Progress. An auspicious start has been made by the House, led by its appropriations subcommittee—heretofore unfriendly to foreign aid—which now has granted fully the President's request for \$500-million to launch the project, plus another \$100 million to help Chile recover from last year's disastrous earthquake.

I have urged that the 18 principal European nations and Canada, that are parties to the OECD, which the United States has already joined, should make the Alliance for Progress its first partnership effort, thereby doubling the available resources to meet the urgent need for economic development in Latin America. I think they will do that—in view of the way I have seen their interests manifested in connection with the work in the NATO parliamentar-

ians. It is essential that this initiative be forwarded and that the prospective program be doubled in money and manpower, so that barriers to expansion of Latin American exports be lifted in Western Europe and that the private economy in Western Europe and the United States be effectively tied into the total effort. Every expert points out that if Communist-oriented Castroism is to find any important support in the Western Hemisphere, it will be because of the failure to develop adequately and in time the trade, health, education, water and soil resources, land use and other economic potentials of Latin America. In addition, the emphasis on self-help in the Alliance for Progress should convince the other American republics that we are a partner, not a patron. For the people of Cuba themselves, the Alliance for Progress is supremely important. They must have aid for adequate economic development and economic justice. They can get these and we can help enormously without the totalitarian regime which they are now suffering. The Alliance for Progress should certainly be available to them as they throw off the Castro dictatorship. The Castro regime promises them only lower living standards, deprivation of their liberties and will confine Cuba more and more to the low estate in terms of its economy and the enjoyment of life by its people—conditions so typical of a Communist satellite. We must make clear that we are opposed to dictatorships of the left as well as to dictatorships of the right.

Second. We must preserve the opportunity to proceed multilaterally. We must constantly keep before the eyes of the other free nations of the Western Hemisphere the tyranny of Castroism, with the expectation that they will recognize it as the threat it is to their own freedom and security, and will meet their commitments to defend the hemisphere against Communist subversion. I believe there is a fair prospect that the other American Republics will recognize, first, that the Communists will use the doctrine of nonintervention to mask their subversive purposes; and, second, that the size and weight of the Communist-furnished arms makes the Castro regime far more of a threat to the security of the other Republics in Latin America than had been realized. All the American Republics must recognize the juridical as well as the moral propriety of invoking the authority of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of September 2, 1947—the Rio Pact, which, for the Western Hemisphere, is tantamount to the NATO Alliance—as implemented by the Declaration of Solidarity adopted at the Inter-American Conference at Caracas—the Caracas Declaration—on March 28, 1954. A role in the informational part of this process may well become a most vital function of the refugees from Cuba and may be very significant to the ultimate course of events.

I point out again that article 6 of the Rio Pact speaks precisely of the inviola-

bility and integrity of the "sovereignty or political independence of any American State" being "affected by any fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America." Under such circumstances "the organ of consultation shall meet immediately, in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent." The decision may be taken by two-thirds of the signatory States that have ratified the treaty, and may result in "recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; partial or complete interruption of economic relations or of rail, sea, air postal telegraph, and radiotelephonic or radiotelegraphic communications; and use of armed forces." Only as to the use of its own armed forces is such a decision not binding on every signatory State. The other sanctions must be applied, if voted under the terms of the treaty. It is a very tight treaty; and only two-thirds of the nations participating are needed in order to bring it into operation.

This treaty is supplemented by the Caracas Declaration, which says:

The domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending into this hemisphere a political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American State, endangering the peace of America.

The signatories to the Rio Pact are all the 21 American Republics. Those represented at Caracas were the same, with reservations only on the part of Guatemala, Mexico, and Peru.

We in the United States have a right to expect that, at the proper time, enough of the signatories to the Rio Pact, recognizing the immediate and present threat posed by Castroism to freedom in the hemisphere and—and I emphasize this—to their own security, will make the Rio Pact effective in this instance.

In the tradition of a bipartisan foreign policy—as sponsored by the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg—in circumstances such as these, I urge support for the balanced approach that I have here described. I hope very much that this may also be the view of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "A Policy on Cuba," from the New York Times of recent date.

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

#### A POLICY ON CUBA

What next in Cuba? The Cuban exiles have been defeated militarily and the United States, which supported them, has suffered a political defeat. However, history is not like a boxing match or a baseball game. It flows like a river. The United States and Cuba are too much intertwined by history, geography, economics, and strategy to be separated. Cuba has been caught up in the vast storm of the cold war. All the forces unleashed by the Cuban revolution are still operating.

Therefore, something has to happen, and the instinct is to say: something has to be

of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4884) to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of April 25, 1961, pp. 6271-6272, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement on the report.

There were no major differences between the House and the Senate in regard to the temporary program to extend Federal assistance to the children of needy unemployed persons in which the Senate yielded to the House. In almost all instances the House receded to the Senate position, with these exceptions:

The Senate receded to the House provision which requires that a State plan for the new program must provide that cooperative arrangements be entered into with the State vocational education agency looking toward maximum utilization of its service facilities to encourage retraining of the unemployed parent. The program will last for a 14-month period, from May 1, 1961, through June 30, 1962, as provided in the Senate bill.

The House accepted a Senate amendment, with a modification, postponing the effective date of the provision whereby there will be no withdrawing of Federal payments because of such statutes for any period up to September 1, 1962. Under the conference agreement, States will be allowed a further period in which study may be given to this problem, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare can cooperate with the States in working out a solution.

The Senate receded as to its amendment which would have changed the name of the "aid to dependent children" to "aid to families with dependent children." It is the understanding of the conference committee that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is looking into all aspects of the aid to dependent children program and that the appropriateness of the change of name will be thoroughly explored at that time.

With those exceptions, Mr. President, the House receded to the Senate position in all other respects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I support the Senator from

Louisiana in asking that the Senate approve the conference report.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask that the question be put again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### NOMINATION OF JULIUS C. HOLMES TO BE AMBASSADOR TO IRAN

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, earlier this week the Committee on Foreign Relations ordered reported the nomination of Julius C. Holmes to be Ambassador to Iran.

When this nomination is considered by the Senate it is my intention to oppose Mr. Holmes' confirmation.

Much has been said in recent months by both congressional committees and the Attorney General of the United States about the need for higher morals and greater integrity in private industry.

Yet by confirming the nomination of Mr. Holmes as Ambassador to Iran the Senate will be placing a cloak of respectability upon "shady deals" maneuvered for the purpose of making "a fast buck" when such shady deals involve Government officials.

Are we to establish a lower standard of morals for Government service than is required of private industry?

Can either the Congress or the Department of Justice point the finger of scorn at questionable business practices while closing our eyes to "slick deals" involving Government officials?

In a later speech in opposition to this nomination I will deal more specifically with the impropriety of some of Mr. Holmes' financial deals.

I shall then point out how by questionable maneuvering, if not in actual violation of the law, Mr. Holmes and his associates pyramided a \$101,000 investment into a quick profit of \$3¼ million.

But today I shall merely enumerate a few of the points at issue.

Several years ago Mr. Holmes and his two associates—Joseph E. Casey and E. Stanley Klein—were engaged in a highly questionable tanker deal in which they placed the making of "a fast buck" above the national interest.

At the time Mr. Holmes and his associates purchased eight tankers from the Maritime Commission there was a law prohibiting their sale by the Government to foreign-owned or foreign-controlled companies. It was likewise illegal for an American company purchasing these tankers from the Government to resell them to foreign-owned or foreign-controlled companies without having obtained the prior approval of the Maritime Commission. The purpose of this provision was to guarantee that these tankers would remain under the control of the U.S. Government.

By circumventing the law, or at least the intent of the law, Mr. Holmes and his two associates sold all of these tankers to companies which were both foreign-owned and foreign-controlled.

Mr. Holmes tries to claim that they did get the approval of the Maritime

Commission, but every member of the Maritime Commission emphatically denied when testifying under oath before a senatorial committee that any notice had been given concerning the proposed sale or that any approval had been obtained.

I quote the Hoey committee's report confirming this statement:

There is no credible evidence that Mr. Morris or any other representative of the United Tanker Corp. group made a complete disclosure to the Commission concerning the arrangements between the Casey group and the United Tanker group which were entered into as early as January 1948.

What is even worse, one of these eight tankers, the *Kettleman Hills*, which the Holmes-Casey group turned over to a foreign owned and controlled company was subsequently leased to Soviet Russia. The tanker was then used by Russia for the purpose of transporting oil from Romania to ports in Communist China and North Korea.

Mr. Holmes tries to shrug off responsibility for what this foreign owned company did with the tanker after his company sold it. But we must not overlook the fact that this tanker came into the possession of these foreign owners as the result of highly irregular, if not actually illegal, maneuvering on the part of Mr. Holmes and his associates.

The Hoey subcommittee which investigated these sales in 1952 strongly denounced these transactions as morally wrong and clearly in violation of the intent of the law.

Mr. Holmes and his two associates, in violation of the clear intent of the law and without taking any financial risk at all received \$150,000 clear profit for each tanker they turned over to this foreign group. Therefore, they cannot dodge some responsibility for what happened.

The most bitter denunciation of this transaction whereby one of these tankers was chartered to Soviet Russia for use in transporting oil to Communist China and North Korea came from former Secretaries of Defense Louis Johnson and General George Marshall.

Beginning with October 1949 and extending through October 1950 they wrote a series of letters to the Secretary of State bitterly denouncing the use of these American tankers to transport Russian oil and emphasized that such action was definitely detrimental to the security of the United States.

It was not until December 1950, 6 months after the outbreak of the Korean war that the use of these vessels in Russian trade was stopped.

Now, what excuse did Mr. Holmes and his two associates give for selling this tanker, the *Kettleman Hills*, and two other tankers to this foreign owned and foreign controlled company?

They said they considered the company to which they sold the tankers—the United Tanker Corp.—to be an American owned and controlled company because the company had only four stockholders, three of whom were American citizens. Therefore they reasoned that the company was 75 percent American owned and controlled.

April 27

\* What Mr. Holmes, Mr. Casey, and Mr. Klein did not disclose was that this company—the United Tanker Corp.—at the time they exercised the option to buy these tankers was capitalized for \$2,500,006. Of this \$2,500,006 capitalization the one foreign stockholder, a Chinese citizen, owned \$2,500,000 while the three Americans had invested in the company exactly \$2 each or a total of \$6.

How naive can any man be? By what line of reasoning can anyone with a straight face claim that three men with a total investment of only \$6 in a \$2,500,006 corporation can control its operation? As if this claim were not ridiculous enough it developed that the foreign stockholders had an option to buy even this small amount of stock from these Americans at a price of \$10,000 for each man.

Obviously, these three men merely got \$10,000 each for the use of their names just as Mr. Holmes and his two associates got \$150,000 per tanker for the use of their names in getting title to three tankers from the U.S. Government for the purpose of turning them over to this foreign group.

This is but one example of the many flimsy excuses advanced by Mr. Holmes and his associates to justify the series of shady and highly irregular procedures surrounding many of the transactions involved in the purchase of eight tankers, every one of which was ultimately transferred to foreign owned and controlled companies. All of these transfers were made without the legal approval of the Maritime Commission.

I will discuss these transactions in greater detail when we consider the nomination, but today I shall close by reading from the conclusion of the Hoey subcommittee which investigated these transactions. The Hoey subcommittee report was filed on May 29, 1952. I quote from the report:

The clear and stated purpose in selling surplus tankers under the Merchant Ship Sales Act was to develop and maintain an efficient and adequate American-owned merchant marine. In the opinion of the subcommittee, it was never the intent of the law to allow this type of profit grabbing in the allocation or sale of Government-owned surplus tankers.

Furthermore, representatives of both the National Tanker Corp. and the United Tanker Corp., in their negotiations with the Maritime Commission which resulted in United obtaining control of the three tankers, did not disclose the complete facts concerning the transactions to the Commission.

\* \* \* \* \*  
 Between July 1949 and May 1950, two American-flag tankers owned by subsidiaries of the United Tanker Corp. and the China International Foundation, Inc., were chartered to the Soviet Government and carried six cargoes of petroleum and other oil products between Constanza, Rumania, and Communist ports in North China, North Korea, and Siberia.

The subcommittee is of the opinion that no American-flag vessels should have engaged in the Communist oil trade. These were the only American-flag vessels known to have been trafficking in the Communist oil trade at that time, and it is paradoxical that other vessels of the United fleet were making substantial profits in the carriage of ECA oil during the same period that these

two vessels were engaged in Communist trade.

\* \* \* \* \*  
 This entire investigation has demonstrated to the subcommittee how various groups of shrewd and calculating businessmen and attorneys, through an intricate series of corporate and financial transactions, were able to realize substantial profits by taking advantage of the confusion and mismanagement which marked the administration of the surplus ship disposal program by the old Maritime Commission.

The subcommittee concluded with this statement:

The subcommittee is of the opinion that there appears to be sufficient evidence of violations of the civil provisions of the Merchant Ship Sales Act in these tanker transactions to warrant prompt action by the Department of Justice. In addition the concealment and misrepresentation of pertinent facts by various officers and representatives of the firms involved in this inquiry in their dealings with the Maritime Commission leads the subcommittee to believe that various criminal statutes may have been violated by these individuals.

\* \* \* \* \*  
 This was a unanimous report of the subcommittee.

CLYDE R. HOEY, *Chairman.*  
 JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,  
 HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
 THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD,  
 JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY,  
 KARL E. MUNDT,  
 RICHARD M. NIXON.

I think the Washington Post in its editorial of February 22, 1952, best summed up this transaction when it said:

The involved surplus ship negotiations of Joseph E. Casey and his associates seem to fall somewhere in between what is legal and what is proper. The inquiry by the Senate investigating committee may not show that the Casey group actually violated the law. On the other hand, the procedure whereby great profits were realized on transactions which resulted in American surplus tankers ending up under the control of foreign-financed corporations will strike at least some persons as a slick deal.

Mr. President, Iran is a very important country. It is located in one of the world's most sensitive areas. It is very important that the U.S. Government be represented at this important post by an Ambassador whose integrity is above reproach.

Any individual who was connected with a financial transaction which was widely recognized as a "slick deal" by "shrewd and calculating businessmen" is not such a man.

Today, Mr. President, we received from the President of the United States an excellent message recommending certain needed legislation to deal with the conflict-of-interest problem. At the same time, the President emphasizes to Congress and to all Government officials the importance of establishing high moral standards in Government. I shall read excerpts from this excellent message from the President of the United States:

There can be no dissent from the principle that all officials must act with unwavering integrity, absolute impartiality, and complete devotion to the public interest. This principle must be followed not only in reality but in appearance. For the basis of effective government is public confidence,

and that confidence is endangered when ethical standards falter or appear to falter.

In concluding his message, President Kennedy said:

Ultimately, high ethical standards can be maintained only if the leaders of Government provide a personal example of dedication to the public service and exercise their leadership to develop in all Government employees an increasing sensitivity to the ethical and moral conditions imposed by public service. Their own conduct must be above reproach.

I know of no stronger statement which could be made against the confirmation of Mr. Holmes. Certainly his conduct was not above reproach.

*John F. Kennedy*  
 THE LESSONS OF CUBA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at this time of examination and self-examination of the events in Cuba, I believe it is important that those of us who heretofore have spoken on the subject should make clear our present position. Happily, we are relieved of the worry about France, and can turn again to the Cuban situation.

A serious reverse was suffered by the forces of freedom in the Western Hemisphere when the Cuban patriots were repulsed on the shores of Cuba. But the President has made clear, in his historic address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, that—

The Cuban people have not yet spoken their final piece.

Neither have we, because, as the President also said:

We do not intend to abandon Cuba to the Communists.

From our experiences in Cuba we can learn some valuable lessons.

First and foremost, a high order of national and partisan discipline is now called for. It is not a time for angry postmortems on blunders. President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, Governor Rockefeller, Senator Morton, Senator Dirksen, and Representative Halleck have made this admirably clear to the Nation and to the world, in the name of the Republican Party. Full opportunity must be afforded our Government to take stock of our own situation, and, through channels readily available, to evaluate the situation in the 19 other American republics, and to determine the significance of the Cuban episode in respect to the entire cold war struggle in this hemisphere. Certainly this is not a time for precipitate action.

It would be very easy to yield to the perfectly natural impulse to seek, by whatever means required, to rid the Western Hemisphere of the threat of the Communist-oriented Castro regime. But such a policy would also prove to be shortsighted and unwise. As the President has said so clearly and portentously:

A nation of Cuba's size is less a threat to our survival than it is a base for subverting the survival of other free nations throughout the hemisphere. It is not primarily our interest, our security, but theirs which is now today in ever greater peril. It is for their safety as well as our own that we must show our will.

gram which may be described as comprehensive.<sup>4</sup>

In the old-age assistance programs in 1958, 49 of the 53 States and territories made specific provision for nursing home care; 39 for drugs; 36 for dental care; 35 for hospitalization; 35 for physicians' and other practitioners' services; and 34 for prosthetic appliances.<sup>5</sup> It has been estimated that about 70 percent of the payments made to suppliers of medical services in behalf of public assistance recipients in all four categories were made for old-age assistance recipients.

The rising costs of the medical care component of public assistance, particularly for the 2.4 million persons on old-age assistance, has led to public concern, and there has been a growing recognition of the need to evaluate public assistance medical care programs. As a result, systematic reviews of State and local programs have been undertaken with increasing frequency in recent years.<sup>6</sup> Typically, the commissions, the committees, and the consultants making these reviews describe the administrative structure of the program, the scope of services provided, and the patterns of providing services. Cost data are usually presented in some detail; service or utilization data, with few notable exceptions, are not presented, generally because they are not available.

Such program reviews are of only limited usefulness in the evaluation of public assistance medical care programs. To be sure, some inferences concerning the quality of the care provided may be made from descriptions of administrative patterns with respect to staff organization and responsibility, the presence or absence of professional advisory committees, the scope of services available, and the manner in which they are provided. But such basic questions as: How much medical care is actually being received? and: Is it enough? cannot even be approached without carefully collected and properly interpreted utilization data. Furthermore, as regards qualitative adequacy, the question, To what extent do recipients receive medical care meeting accepted standards of quality? must also be answered. Measures of the quality of care by professional service auditing ("medical audits") would provide the answer.<sup>7</sup> However, these techniques, which were developed for use in hospitals and in selected health insurance plans, have not been used in public welfare medical care program reviews.

A notable feature of the program reviews mentioned above is their emphasis on cost data. This is due to the traditionally fiscal orientation of public assistance programs and is reinforced by the prevailing method of purchasing medical

care in public assistance programs, i.e., by vendor payments. Dollar figures originating in the agency's accounting office flow quite naturally as a byproduct of the process of paying physicians, hospitals, and other vendors. Emphasis on the almost exclusive collection of cost data stems also from widespread lack of appreciation of the relevance of utilization data for program evaluation. Both cost and utilization data are necessary for program evaluation. But in assessing the relative value of each for this purpose, it should be borne in mind that when utilization data are available, a conversion can readily be made to cost data by applying prices to the items of service. The reverse process, the conversion of cost information into utilization data, is more difficult, and at times, not possible. Moreover, differences in fee schedules and hospital charges invalidate interprogram comparisons based on cost data alone by obscuring variations between programs in the volume of service rendered.

The American Public Welfare Association, among other activities directed toward the improvement of public welfare administration, has given special attention to medical care programs in public welfare departments. It has recently developed a "self-evaluation schedule for medical assistance programs,"<sup>8</sup> and is currently sponsoring, with funds secured from the Public Health Service, a program of research in the administrative aspects of public assistance medical care programs. Studies leading to the improved administration of these programs are now being carried out by the Bureau of Public Health Economics, University of Michigan.

In reviewing research efforts to date,<sup>9</sup> it soon became evident that there is very little information on the amount of medical care received by recipients of public assistance. A preliminary field survey indicated that even in the relatively few States which collect such data, there are important gaps. Also, the limited information which was available did not lend itself to meaningful interstate comparisons because of differences in definitions of service and the absence of basic caseload data from which to develop utilization rates for comparative purposes.

Recognizing that evaluation is a critical element of sound administration and that adequate utilization data are necessary for the evaluation of public assistance medical care programs, it was decided to focus the initial phase of the research program on the collection of such data and on the quantitative appraisal of services received by recipients of public assistance. Although it is difficult to separate quantity from quality in regard to the adequacy of medical care, studies of quality as such, e.g., the application of medical audit techniques, have been deferred.

The selection of the public assistance medical care programs for study in the initial phase of the research was in part dictated by considerations of time and cost. It was decided to limit this phase to old-age assistance medical care programs in a relatively small number of States. The OAA category is a more homogeneous population group than the other three categories. The largest proportion of total outlays

for medical care in public assistance is absorbed by this group. Finally, the OAA category was selected because of widespread interest in medical care for the aged, an interest which has been intensified by the debate over the Forand bill.

No attempt was made in this study to present a national picture of OAA medical care programs or to estimate the amount of medical care received by the 2.4 million persons on old-age assistance. Attention was directed rather toward the development of satisfactory methods of collecting adequate utilization data, solving the problems which were encountered, and indicating the uses of these data in program evaluation.

A word of caution regarding the limitation of utilization data is in order. Records of the use of services are limited to those services for which the administering agency makes a payment. In some areas, welfare recipients may receive a broad array of services for which no payment is made by the welfare agency and of which the agency will have no record. Such "free" services vary in amount and, if they are of some magnitude, they should be taken into account in making interprogram comparisons in terms of utilization data.

Two criteria were used for the selection of States. In order to secure utilization data on a broad array of services, only those States with comprehensive medical care programs for OAA recipients were considered. The State program would have to include at least physicians care—general practitioner and specialist—in office and home; hospital care; dental care; and prescribed drugs, to be selected for the study. Second, States were chosen whose record systems make the collection of utilization data feasible. For example, State programs which provide for important elements of medical care through money payments to the recipient, rather than by vendor payments, present many complex problems in the collection of utilization data.

With these considerations in mind, the old-age assistance medical care programs of four States, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Maryland, and Illinois, were selected for study. The Maryland program is distinctive in that it is administered by the health department; there are also some differences among all four States in the services provided and in payment to vendors. However, the similarities between them in terms of the services provided, in methods of providing service, and in other administrative features far outweigh the differences, so that utilization data were collected in four basically similar, comprehensive medical care programs for the needy aged. The methodology of data collection and the complete findings of this study will be presented in a monograph to be published by the American Public Welfare Association.<sup>10</sup>

This paper deals with some of the ways in which utilization data can be used in the evaluation of OAA medical care programs. Illustrative data from three of the four States studied are presented. If the question, How much medical care is actually being received? can be answered, then a second question, Is it enough? must also be asked. In the absence of generally accepted norms of quantitative adequacy, utilization data, taken from published reports of the experience of a medical care plan for an insured population 65 years of age and over (the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York) and of the experience of the general

<sup>4</sup> Bierman, P. Where Are We Going in Tax-Supported Medical Care? Paper presented at APWA Southwest Regional Conference (Apr. 7), 1959.

<sup>5</sup> Social Security Administration, Bureau of Public Assistance, "Medical Care in Public Assistance: Information Relating to Changes, Early 1957 to January, 1958," State Letter No. 333, Apr. 8, 1958.

<sup>6</sup> See for example: American Medical Association, Council on Medical Service, "A Report on Medical Care for the Indigent in 18 Selected Communities," 1955; New Jersey Commission to Study the Administration of Public Medical Care. The Report and Recommendations, October 1959.

<sup>7</sup> (a) Rosenfeld, L., "Quality of Medical Care in Hospitals," A.J.P.H. 47:856, July 1957. (b) Dally, E. F., and Moorehead, M. A., "A Method of Evaluating and Improving the Quality of Medical Care," A.J.P.H. 46:848, July 1956.

<sup>8</sup> American Public Welfare Association, "self-evaluation schedule for medical assistance programs, 1957."

<sup>9</sup> American Public Welfare Association and Bureau of Public Health Economics, University of Michigan, "Public Assistance Medical Care: Areas of Needed Research and an Annotated Bibliography," November 1959.

<sup>10</sup> American Public Welfare Association and Bureau of Public Health Economics, University of Michigan, "Old-Age Assistance Medical Care: A Four-State Study," (to be published).

1961

hoping we can devise a plan for long-distance transmission of power. This is a very exciting new field, so that we can transfer power hundreds perhaps thousands of miles, and do it cheaply, and that this will mean tremendous efficiencies in terms of the economics involved.

Mr. CLAPPER. Mr. Secretary, you have threatened to George Marshall, the owner of the Washington Redskins football team, that you will take action if he uses the federally owned Washington Stadium—the new stadium being built now, next fall—

Mr. ROLFSON. Pete, I am sorry, I can't even let you finish that question. We have only 1 minute left which we would like Secretary Udall to use as he will.

Secretary UDALL. In summing up I would perhaps in part repeat what I have said. I do think there is a quiet crisis in conservation in America. I think whether we know it or not that our character as a people and our basic inner strength as a people is related to our land and to the way we treat our land. And I think in conserving and wisely using and developing the resources of our land that we will be determining the future strength of America. After all our strength as a people comes in the long run not from our arms, for example, but from our basic resources, from our land, our water, our wood, the resources that arise out of the land itself. And therefore conservation although it has been pushed into the background more now than in previous times it is an important area of activity and I am hoping this administration can make one of the finest records in the field of conservation that can be made. We are going to tackle these problems aggressively and I hope we will have the support of the American people.

Mr. ROLFSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. Thank you for being with us on "Issues and Answers."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator for Montana yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I merely wish to say that I, too, heard the program in which Secretary Udall participated; and I agree completely with the interpretation the distinguished Senator from Montana has made. I believe he has put the matter into proper perspective.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

#### THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, much has recently been said of the possible dangers to our free institutions from secret societies which take it on themselves to judge the best way to fight communism and to determine what policies the United States is to follow.

A recent comment in the well-known national magazine, the New Yorker, puts this situation in a perspective which I believe to be most helpful, in commenting on the John Birch Society.

I ask unanimous consent that the item from the New Yorker of April 15, 1961, may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From the New Yorker, Apr. 15, 1961]

#### THE TALK OF THE TOWN: NOTES AND COMMENT

The best news we have heard in the last couple of weeks comes from a semisecret organization known as the John Birch So-

cety, which is dedicated to fighting communism. The good news is that the founder and head of the society has discovered each of the following persons to be a Communist agent: Dwight D. Eisenhower, the former President of the United States; Earl Warren, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; the late John Foster Dulles, who was Secretary of State; and Allen W. Dulles, the director of the Central Intelligence Agency. At first glance, admittedly, there is something almost frightening in the thought that so many Communists were able to creep into such high positions in the Government. But upon mature reflection the reader will perceive the heartening side of this disclosure. It proves the Communists to be a piffling sort of menace. With the executive and judicial branches of the Government safely in their hands, they were utterly unable to make their designs effective upon, or even apparent to, the rest of the Nation. So disorganized were they, indeed, that the heads of Communist governments abroad obviously never were informed that America was under Soviet control, and often spoke very harshly, and by name, of their American agents. The conclusion seems inescapable that America is able to absorb any number of such conspirators with no ill effects whatever.

Grateful as we are to the John Birch people for so encouraging a revelation, we nevertheless look upon the group, with some irritation, as an upstart in the field. As it happens, we are a member of a sort of semisecret organization ourselves—one that has been in continuous existence for nearly two hundred years. To be sure, its attention has not been wholly fastened on fighting Communism, but it has done quite a lot of good work, in its way. There are some who believe that this organization, whose members have infiltrated every craft and profession, deserves much of the credit for America's enjoyment of the oldest unaltered system of government in the world. The membership is impressively large, and, unlike that of the Communist Party or the John Birch Society, it is not composed of secret cells. In fact, the only real secrecy concerns the election of officers, which is performed in jealously guarded privacy. The rules of membership are few and basic, but upon many matters there is an unspoken consensus. It is generally considered bad form, for instance, for one member lightly and frivolously to accuse another of treachery—although it has been known to happen. The members receive no gaudy uniforms—not even so much as an armband—but each does receive a title. It is not an imposing title, we suppose, but it makes up in homely dignity whatever it may lack in romance, and to some members, at least, it has a certain glamour of its own. The title, dear John Birch Society, is Citizen.

#### MEDICAL CARE PROGRAMS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in all the action I have taken on health care insurance for the aged, I have placed substantial emphasis on the fact that an adequate program to meet the needs of our senior citizens should give top priority to preventive medical care, rather than hospitalization. Medical experts agree that adequate preventive care would lead to sharp reduction in the occurrence of chronic illness and long stays in the hospital. This can best be done by a first cost program, such as I have included in proposed legislation which I and nine of my colleagues introduced earlier this year, which would make physician's care readily available at home or in the office.

This contention is supported by statistics on utilization data in connection with old age assistance health programs, which show that the percentage of eligible persons receiving physicians' care was about six times the number who had to be hospitalized.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, with my remarks, an article entitled, "The Evaluation of Old-Age Assistance Medical Care Programs," written by Dr. S. J. Axelrod and published in the Journal of Public Health.

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

#### THE EVALUATION OF OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE MEDICAL CARE PROGRAMS

(By S. J. Axelrod, M.D., M.P.H., F.A.P.H.A.)

In 1941, Reed and Clark, discussing the need for appraisal of public assistance medical care programs, wrote: "Considering the magnitude of these programs, surprisingly little is known about them."<sup>1</sup> Almost 20 years later, public assistance medical care programs are of even greater magnitude and the same observation can still be made: surprisingly little is known about them.

The growth of these programs can be gauged by expenditures of Federal, State, and local funds for medical care of the needy over the years. In 1939 annual expenditures of such funds were estimated to be about \$50 million. By 1949 this figure had risen to \$125 million. Since then, there has been more than a threefold increase. Currently, medical care expenditures in public assistance programs, including both money payments to recipients to purchase medical care as well as vendor payments, are estimated to be about \$420 million a year.<sup>2</sup> These increases are due in part to rising medical care costs and in part to the more adequate provision of medical care services to recipients of public assistance. Amendments to the Social Security Act in 1950, 1956, and 1958 have encouraged more States to give more medical care to more recipients of public assistance by making possible Federal matching of funds for vendor payments for medical care and by increasing financial participation by the Federal Government in medical care expenditures for recipients of public assistance.

Prior to the 1956 Amendments, which earmarked Federal matching funds for medical care, there were no more than 20 States with relatively comprehensive medical care programs for recipients of public assistance. In the other States the programs were considerably limited in scope, providing, for example, hospital care only, or there were serious limitations in financial support, ranging from monthly maximums on the amount allowed for medical care to no public assistance funds at all for medical care in 16 States.<sup>3</sup> At present, largely as the result of liberalized Federal participation in financing, some medical care is being provided under one or more of the categorical assistance programs in all but two of the 53 States and territories. However, of the States which have recently initiated or expanded their medical care programs, none has a pro-

<sup>1</sup> Reed, I. S., and Clark, D. A. "Appraising Public Medical Services." A. J. P. H., 31:421, May 1941.

<sup>2</sup> Published and unpublished material available in the Bureau of Public Assistance, Social Security Administration, Washington, D.C.

<sup>3</sup> American Public Welfare Association, "Role of the State-Public Assistance Agency in Medical Care." I. General Aspects of Medical Assistance, September 1953.

Mr. CLAPPER. Mr. Secretary, you said you would like to see an additional 15 million acres added to the national parks. First, where would this 15 million acres come from and how would you pay for buying it?

Secretary UDALL. Well some of this land would come from what is now public lands, which would be converted into parks. Some of this land would have to be bought, as we are now proposing that we buy the Cape Cod land, the Point Reyes National Park land, the proposed national park in San Francisco, the Padre Island off the coast of Texas, and other lands of this kind. When you propose buying land east of the Mississippi, it is costly. These are areas we should have set aside a generation ago and we failed to do so and we are paying for it now. The cost, I might say, is going up very rapidly. About every 10 years the cost of these lands that would make good park lands is doubling.

Mr. CLAPPER. I don't believe any President has ever set aside more than about 3½ or 4 million acres during his entire term for national parks. You really believe that it is possible for the Kennedy administration in the next 4 to 8 years to set aside up to 15 million acres?

Secretary UDALL. I think if we could lay out a proper program and aggressively pursue it the way no administration has done recently, I think that we could make that kind of record.

Let me give you an example, here, of what is happening in terms of our National Park System [referring to chart]:

There were 3.5 million acres that came in prior to Teddy Roosevelt's time. During Teddy Roosevelt's administration, 1.5 million acres. Here is Taft, 2 million acres. Woodrow Wilson, the highwater mark, over 5 million acres came in in the National Park System. Harding, very little. Coolidge and Hoover have pretty good records, 3.5 and 3 million. In Franklin Roosevelt's time, 3.5 million acres into the National Park System. But look in the postwar period, during this period of crisis that I am talking about when we refer to a population explosion. In President Truman's administration only 73,000. Under the 8 years of President Eisenhower, 19,000 acres. You can see that in terms of the pressure of people on our remaining park resources, that this is a very serious problem and I think if as a people we determine to make a real record in terms of setting aside public lands for use by all of the people that we can make one of the finest records that has been made and what is more important we can set aside for all future generations a park system that will keep America a spacious land.

Mr. ROLFSON. Mr. Secretary, there are some people who are all for you on this thing, who agree with the urgency and all the rest, but who are nevertheless expressing some concern and even some impatience perhaps that things aren't going fast enough, that perhaps you aren't moving fast enough on it. Certainly Congress is not. For example the wilderness bill that is now in the Interior Committee I understand is in great danger. This would protect some of these wilderness areas from encroachment and from destruction.

What are you doing to help this bill?

Secretary UDALL. Well, I am doing about all I can do. I have testified for it on the Senate side. I am pushing it for every angle. This bill incidentally has had rather rough sledding in Congress. This is the third year that the wilderness bill has been before the Congress. I am hopeful the Senate will act on it and this is one of the bills that, although it doesn't set aside new land, it gives wilderness status to existing public lands and I think this is legislation that our country needs and it would accomplish one of the objectives that I have been talking about here this afternoon.

Mr. ROLFSON. But I understand there are some interests, the lumber interests and the mining interests, for example, who are bringing great pressure to bear on the committee, and there is some prospect that whatever bill does come out would be severely amended and watered down if there is one. Are you—

Secretary UDALL. There has been traditionally, going all the way back to Teddy Roosevelt's time—any time you want to set aside lands for public use there are special interests who oppose it. There are special interests opposing the wilderness bill. I don't think they conceive of it properly. I think this is in the public interest.

But we are going to have to push, we are going to have to drive. But the Secretary of the Interior can't do it, the President can't do it. The President recommended this legislation. We are going to have to have some help from the people too, so I would say that the people out in the country who really believe in this legislation had better begin pushing it because we can't do it all at the Washington end.

Mr. ROLFSON. Mr. Secretary, our guest next week on this program will be the Secretary of Agriculture. There is a long history of struggle between your Department and his over-management of some 180 million acres of forest lands. We hear that this struggle might be revived now. Is this true?

Secretary UDALL. I don't think that it is reviving. It has existed and I think Secretary Freeman and I have the best opportunity that any Secretary of Agriculture and of Interior have had in the last 30 years or so to work out some solutions to partially at least resolve this dispute.

Secretary Freeman and I happen to get along very well. We have had some discussions on this problem. Nothing would please us more, I don't think anything would please the President more, than for Secretary Freeman and I to stop fighting and start doing. I think this is what the President wants and that he is the type of President who we know if we don't solve this problem, he will solve it for us, so I think you can look for some kind of solution emerging from our discussions and I hope Secretary Freeman—I am sure he will—will indicate just as I have today that we are going to try and get agreements where the others have failed.

Mr. ROLFSON. Would you expect the agreements might include putting in your Park Service in the Interior Department some of the lands that are now in the Forest Service in Agriculture?

Secretary UDALL. I personally would hope that this would include a sorting out of lands. After all it is not only a matter of there being some lands that are now in the Forest Service that perhaps should be national parks. We have in our Department some forest lands that perhaps should be in the National Forest System and it is a matter of deciding what the proper use is and proper administration of lands which we have that are already public lands. This has been the dispute and some Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior recently couldn't even discuss this subject without becoming so heated that the discussions were broken off.

Secretary Freeman and I take a different view. As I say, I am hopeful we can resolve some of these disputes.

Mr. CLAPPER. Mr. Secretary, would you favor a separate Department of Natural Resources such as Canada has which would include the public lands and the forests both?

Secretary UDALL. The Canadians interestingly enough have a Department of Agriculture, they have a Department of Forests and they have a Department of Natural Resources.

I think that the Forestry Service, it has been in agriculture for half a century. Although many times in the past it has been discussed, transferring it to the Interior Department and having a Department of Natural Resources, I am not proposing that at the present time. Perhaps it should be done, but I am not urging or suggesting that it be done. We have too many other important problems that should be discussed at the present time. But it does seem to me that the real question is not this question of jurisdiction between Secretaries, the question is, what is good for the country and what will best develop the resources of the country.

This is what we should address ourselves to rather than to personal rivalry of Secretaries in the Cabinet. This is what it has been too often in the past.

Mr. CLAPPER. I would like to ask a question about salt water, Mr. Secretary. On the ninth of March you told a news conference you would have a significant announcement to make on the progress in the program to convert salt water to fresh water. I wonder if you would want to make any announcement on it.

Secretary UDALL. We just about have our program ready to announce. We have had to take a very hard look at it and this has involved getting a scientific panel to look at the program. It has also involved some very tough questions that we have had to try to find the answers to. We hope to have the new direction for our program set out shortly and I am hoping we can make some headway. This is, I think, one of the most challenging problems that this Government faces. I think it is one of the most hopeful areas of activity.

If we can produce a solution to the saline water program, it seems to me this would offer a form of international cooperation for example where we could do far more in terms of prestige than for example adventures in space will do. At least this is my opinion.

Mr. CLAPPER. The President seemed to have the same opinion at his news conference. He said the same thing.

Secretary UDALL. Yes, I believe he does.

Mr. ROLFSON. Mr. Secretary, you Democrats have long criticized the Republicans for a giveaway program of public lands and resources. Have you done anything to reverse this or is there any significant difference in your policy from that of the previous administration?

Secretary UDALL. Well, I think our attitude generally in terms of resources is a more positive one. I think we are going to have more aggressive programs. I think Secretary Seaton in the main reversed the giveaway policies of his predecessor, Secretary McKay. I think there was a very definite giveaway policy in the first 4 years of the Eisenhower administration and I think that Secretary Seaton in the main reversed that policy which was not one of conserving but of giving away resources.

I think in a time like this with our country moving in the direction that it is moving that we have to have conservation policies that are the wisest policies we can devise and we have to push them aggressively and that is what we proposed to do.

Mr. ROLFSON. Can we expect under your administration a new burst of public power programs? For example, may we expect some new TVA's in some of the other great river basins?

Secretary UDALL. Of course many of our river basins have been largely harnessed. I think one area where you can look for activity is for example in the Northwest. The Canadian Treaty, if it is approved, opens up a whole new area of power development. We are looking towards the development of new sources of power, major sources of hydroelectric power in that area, and we are also

1961

began over a year ago and President Eisenhower directed it. And here the actual plan was carried out under a successor administration. I certainly think the attitude of the former President, of Mr. Nixon, of these other people is indicative of the fact that we do stand together as a people and that whether what we did was right or wrong, that there is national unity on questions like these.

Mr. ROLFSON. Most of our information on involvement has come out from officials that won't be quoted. Why isn't our position and our exact stand in this affair publicly proclaimed by the President or someone else in public?

Secretary UDALL. Well, I don't know that in matters of this kind which involve very subtle and delicate questions whether the story probably will ever be told or probably whether any particular person knows the whole story. Certainly in the previous administration when this particular plan was being prepared, no one knew anything about it. There has to be a certain amount of secrecy in it. Obviously our role was a very limited one and I should think because of that reason, certainly any loss of prestige which people are talking about should be a minimum one also.

Mr. CLAPPER. Mr. Secretary, it is possible, isn't it, that a major reorientation is taking place in our international relations, that perhaps we are going from now on to fight the Communists with some of their own methods? Do you think this is possible?

Secretary UDALL. I think certainly the President foreshadowed that in his speech to the newspaper editors last week, yes.

Mr. CLAPPER. Isn't it also possible that the American people—there are some indications that the American people are further ahead of the President than he may think in their desire to take some definite action against this threat?

Secretary UDALL. I think one thing the President has been doing is to try to prepare the American people for this and I think what he was trying to say and did say very eloquently to the American people this past week is that we've got to be ready for new efforts, that we are dealing with very tough people and that we have to be just as tough and determined as they are. And I think the one danger in the past has been a certain complacency by the American people and I think the President is trying to arouse the people out of it, that is what I would say.

Mr. ROLFSON. Do you think he is spelling out specifically enough to the American people what burdens he expects them to bear and what sacrifices to make? We don't really know yet what we are supposed to be prepared for, do we?

Secretary UDALL. Well, I think if you listened carefully you should be aware of some of the things that the President has been trying to point out that we must do and some of the efforts we must make. Certainly in the past 90 days, the first 90 days of the administration, he has stepped up our major programs. We are making a greater effort today. We are trying to prepare for some of these things that we are not prepared for.

I think one of the things we should learn as a result of this recent episode is that we weren't well enough prepared, that our methods and perhaps our determination wasn't strong enough and I certainly do not think that a new administration that is hardly in its seat should be blamed if there was some partial failure in a situation of this kind.

Mr. CLAPPER. Mr. Secretary, is there anything political in the fact that the President has called in former President Eisenhower for talks at Camp David, and former Vice President Nixon? What is the purpose behind this?

Secretary UDALL. I think the purpose of this is national unity. After all President Eisenhower and his Vice President conceived this plan, they started it, they, I suppose, in effect handed it on to the President and I think that probably his feeling is that he should consult with them and let them know what happened and give them the facts as best he knows them and I think it is part of preserving this national unity that is so important at a time like this.

Mr. ROLFSON. Mr. Secretary, a good many Members of Congress who went home for the Easter vacation came back and have since been saying that they found very little enthusiasm for the New Frontier at home and Mr. Nixon, before this consultation, too, of course, said that he found a great deal of support for the President as an individual, but virtually none for the Kennedy program. What are you finding these days?

Secretary UDALL. I think this is a good bit exaggerated. I have been out around the country a good bit myself. I think there is strong support for the President's program. I think there is perhaps a need for people to vocalize it a little more. In fact, I think many of the American people who were the supporters of the President are sort of sitting back and saying, "Well, he is doing so well, let him carry the ball."

I think they are going to have to realize now that it is up to them to pitch in and to help arouse grassroots support for the President's program. But I think the interesting thing is at the same time that the President's program is doing quite well, really.

Mr. ROLFSON. Are you satisfied with the way Congress is handling it, with the speed and all that it is going through?

Secretary UDALL. Congress in some ways could move a little faster, but I think generally speaking when one compares this session of Congress with previous ones that there is a faster pace and that certainly at this stage of the game I feel that the President's program is doing quite well.

Mr. CLAPPER. Mr. Secretary, you have been refreshingly frank in stating several times that you play politics to the hilt, even now as Secretary of the Interior. Some of your Republican critics say that you have been doing this by telling Members of Congress to vote the way the administration wants in order to get certain public works projects through. Is this the way it is done?

Secretary UDALL. In the first place, the statement about playing politics to the hilt was with reference to Mr. HALLOCK.

Mr. CLAPPER. Who also does.

Secretary UDALL. Yes. I do feel and I have always felt as a Congressman—and I am schooled in Capitol Hill politics—that American politics the way both parties traditionally play it is a good thing and I think when one party is in power naturally the members of that party, the Congressmen, the Senators, are going to get a little preferential treatment. It has always been that way. I hope it always is. This is one of the meanings, to me, of the American two-party system. I was perhaps a little franker than I should have been, but I was, I think, recognizing a reality that some politicians like to pretend doesn't exist and that is that there is a little bit of old-fashioned politics and that we play it every day and I make no bones about it and anything I can do to not only help in terms of the bills that I am interested in, out of my Department, that anything I can do to help the President's program, I will do it, providing it is honorable and providing it is proper.

Mr. ROLFSON. We have noticed you involved in a number of these bills and moves that aren't really involved in your Department. What about your own program? It is not going through Congress very fast, is it? The Interior program?

Secretary UDALL. Well, I think our program at this stage of the game is moving about as well as most of them.

Mr. ROLFSON. You have a cut of your budget request in the House.

Secretary UDALL. There was a very modest cut.

Mr. ROLFSON. That doesn't upset you?

Secretary UDALL. No, no, we are not at all disturbed with the cut. In fact we are hoping some of it will be restored. The House traditionally cuts all the budgets. This is traditional. We have several of our main programs that are moving quite well. I think when this session is through that we will have a very good performance in terms of legislative bills enacted.

Mr. CLAPPER. Mr. Secretary, I would like to sit back for a minute here and listen to you expound on something a little bit philosophical. What is this quiet crisis in conservation that you have been talking about?

Secretary UDALL. Well, something has been happening in the United States. Something has been happening to our land and to the relationship of people to land. In this post-war period, for example, we have had a tremendous population explosion. We have had people have much more leisure time. You can travel easier. And this has meant that people, particularly those—and most Americans have some liking for the out of doors—that is, our national parks, our State parks, our outdoor recreation areas have felt a tremendous pressure in recent years. And the crisis is that very little is being done about it. City leaders—at the State level there has been poor leadership. Nationally we have done very little in terms of providing the type of outdoor recreation facilities that are needed for our people, and America traditionally it seems to me has—part of its greatness and part of its grandeur has been that ours has been a spacious land and Americans have always had a great out of doors in which to test their strength and in which to test their understanding of themselves.

I think we are seeing right before our eyes, we are making a decision by default. We are seeing the American Continent change. The bulldozers are advancing and the green face of America is disappearing and I personally think this is a very serious crisis and I am hopeful that this administration can do something about it.

Mr. CLAPPER. One thing you are hopeful of doing from what I have read about your program is to provide park facilities in the East for easterners. For instance the Delaware River projects and so on. Is this a major reorientation toward the East away from the great western parks?

Secretary UDALL. Well, of course many of the great scenic areas are located in the West and inevitably this has meant that most of our parks are in the West.

Nothing would please us more—indeed we are bending our efforts toward that, to have a truly national program. I think one of the symbols of this new approach is the fact that the number one item on our legislative calendar is the Cape Cod Seashore bill. This is an area where there isn't any large tract of land like this land that could be preserved as a part of the National Park System. We hope Congress will act speedily and this bill will become law.

We have other plans for the eastern part of the United States. I think this is where most of the people are and I think this is where most of our money and effort ought to be spent in the next few years because this quiet crisis that I am referring to is more in the East than in the West because we still have a little breathing time, we still have a little room for maneuver left in the western part of the United States. We don't have in the East.



April 27

possible to achieve a more stable and less costly peace in the Far East, I know that the President will leave no stone unturned in his efforts to achieve it.

What applies to Latin America and to southeast Asia and the Far East, applies also to Europe and to Africa. We have been involved deeply in the problems of the former for a long time. In the last year or two we have become involved significantly in the problems of the latter. I shall not, today, go into the details of the situation which confronts us on these continents. Nevertheless, I would point out by way of example that the division of Berlin and Germany has not disappeared with the advent of a new administration. Nor have the weaknesses in NATO dissolved merely because we have installed a new President. Nor have the Eastern European nations yet obtained that degree of national freedom of action which permits a full measure of contact with Western Europe, a condition which must prevail if there is to be a sound peace on that Continent.

I shall not go into detail, either, on the vastly complicated problems of trying to bring control over the weapons of mass destruction and a measure of reduction in the great burden of taxation on our people and all peoples which is entailed in billions upon billions of armaments expenditures. These problems were complex on the day this administration took office. They grow more complex as each day passes without the beginnings of a solution.

As with Latin America and southeast Asia, the President may be expected to bring to bear new ideas on all of these problems of foreign policy which he inherits. Indeed, some ideas already have been initiated. The process of making these ideas effective, however, is, as I have already noted, at best a slow one. After years of close observation, moreover, I am personally persuaded that the machinery of this process within the executive branch of this Government has grown so cumbersome and ineffective that there is grave danger to the principle of responsible leadership by the President. I would hope, therefore, that this administration would proceed promptly to a thorough overhaul of the machinery of intelligence which functions in many departments and agencies in a fashion which deeply influences foreign policy and its conduct.

I would hope, further, that the machinery for the countless secondary decisions of policy through which the President's ideas and primary decisions are evolved would be thoroughly overhauled and streamlined and that the preponderant responsibility in these matters would be lodged where it has not been for many years—in the Office of the Secretary of State.

The difficulties which we face in the world are immense. The responsibility of the President in connection with them are enormous. He carries the ultimate burden for all of us Democrats and Republicans alike. He has a right to expect general support in these matters, a support which must include, may I say, constructive criticism in matters of foreign policy.

I want to say that he has had that kind of support in Congress for the first 3 months that he has been in office. He has had it from Democrats and Republicans alike. I am confident that he has it and will continue to have it from the people of the United States.

*Cuba*  
**SECRETARY UDALL'S COMMENTS  
ON THE ANTI-CASTRO CUBAN  
INVASION**

— Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I was among those who on Sunday watched the ABC television program, "Issues and

Answers," on which the guest was Secretary of the Interior Udall.

I did not get the impression that Secretary Udall, in his remarks on the anti-Castro Cuban invasion, was criticizing either President Eisenhower or Vice President Nixon. On the contrary, in response to persistent questioning, Secretary Udall pointed out that the American people are standing together behind a policy conceived by one administration and carried out by its successor.

There has been some criticism of Secretary Udall. Apparently it comes from those who neither saw the program nor read the transcript. Some criticism comes from those who quote the Washington Post in this way:

Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall said last week's anti-Castro Cuban invasion was conceived a year ago by President Eisenhower and then Vice President Richard M. Nixon. "They started it and handed it over to Mr. Kennedy," Udall said in a television interview.

"Eisenhower directed it," he said. "Another administration carried it out."

I have read the transcript. It shows that Secretary Udall spoke in a context of national unity.

Following is a pertinent answer to Mr. John Rolfson, ABC commentator, who asked:

Do you think that the American people support this kind of an American involvement in an attack on Castro?

Secretary Udall replied:

Well, I don't think there is any question but that they do. The fascinating thing about this particular business is that here was a plan conceived by one Administration—this from all I can find out began over a year ago and President Eisenhower directed it. And here the actual plan was carried out under a successor Administration. I certainly think the attitude of the former President, of Mr. Nixon, of these other people is indicative of the fact that we do stand together as a people and that whether what we did was right or wrong, that there is national unity on questions like these.

Later in the program, Mr. Peter Clapper, ABC Capitol Hill correspondent, asked:

Mr. Secretary, is there anything political in the fact that the President has called in former President Eisenhower for talks at Camp David, and former Vice President Nixon? What is the purpose behind this?

The reply from Secretary Udall:

I think the purpose of this is national unity. After all President Eisenhower and his Vice President conceived this plan, they started it, they, I suppose, in effect handed it on to the President and I think that probably his feeling is that he should consult with them and let them know what happened and give them the facts as best he knows them and I think it is part of preserving this national unity that is so important at a time like this.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the television program, "Issues and Answers," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

**ISSUES AND ANSWERS**

Guest: The Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior.

Panel: John Rolfson, ABC Washington commentator, and Peter Clapper, ABO Capitol Hill correspondent.

The ANNOUNCER. From Washington, D.C., the American Broadcasting Co. brings you "Issues and Answers."

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, what are the issues?

Secretary UDALL. These are times when our strength as a people and our character as a nation are very much on trial. It seems to me as Secretary of Interior and in fact it is my deep conviction that the way in which we use our national resources, the way that we develop these resources, the policies we adopt in treating our land and what comes from it, that these will have much to say about our strength in the future and indeed that our character as a people is related to our relationship with our land.

The ANNOUNCER. You have heard the issues and now for the answers.

Here to explore the issues are Peter Clapper, ABC Capitol Hill correspondent, and John Rolfson, ABC Washington commentator.

To give you the answers, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, former Congressman from Arizona.

Now with the first question for Secretary Udall, Mr. Clapper.

Mr. CLAPPER. Mr. Secretary, you mentioned that our strength as a nation is on trial. In the same line as a member of the Cabinet vitally concerned with the prestige of the Presidency and the administration, what do you think of the President's prestige in view of the Cuban failure?

Secretary UDALL. Well, Mr. Clapper, there is no question at all but that during this episode in the past week America's reputation and prestige have been involved. It does seem to me that since we were involved only peripherally that certainly our country's basic position of strength hasn't been harmed in any way. It would be my hope, however—I think there is a great lesson out of this, and a bitter lesson, too, and that is what the President has been saying since he became President and what he said during the campaign, that there are many tough decisions that face use as a people and that we must in facing these questions be able to muster the best strength our country has and provide the best leadership. I think these points have certainly been underscored in the last few days.

Mr. CLAPPER. I want to give you a chance to comment on Castro's comments of today. He is making a long speech. I don't know whether it is finished yet or not. He says America put its prestige on the line and has lost it.

Secretary UDALL. Of course Castro is probably given more to overstatement than anyone that I know of and I am sure that he is going to have ample time in the future to regret any statements of that kind. But I certainly think one could overstate our role in what happened in the past week. I think it is easy for a person to overstate what America lost if we lost anything. I would hope that what we gain in terms of what we learn out of this would far outweigh anything that we might have lost in terms of prestige at the moment.

Mr. ROLFSON. Well, Mr. Secretary, what about President Kennedy's standing at home? It has been disclosed now that our Government principally through the CIA gave aid and advice and equipment and transportation to the invaders. Do you think that the American people support this kind of an American involvement in an attack on Castro?

Secretary UDALL. Well, I don't think there is any question but that they do. The fascinating thing about this particular business is that here was a plan conceived by one administration—this from all I can find out

office on January 20. But foreign policy does not come to an end with one administration and begin anew with the next. The slate is not wiped clean every 4 years. There is a continuity of the problems which confront the Nation from abroad and a continuity of the responses of our Government to these problems from one administration to another.

This is not to say that a particular administration will not stamp the course of foreign policy with the brand of its own ideas. The process, however, is a slow one. It is slow partly because the problems which we face abroad are not of our exclusive creation and, hence, are not amenable to our exclusive remedies. And, partly, it is slow because the impact of the ideas of a new administration must permeate a large and complex bureaucracy within our own Government before they make themselves felt in action on the problems to which they are directed.

We can grasp the significance of this continuity in foreign policy by reference to recent events in Cuba and in Laos. In the one instance, President Kennedy had urged an alliance for progress of all the American Republics. Within this concept, he presented a broad and cohesive outline for a cooperative advance in the relations of the nations of the Western Hemisphere. The presentation was well-received by other Republics of the Americas. New vistas of common benefit were opened by it.

Nevertheless, within 90 days of the President's taking office we were not yet at the beginning of this peaceful advance but rather face-to-face with a military crisis in Cuba brought about by the launching of an invasion of anti-Castro forces. Instead of being in a position to move forward on a new constructive approach to all of Latin America, the administration was compelled to direct its attention to a critical juncture in our relations with one nation of the region.

This juncture was reached during this administration. But the roads leading to it began many months ago. The juncture represented the culmination of an accumulation of hostility on the part of Cuba to this Nation and an accumulation of our responses to that hostility.

On the other side of the globe, in Laos, something similar has transpired. In fact, this situation had already reached the point of crisis even before the new administration took office. It had reached this stage because in preceding years a peaceful land, once remote from the rest of the world, had been turned into a bone of contention in the larger clash of ideologies and power elsewhere in the world. As a result the people of Laos who until recent years had scarcely ever heard a shot fired in anger found themselves the focal point of steadily converging military forces from outside. Military clashes in Laos which produced the immediate crisis involved but a handful of men. But these clashes opened fissures with large implications for world peace.

The direct involvement of the Soviet Union in Laos as a supplier of military aid to Laotian factions was one factor in producing the crisis and a factor of comparatively recent vintage. But it was preceded by the involvement of the Chinese-supported North Vietnamese Government for a long time in a similar role. The sum total of this outside Communist involvement in the local Laotian situation and its progressive enlargement is not measurable. But our own progressive involvement will give us some insight into the process by which the Laotians were plucked from the obscurity of remote Southeast Asia and steadily moved into a focus of worldwide significance.

When I first visited Laos in 1953, there were only two American junior officials in

the entire country. There was no aid program to speak of and, may I add, no Laotian army to speak of, to aid. But 7 years later, by the time the Laotian crisis broke in full force in the very last days of the Eisenhower administration, there were in Laos hundreds of U.S. officials of several agencies and departments. We had expended hundreds of millions of dollars on aid, largely for military purposes. We had financed the training of thousands of Laotian soldiers. And, finally, our own naval and other forces had converged in the general vicinity of Laos because of the steady advance of Communist-oriented Laotians in the country. This vast commitment of our resources, not unlike that of the Communists, had little to do with either the needs or realities of the situation in Laos. It had much to do with winning hollow propaganda victories in the cold war.

To this situation, too, President Kennedy brought new ideas. In specifics he worked with the United Kingdom and India in an effort to bring about a cease-fire and the neutralization of Laos. In other words, he sought to take Laos out of the cold war. Left to their own devices, the Laotian people would ask for nothing more. From the point of view of the great powers this solution would mark a significant step toward a more rational world situation, one which anyone of them could take in the interests of peace with little, if any, sacrifice of significant national interests.

The initial Soviet reaction to this proposal seemed favorable enough. Nevertheless, in the working out of the details through the existing channels of diplomacy, weeks of delay have ensued.

All the while, professions of the desire for peace in Laos have continued and all the while, the fighting has continued in that country. All the while, the jockeying for some assumed advantage has gone on by much the same responses with which this situation has been dealt for years.

The crises in Laos and Cuba reveal vividly the continuity of both the problems and responses in foreign policy and the difficulties of altering either overnight. Without wishing to downgrade the seriousness of either situation, I must emphasize, however, that they are but a fractional part of a larger picture. Behind Cuba stands the vast panorama of continuing difficulties and a continuing inadequacy of response to them with respect to all of Latin America. Yet this far more significant picture can be overlooked in a fixation on the sensational developments within the troubled island just 90 miles off our shores. We have managed to live with a militantly hostile Cuba for 2 years. I do not believe we could live very well for 2 days with a militantly hostile Latin America.

Yet, what has happened in Cuba under Castro can occur in other Latin American countries. The seed of Castroism is compounded of ruthless totalitarian technique plus messianic indigenous leadership, plus support from outside this hemisphere. It is doubtful that this seed can grow except in the soil of social and economic discontent. Unfortunately such soil covers much of Latin America, from the Caribbean shores down the great spine of the Andes.

It is at least conceivable that this hemisphere can be insulated from a flow from without of material support to totalitarian forces within but the task would be immensely difficult and costly and of only limited efficacy. It is not conceivable, however, that in this day and age of instant and easy communications, this hemisphere can be isolated from the transference of totalitarian techniques from elsewhere. Nor can the appearance of messianic indigenous leadership in Latin American countries be forestalled because what is indigenous to Latin

America is by definition beyond the control of this Nation.

If it is to our interests—and it is—to prevent the spread of a divisive and hostile totalitarianism throughout the hemisphere, there is one point at which a check may be feasible. That point is where a cooperative effort with others renders the soil of the Americas infertile to the seed of totalitarianism before it takes root. And in substance, that is the idea which the President expressed in such comprehensive form a few weeks ago in his speech on an Alliance for Progress in the Western Hemisphere. It is one thing to advance this idea. It is another to bring it to fruition—to promote that economic and social progress which alone promises the removal of the acids of mass discontent from the soil of this hemisphere.

There was much to do with respect to social and economic conditions in Latin America before this administration took office. After the recent developments in Cuba there is still much to do. Time was short when this administration took over. Now it may be even shorter.

If the situation in Latin America is to be altered so that it will no longer provide an incubus for totalitarianism then a great effort must be made along the lines of the alliance for progress proposal which the President has advanced and that effort must begin to take concrete form in the very near future. The effort, moreover, must be a cooperative one because the stake of Latin Americans is far greater and more direct than our own and, in great part, the situation is amenable to change only as Latin Americans are willing to change it. But if they are willing to do what must be done for freedom and progress within their own countries, then the stake of this Nation in the future of this hemisphere is such that we must be prepared to join with them in the effort. I know that the President is so prepared. Are the rest of us also prepared? If we, no less than the Latin Americans, are willing to face the dimensions of the difficulties and act in concert on them, then the President's ideas of an Alliance for Progress can be and will be interpreted into effective action.

Not unlike Cuba, the crisis in Laos is but the visible tip of a vast iceberg involving the mainland of western Asia. It is not only in Laos that the conditions of peace do not yet exist. We may see them, there, now in striking form. But if we look beneath the tip, we will see that the difficulties which confront us, particularly, fork out from Laos into Thailand and even more so into Vietnam. Nor do they end at the sea off southeast Asia. The conditions of peace in any reliable sense do not exist at Formosa or in Korea any more than in Vietnam or Laos. In all of these situations, the new administration begins with what may best be described as the response of the holding action. Such stability as exists in them, in part, is knitted together with huge aid programs of one kind or another, backed with a heavy deployment of our own military forces in the general area.

At best, these situations will remain uncertain for some time to come. At best, the response which we have heretofore given to them will have to be continued for some time to come. It is not yet clear to what extent these situations can be altered in the direction of a more durable and less costly peace by more effective diplomacy but I am confident that the President will not hesitate to bring to bear new ideas to that end. We shall not know the possibilities until ideas have been tested and, I may add, that this testing has already begun in Laos.

It will be a cautious process—this testing—because the President is a prudent man who has uppermost in mind the security of this nation. It will be a slow process for reasons which I have already set forth. But if it is

TABLE C

	Number registered pharmacists engaged as such Jan. 1, 1960 <sup>1</sup>	Number replacements needed annually, 3.5 percent	Potential replacements enrolled in colleges of pharmacy <sup>2</sup>					Number registered pharmacists engaged as such Jan. 1, 1960 <sup>1</sup>	Number replacements needed annually, 3.5 percent	Potential replacements enrolled in colleges of pharmacy <sup>2</sup>			
			For 1960 senior students, fall of 1959 <sup>2</sup>	For 1961 senior students, fall of 1960 <sup>2</sup>	For 1962 junior students, fall of 1960 <sup>2</sup>	For 1963 sophomore students, fall of 1960 <sup>2</sup>				For 1960 senior students, fall of 1959 <sup>2</sup>	For 1961 senior students, fall of 1960 <sup>2</sup>	For 1962 junior students, fall of 1960 <sup>2</sup>	For 1963 sophomore students, fall of 1960 <sup>2</sup>
Alabama.....	1,387	48.5	94	96	143	179	Nevada.....	251	8.8	0	0	0	0
Arizona.....	861	30.1	20	24	27	37	New Jersey.....	3,849	134.7	56	60	63	109
Arkansas.....	884	30.9	21	22	29	31	New Hampshire.....	332	11.6	0	0	0	0
California.....	9,439	330.4	143	225	187	199	New Mexico.....	627	18.4	19	16	18	52
Colorado.....	1,824	63.8	29	23	7	45	New York.....	13,994	489.8	424	493	532	677
Connecticut.....	1,958	68.5	77	74	96	108	North Carolina.....	1,618	56.6	48	48	81	120
Delaware.....	1,533	8.2	0	0	0	0	North Dakota.....	355	12.4	54	55	65	99
District of Columbia.....	2,976	104.2	47	69	86	50	Ohio.....	5,360	194.6	190	207	230	286
Florida.....	2,422	84.8	124	110	126	199	Oklahoma.....	1,658	58.0	76	87	98	137
Georgia.....	437	15.3	40	32	23	40	Oregon.....	1,241	43.4	38	49	40	88
Idaho.....	7,231	253.1	89	90	125	212	Pennsylvania.....	9,400	329.0	334	310	372	424
Illinois.....	2,795	97.8	128	137	152	203	Rhode Island.....	710	24.8	15	15	19	39
Indiana.....	1,697	55.9	109	90	86	126	South Carolina.....	1,008	35.3	51	51	58	118
Iowa.....	1,462	51.2	25	29	24	30	South Dakota.....	480	16.8	43	53	48	68
Kansas.....	1,244	43.5	48	80	20	37	Tennessee.....	2,126	74.4	57	63	90	100
Kentucky.....	2,167	75.8	69	82	117	119	Texas.....	6,663	194.7	140	104	156	321
Louisiana.....	417	14.3	0	0	0	0	Utah.....	617	21.6	47	31	43	44
Maine.....	1,618	56.6	44	35	55	68	Vermont.....	176	6.2	0	0	0	0
Maryland.....	4,400	154.0	170	169	168	240	Virginia.....	1,644	57.5	56	59	75	84
Massachusetts.....	5,650	197.7	220	172	158	220	Washington.....	2,740	95.9	87	37	42	70
Michigan.....	1,886	66.0	24	33	32	39	West Virginia.....	620	21.7	17	20	35	32
Minnesota.....	1,291	45.2	46	47	51	61	Wisconsin.....	2,284	79.9	68	67	82	125
Mississippi.....	3,070	107.4	108	96	112	189	Wyoming.....	278	9.7	28	15	23	30
Missouri.....	407	14.2	25	15	22	20	Total.....	116,707	4,084.7	3,645	3,691	4,091	5,824
Montana.....	920	32.2	49	14	36	54							
Nebraska.....													

<sup>1</sup> Census and license data compilation, NABP proceedings, 1960.

<sup>2</sup> AACF report on enrollment, fall term, 1959.

<sup>3</sup> AACF report on enrollment, fall term, 1960.

Replacements: This tabulation prepared by the National Association of Boards

of Pharmacy, indicates that the number of pharmacy graduates will hardly be enough to meet the replacement needs of the profession this year and next \* \* \* but will be sufficient in 1963. The replacement need figures are based on the assumption that 3.5 percent of all pharmacists die, retire, or leave the profession each year.

**AMENDMENT OF SECTION 314 OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT OF 1944—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL**

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1467) to amend section 314 of the Public Health Service Act of 1944, which I introduced—for myself and other Senators—on March 29, 1961.

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

**AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930, RELATING TO DUTY ON SHRIMPS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL**

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1571) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose a duty on shrimps and to provide for duty-free entry of unprocessed shrimps annually in an amount equal to imports of shrimps in 1960, which I introduced—for myself and other Senators—on April 13, 1961.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL**

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Sen-

ator from Ohio [Mr. Young] and the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] be listed as additional cosponsors of S. 1633, the bill to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, and that at the next printing of the bill, their names be added.

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

**RULES FOR SAFETY PRESCRIBED BY INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL**

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor on S. 1669, a bill to provide that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of certain parts on railroad cars, and to require carriers by railroad to maintain tracks, bridges, roadbed, and permanent structures for the support of way, trackage, and traffic in safe and suitable condition, and for other purposes. This bill was introduced on April 18 by the distinguished Chairman of the Commerce Committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

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

**IMPROVEMENT OF NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL**

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on April 18, 1961, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] introduced S. 1670, to amend the Inter-

state Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, insure protection of the public interest, and for other purposes. On behalf of the Senator from Washington, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] be added as a cosponsor at the next printing of the bill.

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

**CREATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONSUMERS INTERESTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION**

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] may be added as a cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 115) to create the Select Committee on Consumers Interests, submitted by Mrs. NEUBERGER on March 24, 1961.

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

**STANDARDS FOR CERTAIN PARTS ON RAILROAD CARS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL**

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 13, 1961, the names of Senators CARROLL, SMITH of Maine, MOSS, MCCARTHY, NEUBERGER, McNAMARA, MORSE, HART, HUMPHREY, YOUNG of North Dakota, COOPER, BURDICK, McGEE, CHAVEZ, and BIBLE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1669) to provide that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall prescribe rules, stand-

6364

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 27

ards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of certain parts on railroad cars, and to require carriers by railroad to maintain tracks, bridges, roadbed, and permanent structures for the support of way, trackage, and traffic in safe and suitable condition, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON on April 18, 1961.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMERS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 20, 1961, the names of Mr. LONG of Missouri and Mr. CANNON were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1688) to establish a Department of Consumers in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the economic interests of consumers; to coordinate the administration of consumer services by transferring to such Department certain functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, and other agencies; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators) on April 20, 1961.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 24, 1961, the names of Senators LONG of Missouri, THURMOND, SALTONSTALL, and MORSE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1703) to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and other Senators), on April 24, 1961.

#### EMERGENCY LIVESTOCK LOANS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 24, 1961, the names of Senators LONG of Missouri, CHURCH, METCALF, CHAVEZ, HICKEY, JACKSON, RANDOLPH, ENGLE, MAGNUSON, and YARBOROUGH were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1710) to amend the Act of April 6, 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make emergency livestock loans under such act until July 14, 1963, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MOSS on April 24, 1961.

#### NOTICE OF HEARING ON INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION CONVENTION AND RADIO REGULATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to announce that the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold a hearing at 10 o'clock Tuesday morning, May 2, in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, on the International Telecommunication Convention—Executive J—and the Radio Regulations—Executive I. Persons interested in these conventions should contact the Committee clerk.

#### NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

James B. Brennan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin, for a term of 4 years, vice Edward G. Minor;

William J. Andrews, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal, for the northern district of Georgia, for a term of 4 years, vice William C. Littlefield;

Keith Hardie, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. marshal, for the western district of Wisconsin, for a term of 4 years, vice Ray H. Schoonover;

Fred F. Hoh, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal, for the southern district of Ohio, for a term of 4 years, vice Howard C. Botts; and

Peyton Norville, Jr., of Alabama, to be U.S. marshal, for the northern district of Alabama, for a term of 4 years, vice Pervie L. Dodd, retired.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the Committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, May 4, 1961, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Statement by him on the 26th annual convention of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America.

By Mr. CLARK: Article entitled "Human Relations Goes to Washington," written by Senator PHILIP A. HARR and published in the Committee Reporter of March 1961.

By Mr. KEATING: Address on the Electoral College recently delivered by James J. Flynn, chairman of the department of social studies of the Fordham University School of Business.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH: Address entitled "The Nation's Stake in Atomic Power," delivered by Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, at the 1961 convention of the American Public Power Association at San Antonio, Tex., on April 25, 1961.

By Mr. BENNETT: Editorial entitled "How To Catch Pneumonia," published in the Wall Street Journal of April 19, 1961, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

Editorial entitled "When the Poor Support the Rich," published in the Salt Lake Deseret News of April 21, 1961.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER: Editorial entitled "Bye, Bye Blowby," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 22, 1961.

Article entitled "Astor Land," written by Don Carlos Miller and published recently in American Forests magazine.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Editorial entitled "One Hundred Years of the Times," published in the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times of April 22, 1961; letters from President Kennedy, Vice President Johnson, and Governor Rockefeller on same subject.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

Editorial entitled "Freedom Fight Needs Strong Alaska," published in Jessen's Weekly, April 2, 1961.

By Mr. DODD:

Editorial entitled "The Unbalanced View," published in the Pilot, the archdiocesan newspaper of Boston, of recent date.

By Mr. FONG:

Article entitled "U.S. Taxes Cost Us \$230 Million," written by Frank Hewlett and published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of April 21, 1961.

Essay entitled "Jobs for the Handicapped—A Community Challenge," written by Klmo Douglas and winner of first prize in the 1961 essay contest, State of Hawaii.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Article from the Dominion-News, Morgantown, W. Va., April 25, 1961, concerning West Virginia University's rifle team victory in the national intercollegiate team rifle championship competition.

Article from Washington Evening Star, April 27, 1961, "The Rambler Is Taken for a Ride," concerning Roy Swanigan, West Virginia legislator, who has overcome a severe physical handicap.

By Mr. CHURCH:

Article entitled "Stevenson Cutting Large Figure," written by Roscoe Drummond and published in the New York Herald Tribune recently.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Memorandum in Bulletin No. 28 of the Press and Information Office of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Release by Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in regard to research project on air pollution.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Article on Kansas, written by John Bird and published in the Saturday Evening Post.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "Peace Corps Exciting Opportunity for Dedicated, Committed Service," written by J. A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, and published in the CWA News for May 1961.

Article written by Richard T. Greer, Assistant Librarian of the Senate Library, and published in the Catholic Reporter of March 17, 1961.

By Mr. MUNTZ:

Bulletin No. 12 of the Press and Information Office of the Federal Republic of Germany.

#### FOREIGN POLICY AND THE NEW ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a speech I delivered on April 24, before the Duquesne University Law School Alumni Association, at Pittsburgh, Pa. The speech was entitled "Foreign Policy and the New Administration."

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

#### FOREIGN POLICY AND THE NEW ADMINISTRATION

(Speech delivered by Senator MANSFIELD at Duquesne University Law Alumni Banquet, Apr. 24, 1961, Pittsburgh, Pa.)

The responsibility for the conduct of our relations with other nations rests only with the administration in power. The President assumes this responsibility when he takes

April 27

remaining Americans were jeopardized; if Premier Castro were to attack Guantanamo Bay or mount military invasions against his Caribbean neighbors—in such cases the United States would, of course, have to intervene directly, and presumably so would other members of the Organization of American States.

Barring such obviously dangerous, although unlikely, developments the United States should not intervene. Why not? The grave political consequences; the blow to the moral standards and principles by which we live and which are a source of strength in the cold war; the fact that armed intervention without the clearest provocation would reduce our policies to a crude contest in power politics; the loss of needed allies; the perilous international complications—these are the results that would flow from such armed intervention by the United States in Cuba.

Even more basic than our differences in economic system is our philosophic difference with the Communists; we believe in freedom and the rule of law among individuals and among nations. This is the essence of what America stands for in the world, and it is our greatest source of strength. We must preserve it.

#### AN ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MODERN LIBERALISM AND CONSERVATISM IN AMERICAN POLITICS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a week ago last Saturday the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] spoke at Fort Atkinson, Wis., and gave a scholarly and thoughtful analysis of the difference between modern liberalism and conservatism in American politics. It is such an excellent address that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

SPEECH OF SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS, DEMOCRAT, OF UTAH, AT ANNUAL WISCONSIN SECOND DISTRICT DINNER, FORT ATKINSON, SATURDAY, APRIL 15, 1961

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, thank you for your warm welcome to Wisconsin. I return it in kind. All Democrats feel warmly toward Wisconsin these days because we remember it was your fine State which gave Senator Kennedy one of his early primary victories, which started him on the road to the Presidency. And putting Jack Kennedy in the White House will, I am convinced, prove to be one of the great events of our times.

After I had accepted this invitation to speak in the Second Congressional District, I was delighted to learn that I was coming to the heartland of Wisconsin democracy and leadership. I understand the district is not only the home of your distinguished young Congressman, Bob Kastenmeier—who incidentally has become a real influence in the House of Representatives in only one short term, but is also the home of your great Governor, Gaylord Nelson, and of my esteemed Senate colleague, Bill Proxmire, who is showing himself to be cast in the image of Wisconsin's famous Liberal, Bob LaFollette.

Because I am speaking tonight in the shadow of these outstanding Wisconsin Liberals, I have, with some trepidation, chosen as the subject of my talk "The Conscience of a Liberal."

I say "trepidation," because the very word "liberal" is one of the most misunderstood and misused words in our vocabulary to-

day. To some it is synonymous with radical—and to these people a radical in government is one who advocates great and sweeping changes with the least possible delay. The others, the word "liberal" simply means a forward-looking attitude, and a willingness to try new remedies for new or old problems.

Similarly, the word "conservative" has many connotations. It all depends on what you want to conserve. The American Conservative today, by his own admission, wants to return to the forms and usages of the past, even those of the 18th and 19th century. To some this attitude can only be labeled by the word "reactionary."

It is with a clear recognition of this problem of labels—of the fact that the very terms I shall be using are equally as controversial as the ideologies they represent—that I approach this discussion.

The recapitulations which followed the Republican nominating convention last summer, and the Monday-morning quarterbacking which has gone on ever since election day, stirred up a lively discussion of conservatism and liberalism and their impact on the results. That impact, of course, is hard to calculate. The influence of specific issues can be pretty well weighed, partly because the number of people affected by that issue can themselves be counted. But the influence of a philosophy is less tangible.

So it has always been with American politics. Political history in this country has never been shaped by abstract doctrines or theoretical dogmas. Original political theory here, as in the mother country of England, has developed chiefly in time of national trouble when thinking men, seeking to solve urgent problems, have been forced to reexamine basic principles.

For example, when we were hammering out our American democracy, we produced statesmen like Adams, Madison, Hamilton, and Jefferson, who were also political philosophers.

Then, the debate between the North and South in the mid-19th century produced Webster and Calhoun. And the problems of the first half of the 20th century gave us Woodrow Wilson and Robert Taft, two very practical political theorists.

Today, as we try to cope with grave situations both at home and abroad, it has again become evident that we must go back to first principles, and examine the problems of the sixties in the light of today.

Russell Kirk has said that "doubt and violence are the parents of political speculation," while "prescription, legal precedence, and muddling through suffice for ages or nations that experience no serious threat to things established."

"Prescription, legal precedence, and muddling through" have carried us just about as far as they can in today's world, and the time has come for some good, stiff thinking. I welcome, therefore, the upsurge of interest in Conservative and Liberal philosophies which this election, engendered and trust that it has laid the brickwork for a debate on fundamental principles.

My discussion here today of political philosophy is not essentially partisan. Both major political parties have liberals and conservatives in their ranks. Perhaps it would make the choice at the polls easier if all liberals were lumped together in one party and all conservatives amalgamated firmly in the other one. But I doubt that this day will ever dawn. Republican and Democratic Parties are both sturdy institutions which show little interest in being dissected, and reassembled.

One of the best arguments for continued representation of a wide range of political ideologies in each party is that a change of party control doesn't produce revolutionary shifts in policy. One of the major issues in our recent political campaign seemed to

be which party could do the same thing better.

The lack of coherent philosophies and clear-cut party traditions in our two major political parties has produced some very strange political bedfellows. Lincoln, a Republican, made Jefferson his touchstone in the 1850's. Theodore Roosevelt bolted the Republicans as a Progressive and found his inspiration in the Federalists who were Jefferson's opponents.

"This kind of turnabout is traditional American procedure," Cushing Strout observed in the Virginia Quarterly Review in the summer of 1955. "Although it drives the tidy-minded to despair," he continued, "it is powerful testimony to the ingenuity of our political leaders, the vitality of our tradition, and the moderation of our politics."

For the purpose of this discussion, I do not propose to define conservatism and liberalism in neat, one-sentence statements. No dictionary definition could ever be adequate, for one thing, and for another, as I have pointed out, the words mean different things to different people. I shall therefore take the essence of brief statements of faith from two Liberals, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Gov. Adlai Stevenson, and two Conservatives, former President Herbert Hoover and Senator Barry Goldwater.

The statements cover a 25-year period of time. Each spokesman has combined the result of his practical political experience with an awareness of the implications in his own position, and each is an accepted representative of his philosophy.

In his volume "20th Century Political Thought," Joseph S. Roucek says of President Hoover:

"Herbert Hoover speaks for many modern American Conservatives when he identifies the extension of governmental economic controls with the regimentation characteristic of foreign dictatorships, and when he ascribes our high-living standards to the American system of free enterprise he combines almost all of the favorite conservative themes: We must cling to the Bill of Rights; any necessary alterations must be made only by formal constitutional amendment; governments have an insatiable appetite for power; society cannot remain partly regimented and partly free, and even partial regimentation will eventually destroy democracy. To attempt to solve the problem of distribution of a hard-won plenty by restrictions will abolish the plenty."

Moreover, the conduct of business by Government would only give us the least efficiency. President Hoover states: "It would increase rather than decrease abuse and corruption, stifle initiative and invention, undermine the development of leadership, cripple the mental and spiritual energies of our people, extinguish equality of opportunity, and dry up the spirit of liberty and the forces which make progress."

Let us now hear the liberal case as presented by Franklin Roosevelt:

"One great difference which has characterized this division (between the liberal and the conservative groups) has been that the Liberal Party—no matter what its particular name was at the time—believed in the wisdom and efficacy of the will of the great majority of the people, as distinguished from the judgment of a small minority of either education or wealth.

"The other great difference between the two parties has been this: the Liberal Party is a party which believes that, as new conditions and problems arise beyond the power of men and women to meet as individuals, it becomes the duty of the Government itself to find new remedies with which to meet them. The Liberal Party insists that the Government has the definite duty to use all its power and resources to meet new social

1961

managers. But, they must know the truth.

The purpose of the Douglas bill is to bring the true price of credit out from under the disguises and camouflage under which it often hides. Some of these disguises are very interesting—and, I might add, quite misleading.

For example, sometimes the consumer is quoted a price of so many dollars down, and so much more per month. Immediately, the question arises: For how many months? Many advertisements fail to say. There is no statement of the price of credit. The true annual rate, which may vary from as low as 6 percent to more than 100 percent, is never disclosed. The whole truth is not being told.

Another disguise is quoting the price of credit as a monthly rate. The true annual rate is 12 times the monthly rate. A monthly rate of only 5 percent thus turns out to be a true annual rate of 60 percent.

Then, there is the discount disguise. Suppose you borrow \$100, agree to pay it off in monthly installments, and pay the lender \$6 in advance. This looks like a 6-percent loan. Often, it is advertised as such. In fact, however, you have the use of only an average of about \$50 over the course of a full year, because you have paid off half the \$100 in 6 months. The true annual interest rate therefore is nearly double the advertised 6 percent—to be accurate, it is about 11½ percent.

Some of the case histories brought before the Senate committee last year were startling. In one instance, a man purchased an automobile for a listed cash price of \$550. This is what it said at one corner of the bill of sale. In another corner, it stated:

Balance including finance and insurance charges to be paid in 16 payments of \$60.

That comes out to \$960, yet the so-called cash price was \$550.

Almost everyone learned how to compute true annual interest when in either grade school or high school. A study made by the Library of Congress last year indicated that a random sampling of some 20 arithmetic books in current use still teach interest as a simple annual rate. Where the great majority of the American people are familiar with this method of computing interest, it seems difficult to justify the retention of all of the confusing and misleading methods that are currently being used.

The Douglas bill requires that the truth, the understandable truth, be told about the price of credit. Surely, this is most reasonable. I urge Senators to support this measure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] as a coauthor of the Finance Charge Disclosure Act. I am prompted to do so for two reasons:

First. The public, who are the users of credit facilities offered by the various finance companies and institutions, have a right to know, in terms of simple annual interest rates, what they are required to pay for such services. Regrettably, because of the complexity in stating interest rates on a monthly basis and

on unpaid balances, the average borrower or user of credit is completely confused and quite often misled. He often falls into a cleverly camouflaged trap from which, without ruin and degradation, he and his family cannot escape.

Second. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Ohio Senate a bill, which if enacted and signed, would substantially increase the existing legal interest rates that may be charged by small loan companies to a point, I am told, making the rates in Ohio the highest in the Nation. Under the guise of lowering interest rates on the first bracket of loans of \$150 or less, the bill would substantially increase the existing high rates on unpaid balances of larger amounts. As an example, the bill would increase the rates on the amounts in excess of \$300 but less than \$500 from the present 8 percent per annum to 32 percent per annum. This is an increase of 400 percent. The bill also raises the statutory ceiling on small loans to \$2,000.

I am hopeful that the Ohio Legislature will finally defeat the proposal. It has been estimated that if the bill is enacted it will result in draining from \$10 to \$15 million annually from the purchasing power of the citizens of Ohio.

Should the bill be enacted however, and I hope it will not be, the citizens of Ohio should be told in simple language the exact interest rate they will be forced to pay. Mr. President, the Douglas bill will require that and I support it wholeheartedly.

#### CUBAN POLICY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the lead editorial in today's issue of the New York Times was a very wise and thoughtful one on our policy in Cuba. It concerns not only what has happened, but what Senators, Representatives, and the President of the United States should think about in the future. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

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

#### A POLICY ON CUBA

What next in Cuba? The Cuban exiles have been defeated militarily and the United States, which supported them, has suffered a political defeat. However, history is not like a boxing match or a baseball game. It flows like a river. The United States and Cuba are too much intertwined by history, geography, economics and strategy to be separated. Cuba has been caught up in the vast storm of the cold war. All the forces unleashed by the Cuban revolution are still operating.

Therefore, something has to happen, and the instinct is to say: something has to be done. The first thing to recognize is that whatever is done should not be done hastily. There must be no repetition of the incredibly inefficient intelligence analysis of the Cuban situation which preceded last week's fiasco. To those who knew the situation in Cuba and knew the formidable strength of the leaders and their regime, the outcome of such an invasion attempt was inevitable. And even had it succeeded, the CIA concept of putting in a rightwing government that would have been branded as a Yankee creation was dreadfully wrong. It is obvious that the first step must be to reorganize the personnel and methods of the

Federal officials dealing with the Cuban problem today. Any policy, any action to be taken in the future must be based on an accurate assessment of the situation.

There are certain developments that would force the United States to act; and such action would be fully understood by the world at large. If the Russians, for instance, were to set up missile bases or move in with a dangerous degree of military support; if Americans were killed and the lives of the remaining Americans were jeopardized; if Premier Castro were to attack Guantanamo Bay or mount military invasions against his Caribbean neighbors—in such cases the United States would, of course, have to intervene directly, and presumably so would other members of the Organization of American States.

Barring such obviously dangerous, although unlikely, developments the United States should not intervene. Why not? The grave political consequences; the blow to the moral standards and principles by which we live and which are a source of strength in the cold war; the fact that armed intervention without the clearest provocation would reduce our policies to a crude contest in power politics; the loss of needed allies; the perilous international complications—these are the results that would flow from such armed intervention by the United States in Cuba.

Even more basic than our differences in economic system is our philosophic difference with the Communists: we believe in freedom and the rule of law among individuals and among nations. This is the essence of what America stands for in the world, and it is our greatest source of strength. We must preserve it.

The hegemony of the United States in the Western Hemisphere is threatened for the first time in a century. It can only be defended by a positive, creative policy—one that builds. Of course, we are strong enough to crush the Castro regime, but to do so by force would lose us far more than we could gain. It is hard to be patient under such provocation and defeat as we have experienced. Yet it is the mark of true strength to take both defeat and victory in one's stride.

The chief danger to the United States and the rest of Latin America is not Cuba by herself, but Cuba as a possible model for other revolutions, and Cuba as a base for the spread of anti-Yankee or communistic doctrines. How to counter the creeping subversion of the totalitarians is the great problem for the free world, as President Kennedy has recognized. It cannot be done by adopting their methods. That would be to surrender.

Defend the security of the United States. Continue by all legal means to encourage the anti-Batista, anti-Castro Cuban exiles in their determination to establish a free and democratic regime with social justice. They must not be abandoned.

Above all prove, by deeds and not just words, that we are determined to support the demands for social reforms throughout Latin America; that we are not merely anti-Communist; that we will oppose rightwing reactionary military dictatorships as we do leftwing, communistic dictatorships; that we ask partnership and cooperation, not subservience. This is the only kind of intervention that can permanently succeed in Latin America.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to read briefly from that editorial:

There are certain developments that would force the United States to act; and such action would be fully understood by the world at large. If the Russians, for instance, were to set up missile bases or move in with a dangerous degree of military support; if Americans were killed and the lives of the

At the same time, they are apprehensive lest we be connected with any bungling.

Published press reports alone provide a damning indictment of the entanglements, the timing, and the fumbles in the recent invasion of Cuba. Let me cite a few:

First. The Cuban Revolutionary Council was not aware of the time and date of invasion. In fact, the Council's Minister of Defense, Dr. de Varona, was conferring with his Naval staff over invasion plans when he was told the invasion had already taken place.

Second. When Cuban naval officers commanding the landing craft were given their destination once at sea, they nearly mutinied. They knew the troops would be landed in mangrove swamps, waist deep in water.

Third. When they did land, Castro tanks and heavy weapons were waiting—obviously aware of the landing point.

Fourth. An air umbrella which Cuban exile flyers promised the invasion force never materialized because aircraft they anticipated, at the fields where 150 pilots waited, never arrived.

Fifth. Help from the anti-Castro underground in Cuba failed because the underground was crippled badly a whole month earlier. Most of its top leaders, including Gonzales Corzo, the anti-Castro military coordinator for all Cuba, were arrested by Communist secret police during a meeting in Havana March 17. Castro forces also moved rapidly at the time of invasion to round up other underground and sabotage units.

Right now we are having a lot of glorified self-recrimination. I suggest we stop trying to fix any blame. Let us, instead, learn what lessons we can, act swiftly and decisively to prevent any repetitions, and then move ahead in our fight for freedom.

The President has made a commendable beginning by naming Gen. Maxwell Taylor and his small committee to review America's capabilities. The group is small enough to act quickly, and yet represents a divergence of background, which is healthy. Communism has established a strong base in Cuba. So long as Cuba is controlled by a hysterical demagog, it poses a direct threat to our shores. Additionally, it is fast becoming a nesting place for Red spies and firebrands infiltrating throughout Latin America.

Must we wait for all other Latin American nations to awaken to this peril? Or, should we act unilaterally in our own interest? And if so, how? This is one question which this committee and the Nation must resolve shortly. I pray the committee recommendations and the decisions will both be prompt and correct.

For myself, I do not propose the use of American military force in Cuba at this moment. I do propose a continuation of the firmness evidenced after the ill-fated invasion.

I conclude with just one thought. When we speak with strength, we must be prepared to act with strength. When we act with strength, we must act de-

cisively. We must be prepared to commit every resource, if need be, with but one thought—and that is to win.

#### OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, big oil has scored again in this administration by winning conspicuous omission for its fat 27½ percent depletion loop-hole from the President's recent tax message.

This is another reminder to those naive enough to need one that the one big private interest that can throw its weight around in this administration is oil.

Oil has become the special interest Achilles' heel of an administration that otherwise has a splendid public interest record.

Undoubtedly, the most notorious loop-hole in our Federal tax structure is the provision that singles out oil for a fat 27½ percent of gross income exclusion from income taxes on grounds of depletion. Most minerals enjoy only a 15 percent depletion allowance at most. Recommendations to bring oil down to this more moderate level would restore hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue to the Treasury.

For years this special consideration for oil has been the target of those who have sought greater equity in the tax structure. The administration has just made a series of far-reaching recommendations that have as their express purpose greater tax equity. But was the oil depletion allowance included? No. Dividends, foreign earnings, and expense accounts are hit hard and directly. But oil continues its political charmed life and escapes once again. In fact, oil depletion is the one ripe and obvious tax loop-hole to escape the President's recommendation.

Unfortunately, this exception for oil is becoming a steady pattern. The administration's nominations for top office were excellent, public-interest selections—with a single exception. Big oil succeeded in placing their men in the two critical positions in our Government that can benefit the industry.

The nomination of oilman John Connally as Secretary of the Navy has placed an executor of the will of one of the richest oil fortunes in the world as the man who will buy the oil for all the Armed Forces and who determines the Navy's critical research program in oil's dangerous competitive fuel—atomic energy.

The nomination of John Kelly as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Minerals was even more incredible. It has placed a man who still holds millions in oil interests at the head of the Oil Import Administration, the Office of Oil and Gas, and virtually every significant program of the Federal Government affecting the industry.

Consider that the oil-gas industry alone of all American industries has won such control over the body that regulates it—the Federal Power Commission—that for years the FPC has refused to follow the direct order of the Supreme Court to

regulate the price of natural gas at the wellhead, and still does.

Also the oil-gas industry alone enjoys the exceptional privilege of approval of their rate increase requests before the regulatory body considers them. Of course the request may later be denied and refunds required, but meanwhile the public, not the industry, has suffered the full weight of the years of delay now required to complete an FPC hearing.

#### PEACE CORPS ASSISTANCE TO TANGANYIKA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Peace Corps has just announced its first pilot project—it will send 28 American engineers and surveyors to Tanganyika to assist the government of that country in the development of an adequate road system.

While I was on a visit to Africa last year on a study mission with several Members of the Senate, we stopped in Tanganyika. It is a new country. Like the United States did in its early stages, Tanganyika needs a system of feeder roads running into the interior of the country to enable the small farmer and rancher to bring his produce and his herds to the main market centers.

Those roads do not exist now. Construction cannot proceed until critical surveys have been made.

Sir Ernest Vasey, Minister of Finance for Tanganyika, has pointed out that the government can only train two land surveyors in the next 5 years. They will be hopelessly inadequate, he explained, for the basic planning needed in many of the road development schemes.

The request for 20 surveyors, 4 geologists, and 4 civil engineers came direct from the Government of Tanganyika. I think it is indicative of the kind of response the Peace Corps has invoked in newly developing regions of the world.

Peace Corpsmen who go to Tanganyika will not be advisers, working at a high level. They will be doers—they will be working on the job, actually doing the surveying in the interior of the country.

But they will also be teachers. The Government of Tanganyika will assign young Tanganyikans to each Peace Corps team to learn methods of surveying. When the Americans return home, they will leave behind a cadre of local people who will be able to carry on the work.

Mr. President, this is the kind of hard-headed, realistic approach which is urgently needed in tackling barriers to development in new countries. It is assistance, but it is more than assistance—it is cooperation and education and concrete progress all rolled into one project.

Most importantly, it is on the people-to-people level that will give Tanganyikans the opportunity to learn from, and to share with, Americans who are vitally interested in them and who will represent the very best our country can produce.

The eyes of our Nation, and of the world, will be on the 28 Americans who are selected for this project.

while at the same time reducing defense expenditures below the levels that would otherwise be faced.

Over the years, we will continue to make major changes in the pattern of defense spending. We cannot afford to modify these decisions to accommodate local or private interests, no matter how legitimate. But we have an obligation to take steps to mitigate their consequences for the people affected.

At this point I want to mention two common assumptions which are, in my judgment wholly fallacious.

First is the assumption that our economy is not strong enough to maintain large defense expenditures over a protracted period. I have no doubt that, if required, we can continue to sustain defense expenditures at their present levels, or, indeed, at increased levels, if this should be necessary. We can and must expend whatever is needed to protect the lives and substance of our people.

Second is the assumption that our economy is dependent upon large defense expenditures. I am equally certain that this assumption is false. We all earnestly hope that the day will come when we can substantially reduce the portion of our national wealth devoted to the production of instruments of war. I am confident that when that day arrives, far-sighted planning will permit that portion of our wealth now committed to national defense to be shifted to the improvement of the well-being of our people without serious disturbance of our economic life.

The future is, of course, uncertain. But of one thing I am sure—whatever the future may bring, our economy is strong and resilient enough to meet any challenge that may arise.

Defense spending represents more than one-half of the Federal budget, and nearly 10 percent of the gross national product. Aside from the 2½ million men in uniform and the more than 1 million civilian employees of the Department, there are 3 to 4 million people in the United States who support themselves and their dependents on the paychecks of private defense contractors.

The scale of defense spending is multiplied in importance by the shifts in where and how the money is spent.

As one weapons system is phased out and another one developed, defense business moves not only from one contractor to another, but from industry to industry and from State to State.

The shift from manned bombers to missiles has meant that an increasing volume of defense production has been moving to the electronics industry and away from the old aircraft plants. Similarly, although we are accelerating the procurement of Polaris submarines and increasing the share of the defense dollars being allotted to shipbuilding, a major part of that work is going outside the shipyard into nuclear power plants and electronics companies.

These specific shifts in our defense plans, however, tend to obscure an even more important development—the rate at which shifts in defense planning are increasing, both in size and frequency.

The rate of change is largely a function of our rapidly advancing technology and the growing uncertainty about what research and development will produce. The uncertainties that surround all of us are compounded for the defense planners by uncertainties about how the technology of our potential enemies may develop—and indeed, about how it has already developed. We must try to match our defense systems still in the development stage to enemy missile systems on the drawing board.

As our choices become more complex, their consequences extend farther and farther into the web of our economy. The shift from the longbow to the crossbow involved only the prime contractors. In the typical

weapons system today, there may be as many as six or eight layers of subcontractors.

The difficulties of rational planning are enormous. But we must meet them with a corresponding effort. There are a number of steps we can take, some of them within the Department of Defense, and some of them involving the country as a whole.

Within the Department, our planning must extend further into the future in order to provide a leadtime sufficient to permit adjustment to the future consequences of present decisions. Our choice of weapons must reflect the most imaginative exploration of all the choices available to us. Our budgeting procedures must be revised to show us all the costs of alternative weapons systems, not only for research and development, and for initial construction, but for operation and maintenance as well.

We must be bold enough to grasp distant opportunities, but we must be prudent enough to hedge our bets. Where we can, with reasonable assurance of success, buy time by committing ourselves now to long-lead items, or to production facilities, we must do so. We are proposing to contract now for facilities to double our Minuteman production capacity, thereby providing insurance against a future requirement.

This kind of planning will enable us to predict a little better the pattern of defense spending, but it will not avoid shifts in the spending pattern. The purpose of our planning is not to produce a Maginot Line, even in outer space. It is rather to maintain the kind of alert, flexible posture that can respond immediately to new developments in technology at home, or to new insights into the plans and capabilities of our potential enemies abroad.

We can continue to expect, therefore, that there will be major shifts in our defense program from year to year, and perhaps more often. Indeed, I think there would be real cause for concern on your part if you saw that our defense program over the next 4 years was following precisely the pattern that has just been set for it.

Given the inevitability of frequent and major changes, our defense planning must extend beyond the Defense Establishment, to help the American economy absorb the impact of these changes without breaking stride. All the major problems that challenge the flexibility and resiliency of the total economy find a focus in defense contracting—automation, rapid shifts in demand, jurisdictional conflicts between craft and industrial unions, and the like.

We, in the Department of Defense, have already taken the first step in the direction of a working partnership with other agencies of government and with private groups to attack this congerle of problems. It has traditionally been the policy of the Department of Defense not to begin planning for shifts in resources within the United States, base closings, plant sales, and the like, until the last possible moment before the change is actually due to take place.

The basis of the previous policy has been the fear that decisions taken upon sound military grounds may be upset by the pressures of local and private interests. I expect to make it clear that our decisions, once taken, will not be subject to reversal, except for changes in the facts on which they were based originally.

Once our position has been made clear, however, I anticipate that we and the communities affected by these decisions will join together to use the time between the announcement and the action to develop plans to reduce the impact of the change.

We have organized a special unit just for this purpose in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Installations and Logistics. This unit will not only draw on the resources of the Department of Defense; it will seek help for those affected from the Departments

of Labor and Commerce, the General Services Administration, the Civil Service Commission, and the Small Business Administration.

The help that we can offer includes finding jobs for displaced Government employees in other installations, arranging for surveys of business opportunities in communities that are losing payrolls, and providing a variety of technical services.

But more important than any of these is the encouragement we can give these communities to help themselves, not only by advance planning, but simply by spreading accurate, advance information to everyone concerned, spiking rumors and deflating exaggerations.

Any decision that comes out of Washington and falls on a particular community a long way off, is likely to be frightening until it is explained and understood. We propose to take enough time to try to explain it. With your help, I think we cannot only explain the move but develop an orderly adjustment to it.

If change is the law of the universe, it is a law enforced with particular stringency in military planning. The penalties for failure to observe it are unavoidable and harsh. The President's defense program is designed to improve the capacity of the military establishment to adjust to changing military needs. It is also designed to reduce the impact of these changes on the economy as a whole.

#### *Cuba* SPECIAL REPORT ON CUBA

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have received so much mail, so many questions have been asked, so many suggestions on the Cuban situation have been made, that I feel it is proper for me to make some remarks at this time.

The gravity and importance of what I want to say is such that I want to be absolutely certain of two things:

First, that I cover a number of points in as short a time as possible.

Second, that the language I use is carefully considered so it will not be misconstrued.

I cannot say too strongly or too often that the American people must and will unite behind any action necessary to preserve our freedoms—and to help others preserve theirs. There is no time or place for partisanship. This is a time of national emergency. From all reports, the American people are far ahead of many in Washington in realizing that we are at war with communism. This war, hot or cold, shooting or silent, at home or in far off lands, has taken and will continue to take many strange forms. It is truly total war. Economics, propaganda, politics, and diplomacy are just as important tools of this total war as armed might, which is becoming more and more of a last resort.

We traditionally abhor the use of armed might. We do not like to extend our influence through a gun barrel. But, we also ascribe to the slogan "Don't tread on me," and the American people are sick and tired of being made to look ridiculous by a bearded fanatic who has created a Communist stronghold just 90 miles from our backyards.

In short, the American people are ready to accept constructive and forceful leadership. They are prepared not only for strong words, but for strong deeds if they too are required.



## The Agricultural Situation Is a Many-Sided Thing

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 26, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the urgent need for enactment of long-range and forward-looking farm legislation was emphasized by Agricultural Secretary Orville Freeman when he testified before the House Agricultural Committee April 24 on the proposed Agricultural Act of 1961. He cited the current technological explosion in agriculture and the magnitude of the storage problem as two of the reasons why this bill should be enacted into law as soon as possible. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include this portion of his testimony in the RECORD:

#### TECHNOLOGICAL EXPLOSION HAS INTENSIFIED THE FARM PROBLEM

#### THE URGENCY OF THIS LEGISLATION IS FURTHER EMPHASIZED BY THE CURRENT TECHNOLOGICAL EXPLOSION IN AGRICULTURE

The magnitude of the technological revolution in agriculture is too little recognized, and its consequences—in the present and in the future—are not sufficiently realized or understood.

Agricultural efficiency and productivity have advanced so rapidly during the past decade that agriculture has tripled its output per hour of labor while industry's output has only doubled. Output in agriculture increased much more rapidly than the commercial market increased. During the 1950's farm output increased by 28 percent while population increased only 19 percent. Since the domestic demand for food is tied closely to population changes this means that supplies have outrun demand. Supplies have pressed against population needs in the United States and given rise to a constant downward pressure on farm prices. This increase in output has been accomplished with the use of only 2 percent more sources than were used 10 years ago. The composition of these resources has changed sharply, with about one-third less labor and 80 percent less cropland. But the use of machinery, fertilizers, pesticides, and other purchased inputs has risen sharply. Overall efficiency, in terms of output per unit of input has gone up by 25 percent. These changes in resource needs have had a sharp impact on declining farm employment, increased capital requirements, and the decreasing opportunity for young people to enter farming.

This technological revolution in agriculture has only just begun. Only a few of our farmers are using all of the new technology to the best advantage. Economists at the Department of Agriculture recently estimated that a population of 230 million people in 1975 could be provided better diets, and our export markets readily satisfied, from a crop acreage no larger than that used just prior to the start of the Conservation Reserve program, simply by using presently-known methods of production on best farms. If all farm production in 1975 were to be carried on with only the best techniques in use in the late 1950's, not all the cropland acreage now in use would be needed for food and fiber production.

It breaks down to this: If American farmers are given some assurance of relatively favorable prices and incomes in the 1960's, and if we provide a sound program for adjusting our production to that which can be used, we will have a highly productive and flexible agricultural plant—one capable of responding to any foreseeable food production emergency. This is the kind of an agriculture we want.

But, in the absence of such a program, results could be disastrous. What are the potential consequences?

Farmers could, in the absence of such a program, use their productive capacity indiscriminately. In that event, if support programs were continued, the burden on the Federal budget would become intolerable, and the stockpiles of surplus completely unmanageable. Or—and more likely—the public would refuse to continue such supports, and prices and incomes would be driven down so low that results could be catastrophic. Millions of farmers, their incomes depressed below subsistence level, would swell the ranks of the unemployed, would crowd already crowded areas of our cities, seeking jobs. And many of them would be neither trained for jobs or adjusted to city life. The economic problem would be complicated by the social problem.

This is not all. I should like to point out here how such a development would in the end be likely to add higher consumer food prices to its unfortunate results. Further decline in income for the family farm could lead to a corporate type agriculture controlled by outside capital. Hired labor would increasingly replace work done by the farm operator, and the costs of management, supervision and labor would go up. For one of the major reasons why the American family farm has become the most efficient agricultural producer in history is that the owner-operator is on hand, to do the work and to supervise the work. Neither collective farms nor large corporate landowners are able to match the efficiency that results.

If low incomes squeeze out all but a few corporate-type farms, there would doubtless result the kind of supply control that would result in high prices, without regard for the public interest, or the consumer interest, or interest in our programs to expand the use of food abroad in the interest of peace and economic progress.

We deplore the collectivization of farms in a part of the world, and we would encourage land reform in those other areas where huge landholdings have—like the Communist collective farms—proved so inferior to our family farm economy. How ironic it would be if we allowed that family farm economy, that has proved its superiority socially as well as economically, to be destroyed for want of the tools it needs to meet conditions of today.

The family farm in this Nation has reached a pinnacle of success in its primary function, the production of an abundance of food and fiber to meet human needs. It has made this abundance available to the consumers of this nation at a lower real cost than ever before in history. The consumer now spends about 20 percent of his disposable personal income for food, as compared with more than a fourth in 1947. The consumer in America works fewer hours to feed himself and his family than in any other country. The American public should pay tribute to the farmer for his contribution to our standard of living. Even Khrushchev pays that tribute. A little over a week ago he was quoted as saying that the Soviet triumph in space "must not detract the attention of the Soviet people from other targets, and these include catching up with the United States in the standard of living."

To insure our continued superiority in this field in which we have unquestioned leader-

ship, we propose a program that will end the current paradox in which productive success has led to economic distress. This happens, in a large measure, because of the inelasticity of the human stomach, hence the inelasticity of the demand for food. A little too much in the way of food supplies leads to dramatic farm price declines—hence to a farm income problem. And a little too little in the way of food supplies leads to skyrocketing food prices and a real income squeeze on consumers—this is the food problem so often encountered in wartime.

In fact, paradoxical as it may seem, these gyrations and this instability can hurt both producer and consumer at the same time. The instability adds to the risk of farming, and risk always increases costs. And the uncertainties of economic ups and downs make for an inefficient use of the productive plant the farmer has, and which he must maintain whether prices are good or bad. This, too, increases costs.

This leads to my final point with regard to the technological explosion and its effect on both farmer and consumer. Only if we put into effect a program that succeeds in adjusting production to that which we can use and that at the same time provides a fair income for the farmer, only if we thus promote economic and price stability in agriculture, only then can continued technological improvements in production be expected to result in an eventual lowering of prices to consumers while maintaining farm incomes. Without such a program the farmer must pay the cost of risk, and of inefficient use of his productive plant, as I have described. Without it he must maintain greater financial liquidity than would otherwise be the case; he must pay more for credit; he is forced to use older and less efficient methods than he would otherwise use.

Supply adjustment programs that serve to reduce and minimize the extreme and uncertain price fluctuations in agriculture would reduce the costs borne by the farmer. They would mean a gain in production efficiency, and this in time would mean a reduction of the per unit cost of production. This would really set the stage for both the maintenance of farm incomes and an eventual orderly lowering of prices to consumers, consistent with the march of technological advance.

The urgency of this legislation is demanded by the magnitude of the storage problem.

The cost of the storage is so great that we cannot expect it to be long continued. This is an immediate and pressing burden. Eight years ago, agriculture's house was in order. Commodity carryovers were at reasonable levels. Producers had no burdensome surpluses hanging over their heads.

These were the quantities, held in public and private hands, of principal crops carried over into the marketing year of 1952-53:

Feed grains: 20.1 million tons which was 18 percent of the amount used in that year.

Wheat: 256 million bushels, or 26 percent of the amount used in that year.

Cotton: 2.8 million bales, or 22 percent of the amount used in that year.

The coming marketing year confronts us with a different picture:

Feed grain stocks will be around 84 million tons, or half of a year's needs. Over 85 percent will be Government owned or under CCC loans.

Wheat stocks next July 1 will amount to about 1½ billion bushels, or more than a year's expected domestic and export needs. About 90 percent will be under CCC loan or in CCC inventory. Cotton stocks, at 7½ million bales, largely in private hands, will be down

sharply from recent highs, but almost 3 times as large as in 1952.

The growth of feed grain and wheat stocks did not occur overnight.

Feed grain stocks have increased in every year since 1952, as a result of excessive production. Wheat stocks have increased in 6 years out of 9.

How can we convey the magnitude of the storage problem?

Taxpayers should know that Government costs of carrying and handling commodity stocks have risen from \$238 million in fiscal 1953 to \$1 billion in the current fiscal year. These costs include storage, transportation, and interest. The CCC investment in price support at the end of this fiscal year will be about \$8.5 billion. Wheat and feed grains will account for 87 percent of this.

We must face the problem of working down these large stocks. As long as they exist, they pose a threat to markets and to price stability that extends beyond these commodities to the livestock industry.

We cannot reduce stocks as long as the supplies that come out of inventories are more than replaced from excess current production. Each recent year has added an average of 7 million tons of feed grains to stocks. Annual additions of wheat have been about 130 million bushels. We cannot expect to reduce CCC inventories until we have the legislation and programs that will effectively adjust production below total annual needs. This is a major goal of legislation here proposed.

*Cuba*  
**More About the CIA From the Press**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the New York Post for Tuesday, April 25, 1961, by the able Washington columnist, Mr. William V. Shannon. I am bringing this item to the attention of my colleagues in another effort to point out that we are getting our information on this super secret organization only from the press. From the press we learn of the ineptness of the CIA in the Cuban invasion. We were given no advance notice that our Government was involved in the plan. Mr. Shannon's article again points up the need for this body to exercise some direct control over what has become something of an autonomy—an overseer of our foreign policy—inside the executive branch:

**CIA KEPT ITS SECRET—EVEN FROM THE REBELS**

(By William V. Shannon)

WASHINGTON, April 25.—The strange story of how the Central Intelligence Agency mismanaged last week's misadventure in Cuba can now be pieced.

According to information from exile Cuban sources which has been reluctantly confirmed by Administration officials, the leaders of the Cuban Revolutionary Council had no part in directing the actual military operation and no opportunity to coordinate with the Cuban underground.

The CIA held the six leading members of the Council incommunicado near an abandoned airfield somewhere in Florida while the "invasion" was underway. They were not permitted to join the rebel forces or speak in their own name. Statements were issued in their behalf of which they had no knowledge.

Only after it was clear the invasion was going to fail were they consulted by top-ranking U.S. officials.

**HELD 3 DAYS**

The story began on Sunday, April 15, when members of the revolutionary council in New York received word that they should go to Philadelphia. They were then flown from Philadelphia to an abandoned airbase somewhere in Florida. They were quartered in an old, rambling house in a deserted area. Armed guards were posted outside.

Provisional president Jose Miro Cardona, defense minister Antonio de Varona, and Manuel Ray were among the six civilian exile leaders kept incommunicado in this house for the next 3 days.

The reason for holding them in this fashion was apparently a desire on the part of U.S. intelligence officials to maintain tight security.

**OFF GUARD**

The Cuban exile leaders first heard of the invasion from radio news bulletins on Monday. The timing of the operation caught at least some of them off guard. It provided no opportunity to work out plans with the underground inside Cuba to set off sabotage and diversionary incidents. The coordinator of the Cuban underground had a few days earlier journeyed from the island to Miami in order to make such plans. The invasion caught him flatfooted and as a result, there was no sabotage or uprising. Some of the Cuban exiles blame the CIA for this failure. The CIA explanation is that it did not wholly trust the underground and chose not to rely upon it.

On Tuesday, the exile leaders were briefed on the military situation in Cuba by a U.S. Army colonel. They grew restive, clamored for more information, and demanded to be allowed to confer with their supporters.

At 1 a.m. Wednesday morning, Adolph A. Berle, coordinator of the State Department task force on Latin America, was routed from his bed in Washington by an urgent call from the White House and directed to fly to Florida. He was told the invasion seemed definitely to have failed. He arrived at the guarded house in Florida shortly after daybreak and spent the morning canvassing the situation with the Cuban exiles.

**COMPLETE DISASTER**

That afternoon, he flew with them back to Washington where the group met twice, once in the late afternoon and again early in the evening, with President Kennedy. The President meanwhile was working between conference on an entirely new draft of the speech he made the next day to the American Society of Newspaper editors. After conferring briefly with him a third time the next morning, the Cuban exiles were released from the CIA's protective custody and allowed to go their own ways.

The only member of the revolutionary council to participate in the invasion was Capt. Manuel Artime, the youthful ex-Castro follower whom the CIA had developed as a protege. He broadcast appeals to the Cubans to overthrow Castro, speaking from a ship off shore. This ship was subsequently sunk by Castro's planes and Artime's whereabouts are now unknown.

The landing itself was apparently a disaster from first to last. There was only one landing, not several. It took place on a mile-long strip of the coast of Cochinas Bay.

Three roads lead inland but Castro's forces succeeded in blocking them all. The United States provided air cover against the attacks by propeller planes, not jets, used by Castro's air force. The rebels captured an airstrip near the coast, but the plan to use it to bring in supplies went wrong because Castro's men had rendered the strip useless by heaping mounds of gravel on the runway.

About 1,200 or 1,300 men were landed. More than one-third were captured by Castro's troops and most of the rest were killed. Castro's forces apparently did not fight with any great distinction but they had so many natural advantages of position and terrain they were able to crush the landings in less than 3 days. Very few, if any rebels made their escape to the Escambray Mountains.

**FOUR BIG MISTAKES**

The CIA is known sarcastically in Miami as the Cuban Invasion Authority. The more liberal wing of the Cuban exile movement is convinced the disaster took place because the CIA overestimated Castro's weakness, refused to cooperate wholeheartedly with the underground, put too much reliance on sheer military force—and they did not provide enough of that.

The Cuban exiles believe that the CIA's treatment of them during the invasion as so many puppets was the natural outcome of this basically contemptuous, paternalistic approach. U.S. officials deny that all of the Cuban complaints are justified but they concede that the CIA's attitude contributed heavily to the making of the fiasco.

**Controversial Committee**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. CLYDE DOYLE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on Wednesday, March 1, 1961, entitled "Controversial Committee":

**CONTROVERSIAL COMMITTEE**

The life of the House Un-American Activities Committee continues to be a stormy one. Riots have attended some of its hearings and new efforts have been launched in Congress to curb it. Yet a great many Americans feel its work is necessary to keep the Nation alert as to Communist infiltration. And the Supreme Court, in a narrowly split decision, has just upheld all terms for two witnesses who refused to answer the committee's questions.

The chief significance of these cases is their confirmation of the Barenblatt decision in 1959. That ruling signaled a halt to the Court's trend following the McCarthy era. In the Watkins case and some others it had castigated the abuse of investigative committees' power and set up stern limits. But then in the Barenblatt case and now in the Wilkinson and Barden cases, the Court has supported wide authority for such inquiries.

The majority, speaking through Mr. Justice Stewart, specifically declares it is making no judgment as to the wisdom of the creation or continuance of this committee.

Further, he said, Communists should look toward the formation of a super peace organization "possibly of the type of the British Peace Council" which "is linked with peace movements in all other countries through its association with the World Council of Peace." (WPC has been cited as a Communist world front organization.)

An analysis of Gus Hall's lengthy policy statement shows that we can expect these main features of the attack:

They will charge that the system of U.S. overseas bases is "needless and useless for the defense of the United States and a waste of the taxpayers money."

They will praise the policy of peaceful coexistence, and propose plans "for the use of the billions being squandered on arms for houses, hospitals, schools, roads, and other social service and social welfare needs."

They will demand universal disarmament as a panacea to end the threat of war. And they will continue a day-to-day harassment of the "big brass" for stepping up the armaments race and for "provocative warlike moves" in regard to Cuba and other countries.

Above all they will carry on a running attack, charging that the "monopolies, the Pentagon, and their political henchmen are sacrificing the national interest, hurting our national prestige, degrading our democratic heritage, undermining the security and liberty of every American, and jeopardizing the very existence of the American people."

While this is going on inside the United States, similar campaigns will be launched in other countries of the free world. For this drive is worldwide. It is based upon an agreement made by 81 of the world's 87 Communist Parties in Moscow last fall, an agreement which Gus Hall quoted as his guide in launching such activities here.

Communists obviously are aiming to whip up public mob hysteria against the U.S. defense establishment both here and abroad, thus gain their real goals of weakening U.S. ability to defend herself and her allies against the rising tide of Communist "peaceful" aggression.

What can be done? Counteraction must take into account the fact that the vast majority of people in peace groups think of themselves as non-Communists and even as being opposed to Communist tyranny.

For this reason, counteraction must avoid attacks against individuals, and must avoid any blanket statements about a particular peace group or about the peace movement in general.

What veterans can do, however, is to inform fellow citizens in peace groups, in unions, in fraternal, women's and youth groups correctly and repeatedly on issues of vital importance to our national security.

All of the people in peace groups which Communist hope to exploit for their own ends must be made aware how Communists are working to use their idealistic views to speed the destruction of free institutions and the means to defend them.

Only by a constant flow of information on the role of the defense establishment in defending free institutions and in furthering man's hope to live in a world at peace can Communist agitation be counteracted and defeated.

What Communists are trying to do, in effect, is to use a chain forged in Moscow to harness American peace groups to haul the Communist chariot ahead. You have it in your power to break that chain.

#### HOW REDS ARE MOVING IN LATIN AMERICA

In an unimpressive building in Mexico City on March 5, Red Chinese Delegate Chou Erh-fu wound up a ringing speech that had been punctuated by shouted slogans of, "Long Live China" and "Long Live Mao Tse-tung."

The audience was made up mostly of Latin Americans, including a large delegation from Fidel Castro's Cuba, attending the Latin American Conference for National Sovereignty, Economic Emancipation and Peace.

The conference was called by former Mexican President Lazaro Cardenas, a 1959 visitor to Peiping and a top member of the Executive Bureau of the World Peace Council which is run by the Chinese and Soviet Communists.

As was expected, the meeting ended with a string of resolutions condemning alleged U.S. aggression in Cuba, seeking repeal of hemisphere treaties for mutual defense and cooperation, opposing U.S. military missions to Latin America, opposing all U.S. aid, and supporting efforts to "liberate" territories held by Western countries in Latin America.

The real importance of the meeting is the fact that it was held in the first place. It was at an Afro-Asian Solidarity Congress in Cairo in December 1957 that campaigns were launched which have brought us the Congo and the turbulence in Africa.

We can expect that the meeting in Mexico City means the launching of an intensified effort by Communists to create chaos in Latin America, to break up the unity of the Western Hemisphere, and to further isolate and weaken the United States.

Action to counter such a Communist campaign can be taken by trade unions, by other private organizations which have regular relationships with friends in Latin America. The most effective action, however, can only be taken through the offices of the U.S. Government.

In the case of Africa there was a time lag of about 2 years between the Afro-Asian Solidarity Congress and the outbreak of chaos. There are some signs in Latin America that we might not have that much time left there in which to act.

### The Dilemma of Business

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the April 3, 1961, issue of the New Republic. Mr. T. K. Quinn here concludes his enlightening discussion of the price-fixing case involving the electrical manufacturing companies. On March 23, 1961, and April 26, 1961, I inserted articles by Mr. Quinn on this same subject. The importance of the matter commends it to our attention:

#### THE DILEMMA OF BUSINESS

The decision, the jail sentences, the fines, and the disillusionment following the electrical machinery price collusion case in Philadelphia could mark the beginning of a new understanding of the economic and political issues involved if the actual conditions are frankly faced. This is much more vital than the passing, publicized settlements and new Federal lawsuits against the price fixers promised by the Attorney General.

We are obliged to begin, as Judge Ganey said in Philadelphia, with the conclusion that the chief officers of 21 corporations had guilty knowledge of "the vast conspiracy."

After all, price control is a common practice in many industries. General Electric, the principal offender, has a long record of antitrust violations dating back 50 years. On an average of once every 2 years for half a century the company has had some governmental action brought against it. The policy of violation is well established. Similar indictments, although not so regular or quite so often, have been brought against such other giants as General Motors, Du Pont, A.T. & T., Westinghouse. There have been a number of convictions despite almost insurmountable obstacles the prosecution must overcome.

The plain fact is that the big corporations are caught in an impossible dilemma. On the one hand, they know from experience that unrestricted price competition is destructive and that if it actually prevailed markets could be disrupted, profits reduced or eliminated, and industrial instability result. They could, of course, crush smaller concerns because of their capital advantages but would in time be themselves broken up. When giants fight there is bloodshed.

Adam Smith is outdated in this modern age largely because fixed overhead has become a principal factor in total cost, and because corporations have swollen so big as to make our whole society dependent upon them. They simply refuse to take price chances wherever they can be avoided, often regardless of the law.

On the other hand, anything less than seemingly enthusiastic support of competition as a constructive force would be inevitably interpreted as an attack against free enterprise, so faithfully advocated and guarded by its honest believers and practitioners as well as by those who, being in positions of capital and market advantage, insist upon the license to charge and do as they please, free from all governmental interference or public controls of any kind, and regardless of inflation or any other harmful effects. What they really want are easy profits, assured, continuing and increasing.

So big business, preaching one thing and practicing its opposite, is obliged to pretend that it favors competition and the antitrust laws while it secretly opposes them, establishes uniform and administered prices, sets up barriers against the entry of new companies into its fields, stalls costly technological innovation and curtails production. Thus, otherwise respectable businessmen—the conforming bureaucrats in big corporations—become the carriers of misrepresentation and falsehoods and degrade themselves. They are victims of a dilemma most of them don't understand.

In about one-third of the national economy—an area that includes automobiles, steel, cigarettes, cement, oil products, chemicals, roofing materials, electric light bulbs and machinery—price competition has been eliminated by mutual understanding, legally or illegally, among the corporations represented. They have taken the position, in practice, that prices should be substantially uniform and profits so made secure.

Now, if the American public is ready to accept this condition then the only remaining question is who should fix the prices and what standards should be adopted. Shall we permit these and other private collusive interests themselves to decide what their "take" is to be? If so, then the laboring man should also be permitted to set his own wages.

Before pursuing this absurdity further, let us quickly say that obviously the public interest must come first, and it becomes the duty and responsibility of the people, acting through government, to set the prices which would otherwise be under private collusive control. The situation is not changed in the least by resorting to name calling—i.e. "socialism." We would simply be recogniz-

offer economic aid to Cuba providing the Government of Cuba will cease its build-up of Soviet armaments in this hemisphere, and

Third. The American people are eager to extend the helping hand of a good neighbor and accept the Cuban people as full partners in the inter-American society of nations, providing the Government of Cuba will stop to serve as a base for Soviet penetration into this hemisphere.

I am suggesting that there is room for exploration of alternative accommodations. I am not suggesting, however, that this Nation can stand quietly by while Cuba builds up a base hostile to our way of life and dedicated to support Soviet Union penetration into this hemisphere. What I am saying is that we should give Castro one more opportunity to demonstrate to the world and to the United States that he is not a tool of Soviet subversion. If he is willing to do this, he has nothing to fear from the United States.

President Kennedy, in his inspirational inaugural address, addressed himself most eloquently to the problem which faces us today. He said:

Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

The question then is, Should we make one more try to find an acceptable rapprochement with Cuba? If we succeed in this try, we will have demonstrated to the world our own greatness and a leadership truly worthy of the New Frontier. If we fail, then we will have shown the world that Castro is, in fact, a madman condemned to his own destruction.

Mr. Speaker, before we support another invasion of Cuba, an invasion which ultimately can be expected to involve our own military forces, let us pause to ponder the words of our great President:

So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.

### Liberalism Is American Tradition

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to insert the following editorial by Mr. C. L. Dancy of the Peoria Journal Star in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LIBERALISM IS AMERICAN TRADITION

(By C. L. Dancy)

Dear anti-Communist friends, Sunday, we urged you not to hunt subversives, since that

is a very difficult task even for professionals and is no place for us amateurs.

Today we'd like to talk about liberals, the people that we believe some of you confuse with the real enemy.

Liberals should not be confused with Communists. (The Reds aren't liberal at all.)

A genuine liberal has a liberal or generous and open-minded approach to all problems. He is opposed to prejudice or discrimination on the basis of race, religion, color, economic status, or social status.

He believes that every person involved in a crime is entitled to the benefit of the doubt until proven guilty by processes assuring him every right and safeguard under our great liberal Constitution. And he further believes that the convicted criminal should be treated with no thought of punishment but in a manner best calculated to salvage and rehabilitate that human being.

These are all noble sentiments.

You have no quarrel with liberals.

However, there are also some mixed up folks who call themselves liberals, usually loudly. And this is where the confusion comes in.

You might say they usually exhibit a violent underdog complex and a "McCarthy syndrome."

These are the folks not satisfied and not emotionally cut out to be liberals, so instead of no prejudice they specialize in reversing the historic prejudices.

They are usually violently prejudiced up the social or economic scale, instead of down. Sometimes, instead of maintaining an absence of prejudice and a liberal view even on matters of race and religion, they develop a passionate prejudice on behalf of minority groups against majorities.

(NOTE.—This is understandable, and in some circumstances commendable, but it certainly is not liberal.)

Finally some of them are so thin-skinned and jittery about their supposed liberal beliefs that they are scared to death they will be linked with Communist philosophies, so they strike out with passion and prejudice at the very idea of people being curious about Communist activities.

They are afraid of where it will lead, and history has given them some cause for this.

That's why they aren't the least bit liberal toward anti-Communists. The word knocks them off balance.

So remember that the liberal tradition is part of America from the days of the Founding Fathers, and is part of the true character of our Nation.

Be liberal yourselves. Study with objectivity, not emotion. Study with an open mind, not prejudice.

If you still have outspoken enemies, ignore those who are mixed up liberals. Don't confuse any special personal enemies with the great enemy of us all. Don't be distracted by jittery people.

The more you learn to know your enemy and his real nature, the less time you'll have to waste on these other folks.

C. L. Dancy.

### A Realistic Approach to Our Educational Problems

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, a joint resolution adopted by the 72d General

Assembly of the State of Illinois might be of keen interest to the Members of the House deliberating on the proposed Federal aid-to-education legislation. It is interesting to note that the resolution was originally offered by 29 members of the Illinois Legislature who are closest to the problems in education in my State.

I submit that this resolution, as placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 17 by Congressman ROLAND LIBONATI, is a realistic approach to the real problem which faces the parents and taxpayers, not only in Illinois, but across the other 49 States.

### Editorials Appearing in the VFW American Security Reporter for March 1961

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I wish to call to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, two articles appearing in the March 1961, issues of the VFW American Security Reporter, published monthly by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is my own personal experience over a long term of years that the Veterans of Foreign Wars is one of several national organizations of distinguished veterans of wars in which the United States has been involved which is doing a vigorous and valiant and necessary patriotic service to the cause of our national security. The editorials follow:

#### COMMUNISTS ANNOUNCE OPEN WARFARE

The Communist Party, U.S.A., has now disclosed openly that destruction of the U.S. defense establishment is a major objective of its "peace policy."

General Secretary Gus Hall rolled out the broad outlines of the campaign at a meeting of the party's 60-member National Committee in New York January 20.

He said that Communists' biggest job in the immediate future is to agitate both inside and outside of established peace organizations to destroy public confidence in the U.S. defense establishment. He declared: "It is our task to reveal to every American that big business and big brass are today the chief force for war. We must make clear that their talk of defending freedom is a fraud."

Moreover, he said, Communists must step-up their work inside peace organizations and work to "widen the struggle for peace, to raise its level, to involve far greater numbers, to make it an issue in every community, every people's organization, every labor union, every church, every house, every street, every point of gathering of our people. It is imperative to bring everyone—men, women, youth and, yes, even children—into the struggle. The fight for peace is basic to the cause of progress and socialism."

He indicated that this would mean many more "mass marches, demonstrations, peace walks, picket lines, postcard campaigns, letters to Congressmen and Senators, delegations, meetings, and many others."

quate. It was no match for the defending forces available to Castro.

The invasion failed also because it was ill conceived, poorly planned, and lacked necessary military capability. It is difficult to believe that the Pentagon was very pleased with the operations. I am inclined to think that our military leaders were skeptical onlookers, thoroughly amazed at the ineptness of amateurs playing at war. It would appear that on the American side, the invasion was encouraged essentially by a group of enthusiasts who really believed that Cubans by the thousands would leap to arms in support of the counterrevolution. They were wrong and our position must be reoriented.

But most important, the counterrevolution failed because it had no roots in the people of Cuba. It failed because it had no appeal for the farmer and the worker. It failed because it appealed mainly to the dispossessed—those who had and lost. Unfortunately, there were many, many more of those who had nothing and were promised much.

There is strong evidence today that the recent invasion of Cuba was only a probing action, that there will be other invasions of Cuba, supported and encouraged presumably by the United States.

Before we support other invasions of Cuba, let me caution the sponsors of future invasions to read carefully the lessons on revolution written by Che Guevara in his manual on guerilla fighting in the Castro uprising. Whatever Americans may think of Castro, he is nonetheless a living example of a success revolutionist. He understood and still thoroughly understands the Cuban farmer and worker. He won in Cuba, because he fanned the burning desire of the peons for land and reform. He has maintained himself in Cuba, because he fans the great pride of Cubans in Cuba and in themselves. Unless the architects of future invasions ignite a similar spark in the hearts of the Cuban farmers and workers or crush them outright with overwhelming military power, it is doubtful that these recent guerilla fighters will desert the Castro revolution.

So much for the invasion which failed. We have also failed to starve Castro into submission. The sugar embargo has failed and so have our efforts to isolate Cuba. As a matter of fact, these efforts have aroused sympathies for the Cubans throughout South America and in many parts of the world. The great Yankee democracy is pictured as a heartless colossus crushing the little people of Cuba.

But why are we so overwrought about Cuba?

Historically, the United States has always feared the presence of an alien force on Cuba. In the Castro regime we have a hostile government which has accepted foreign military and economic assistance of great potential danger to the United States. Cuba is being built up not only as a hostile military base, but a stepping stone for international communism—a friendly door inviting Soviet penetration into this hemisphere. This we cannot permit. What frustrates

us in Cuba is that we are unable to come to grips with the real culprit, the Soviet Union.

The United States has every right, under international law and under the inter-American treaty arrangements, to defend itself and the hemisphere from external attack, direct or indirect, whenever such an attack has occurred or is being prepared. It has no right, however, under international or domestic law, and no moral justification for taking action but pretending that it is not doing so.

Moreover, as long as the pretense exists, any such action must be covert, ineffective, and doomed to failure. We thereby compound cynicism with defeat.

Before we took action in Cuba or supported others, in so doing we should have ascertained whether we had full legal and moral justification for what we did. Our experts in international law know that frequently there is a legitimate conflict of legal principles which creates doubt as to our legal rights. However, we have the right and duty to apply those principles which sanction actions essential to protect ourselves and to oppose aggression if such a threat in fact exists. If the facts did not justify such action, we had no course but to withhold action.

We have always stood before the world as the defenders of international law. We therefore cannot afford to be vulnerable to a charge of violating it.

Nevertheless, the conclusion seems to be that we must destroy Castro and his regime. We could crush him with our military power like an elephant might crush a mouse, but we dare not. And so we have decided to sympathize with, support, and encourage a counterrevolution in Cuba.

In the light of this decision, other invasions of Cuba are coming. Who will be the invaders? Reliable sources have suggested that they will be Social Democrats. Each one of us will have his own views of what is a Social Democrat, but it is reasonable to assume that the United States will support Cuban patriots with liberal views. The invaders can be expected to support progressive social and land reform programs. The fundamental political objective of the invaders will be to reestablish freedom and democracy in Cuba.

The last invasion failed to communicate its objectives to the people of Cuba; and future invasions, I regret to observe, will have the same difficulties. For in a popularity contest in Cuba, Castro is the hero. It was Castro who seized the sugar lands. It was Castro who seized the banks and factories from foreigners and wealthy Cubans. It has been Castro who has seized the imagination of the Cuban people.

As Americans, we hope patriots will find a way to ignite the spark of desire for freedom which could destroy Castro, but I doubt that the peons and the bearded ones can really understand the noble intricacies of a social democratic counterrevolution. I must reluctantly conclude that in any future invasion as

in the past one, they will remain loyal to Castro.

It has been reported that during the last invasion, great masses of people were armed and ready to fight off the invaders. Accordingly, if an invasion of Cuba by "Social Democrats" or any other group is to succeed, it seems quite certain that U. S. military forces will have to play a determining role. The invaders must be strong enough militarily to destroy sizable Castro forces on the beaches and in the interior. This will require the recruitment, training, and equipping of major rebel invasion units. It will require naval and air support. Bluntly, it will require at least limited military intervention by the United States. This course will lead us to horrible bloodshed and slaughter.

We might get some other South or Central American country or countries to do the recruiting, training, and equipping for us, but this is a doubtful expedient. It would certainly entail the possibility of the inherent danger that the countries of South America might choose up sides.

Is there then an alternative, or must we take the calculated risk of supporting with military power a counterrevolution against Cuba? There must be an alternative.

If negotiations, cease fire, and a neutralist government are preferable to war in Laos; if endless meetings and discussions on control of nuclear weapons are more acceptable than unilateral nuclear testing; if insults and abuse can be endured better in the United Nations than a clash in the Congo, then surely reason dictates, even though emotions cry otherwise, that the United States is big enough to talk to Cuba.

"It's too late for that now," the cry echoes every time negotiations are suggested.

Yet, if this is a sincere statement, then one ventures hopefully that there might have been a time in the past when the United States might have negotiated with Castro. And, if we could have negotiated in the past, then why not now? How will we know whether some acceptable rapprochement is not possible unless we try?

I am inclined to think that this country might well exercise a little restraint and patience with Cuba. Governments and regimes have come and gone in Central and South America. We have weathered storms before. Castro may be an unpleasant irritant, a thorn in our side, but I certainly hope no one believes Cuba is a serious challenge to the United States.

I suggest that:

First. The American people can accept the land reform program and the social and economic changes inaugurated in Cuba, providing the Government of Cuba will undertake to reimburse the original owners for the properties taken from them.

Second. The American people are ready to consider the reestablishment of normal trade and commercial relations between our two countries, and even to

1961

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2923

overly timid in allowing the creation of new credit.

Germany has continued to guard against inflation (as successfully, in fact, as any industrial country) and has kept a tight rein on the expansion of credit.

The report called for easy money and said that a rate of interest high enough to stimulate any large volume of personal savings would seriously curtail investment.

Germany has kept a high rate of interest. The report said that tax concessions granted to industry, such as depreciation allowances, were being abused and that in any case they represented only an expenditure of tax funds which would otherwise have been collected by the Government. Accordingly, the report said, a compulsory investment program would be more effective. Under the recommended program, all industries were to be assessed for the fund and the government was to distribute the money to industries where there was a crying need for expansion.

The Government did nothing of the kind. The key bottleneck in German industrial expansion, the report said, was an inadequate supply of coal. It recommended vast Government programs for stimulating the production of coal.

Little was done along this line. Coal has become a drug on the market and the problem has been how to dispose of the surplus.

The report proclaimed that "the nostalgic hopes \* \* \* looking toward a revival of the 19th century role of the capital market are doomed to disappointment. The capital market plays no such role in any modern country and there is no prospect that it will."

The capital market is still functioning much as it always did, here as in Germany, in spite of persistent attempts to dislodge it.

Finally, the report drew a distinction between Germany, squeezed between too great a demand for imports and not enough exports, and the United States, "where there has never been any fear of a squeeze or an external drain."

Today, having disregarded all of Mr. Heller's recommendations, Germany has turned the tables on us. It has built up an enormous trade surplus, accumulated nearly \$8 billion in reserves, and the squeeze is on the United States—to such an extent, indeed, that we are begging Germany to help us out.

What actually happened just couldn't happen, according to Mr. Heller and others. They go on pretending that the United States must take the same medicine they prescribed for Germany even though Germany recovered precisely because it poured the nasty stuff down the drain.

Now, what are the dangers and lessons?

First, Danger: Security classification by the State Department which withholds information from our people.

Lesson: Public knowledge and discussion will show up the fallacies of regimented bureaucratic thinking, foreign to a free enterprise constitutional Government society.

Second, Danger: The gentleman whose views are so thoroughly discredited, Mr. Heller, is now the top economic adviser to the President.

Lesson: A President can surround himself with fuzzy thinkers.

Third, Danger: While Germany disregarded these fallacious economic theories, of no need to worry over inflation, easy money, Government aid to industry, misunderstanding the capital

market, the United States is obviously following them, witness recent Presidential messages and legislation—the tax recommendations, area redevelopment bill, the housing message, and the like.

Lesson: Government regimentation, Federal bureaucratic planning, taxing, and control is no match for free private enterprise and people left alone by Government.

When will our people wake up to the dangers which our Nation faces and remember the lessons learned by our leaving the Old World, our revolution and formulation of our form of limited constitutional Government?

## Confidence in Uncle Sam: Unlimited

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday and Tuesday, April 24 and 25, 1961, Quimby Melton, Sr., publisher of the Griffin Daily News, Griffin, Ga., initiated a campaign entitled "Confidence in Uncle Sam: Unlimited." I personally endorse the thoughts of this patriotic American, and it is with personal pleasure that I include an editorial written by Mr. Melton, which appeared in the Griffin Daily News issue of Tuesday, April 15, 1961:

## CONFIDENCE IN UNCLE SAM: UNLIMITED

The suggestion made Monday, in this column, that every family in Griffin and Spalding County show their confidence in Uncle Sam, by buying a U.S. savings bond, is beginning to "snowball." There are indications that this suggestion may catch on as a nationwide campaign.

Today, the city commission has issued a proclamation calling May a month for showing "Confidence in Uncle Sam: Unlimited." In this proclamation the city fathers urge everyone to buy a bond during the month of May. If every family in Spalding does this it will mean \$150,000 they are investing in a fund to help preserve democracy and freedom in this Nation.

Numerous persons have called, not only locally, but several from out of the county, approving the plan. Today we are featuring the proclamation of the city commission in another story. Tomorrow we will comment on what folks are saying in support of this campaign.

It all started when we were impressed by the statement of President Kennedy, that he was determined that our freedoms should not be curtailed by communistic aggression.

We asked ourselves, "What can I do to help?" Then came up with this idea of buying a bond—taking stock, as it were, in the "Confidence in Uncle Sam Unlimited" organization.

To fill out the column today, we'll just recount a conversation with two men.

One, a businessman, said, "I'm going to buy a bond for each of my three grandchildren. I want to do my part to help guarantee that they never live under the rule of a totalitarian dictator."

The second man, a large property owner and a man who owns many gilt-edge stocks and bonds, said:

"I have never bought a Savings Bond. For

I can earn more interest with my money by other investments. But this can be called a national emergency. I'm going to buy at least \$1,000 worth of bonds, not as an investment, but as a contribution to my Government. I realize, looking at this from a hard-boiled business viewpoint, that if the Communists take over all the property I own and all the stocks and bonds in my safety deposit box will not be worth a dime."

There you have two viewpoints.

The businessman, who wants to help guarantee that his grandchildren will enjoy the same freedoms as he enjoys; and the hard-boiled investor, who wants to guard the value of his property, stocks and bonds.

Few of us can buy \$1,000 bonds—but each family can well afford to put \$18.75 into one bond and have a part in saving this Nation of ours from Communist domination.

Come on Griffin and Spalding County—let's all buy bonds.

## Another Try at Cuba

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the leaders of the Democratic and Republican Parties for supporting President Kennedy's foreign policy at this crucial time. There can be only one foreign policy of the United States, and the President is solely responsible for its execution. Certainly history has shown that once a decision is made the people of this great democracy have never flinched from the consequences of that decision.

Past events, however, have also demonstrated that the American people do not have closed minds. They seek information and even welcome debate. They are eager to explore alternatives. They have faced up to war, but overwhelmingly they desire peace.

Because we are an intelligent people, I believe, Mr. Speaker, there is room and indeed a need for an objective appraisal of the Cuban situation.

The invasion of Cuba was a horrible fiasco. The American people join with those who grieve for the young Cubans, so uselessly sacrificed on the beaches of their beloved land. Furthermore, it is no secret that many Americans have lost confidence in those who conceived and led this unfortunate invasion. Most significantly, the American people are deeply disturbed by the terrible blow which the invader debacle has dealt the prestige of the United States.

It matters little whether the United States did or did not finance, organize, and arm the invasion forces. The cold fact is that the world believes we did. And so, Mr. Speaker, we cannot escape the indictment that the failure of the anti-Castro counterrevolution was an American failure.

But why did the invasion fail?

As a military action, it was doomed to failure from the beginning because the invasion force was militarily inade-

parts of the country came complaints against the electoral college. Every 4 years, the months after the presidential election, becomes open season on the machinery for choosing the Chief Executive.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD is the spearhead of the current attack on the electoral college. He argues that the college is antiquated and that only the popular vote should decide our choice for President and Vice President. This position, so soon after one of the closest elections in our history, only helps to confuse the issue for the average citizen.

The members of the Constitutional Convention in 1787 found the decision on the mode of choosing a President one of their most difficult. James Wilson, a delegate, stated it this way:

"The subject has greatly divided this House. It is in truth the most difficult of all on which we have to decide."

The final decision to permit the State legislatures to choose the method of picking their electors for the President and Vice President was based on the thesis that the right of appointment was not to be exclusively vested in the people.

What was the intention of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention in deciding on this method of electing a President? One suggestion is that they wanted to keep the people from all participation in choosing the Chief Executive. Another suggestion is that they wanted the electors to be completely free agents without any control by the people. The Founding Fathers would have denied both of these suggestions. James Madison constantly stated "the President is to be elected by the people." Edmund Randolph said "the electors must be elected by the people at large." Such statements clearly refute the view of those who argue that the Founding Fathers feared the people and distrusted their judgment.

It has never been quite understood that under the Constitution State legislatures have the uncontrolled and unrestricted power to fix the manner of appointing the presidential electors. With this great power at their disposal State legislatures have nevertheless, under a kind of moral persuasion, given up their prerogative of changing the present system. By the adoption of similar laws in each State there has developed a uniform method of appointment.

The method of choosing electors in present use is called the general ticket-plurality system. In the election just completed there were 537 electors to be voted on. The breakdown of the number is arrived at by assigning 100 electors to the States on the principle of equality, each State being entitled to 2. The remaining 437 electors (to be reduced to 435 as the result of the census of 1960) are distributed according to the principle of population, each State being assigned as many electors as it has Congressmen. To be elected a presidential candidate must capture a majority of the total electoral vote. In the election just completed an electoral vote of 269 was needed for a nominee's victory.

The Constitution says that electors may be chosen, "in such manner as the [State] legislature may direct." Under the present general ticket-plurality system a citizen enters his voting booth to choose a nominee for President. In fact he is voting for every elector to which his own State is entitled. For example, if you voted in New York State on November 8, you would have faced a voting machine listing the names of Kennedy-Johnson and Nixon-Lodge yet as you pulled the lever for either team you would have been voting, not for your candidates, but for a list of 45 electors previously approved by his political party.

As a result of this system the candidate who wins the largest popular vote in the State receives all of the electoral vote of that State. This makes possible the situation in which the candidate with the total popular vote of the country could lose the electoral vote and the election. An extreme example might be as follows:

State	Candidate A		Candidate B	
	Popular vote	Electoral vote	Popular vote	Electoral vote
Alabama.....	Thous- ands 25	0	Thous- ands 200	11
California.....	2,160	32	2,000	0
Massachusetts.....	1,100	16	1,000	0
Montana.....	80	0	100	4
New York.....	3,100	45	3,000	0
Ohio.....	1,000	0	2,000	25
Pennsylvania.....	1,000	0	2,000	32
North Carolina.....	80	0	700	14
Texas.....	600	32	400	0
Wisconsin.....	401	12	400	0
Total.....	9,496	137	11,800	86

The Constitution makes electors free agents who may vote for any qualified man or woman that they feel should be President and Vice President. Our Founding Fathers did not fully recognize the possibility of political parties and thought of the electors as free agents. This myth persists. For example, as late as 1952 in *Ray v. Blair* (343 U.S. 214) the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that a California law requiring an elector to sign an affidavit to support the candidates nominated at the national conventions was unconstitutional. Custom and party pressure almost invariably make electoral delegations vote as a unit. The last exception to this occurred in Alabama in 1956 when 1 of the 11 Democratic electors did not cast his ballot for Stevenson.

Some of those who have agreed that the above system has outlived its usefulness refuse to support the thesis that some system not using the electoral college should be devised. A method called the single-member district system has been suggested as a more democratic way of choosing electors. In this method the candidate receiving the largest popular vote in each congressional district would get the electoral vote for that district. The candidate receiving the greatest popular vote in any given State would garner the two additional electoral votes for the State. For example:

NEW YORK	
Candidate A:	Won 23 congressional districts—23 electoral votes.
Popular vote—3,240,600—2 electoral votes.	
Total electoral votes: 25.	
Candidate B:	Won 20 congressional districts—20 electoral votes.
Popular vote—2,801,306—No electoral votes.	
Total electoral votes: 20.	

While the single-member district system has gained some momentum, the most effective argument against it is that it would inevitably degenerate into a gerrymandering system. A gerrymander is an artificial arrangement of districts designed to give the political party making it (that is the party in power) a guarantee of electing its candidate to a representative or electoral body. With all the undemocratic overtones to "gerrymandering" it would seem that the single-member district system would be a weak solution to the electoral problem. However, it is generally agreed that this system is superior to the present general ticket-plurality system.

Following the election of 1948, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge and Congressman Edward Gossett introduced a resolution for a constitutional amendment. It was approved by the Senate, but later failed in the House. This resolution would have translated popular votes into electoral votes, and allotted a State's electoral quota among the candidates in proportion to the statewide popular votes polled. All that would be necessary to win would be a 40-percent plurality which would practically obviate the chance of an election being thrown into the House. This proposed amendment would have operated as follows:

NEW YORK

Present System:  
Candidate A, 3,260,362—45 electoral votes.  
Candidate B, 2,167,367—No electoral votes.  
Lodge-Gossett resolution:  
Candidate A, 3,260,987—22.6 electoral votes.  
Candidate B, 1,999,999—22.4 electoral votes.

The strong argument against a change by means of the Lodge-Gossett resolution is that both State and National Legislatures presently overrepresent rural interests. The present electoral college system, conversely, is the only way to assure that presidential candidates will listen to the demands of urban majorities and minorities in America. The chief interest of southern sponsors of electoral reform is to diminish the alleged power of urban minorities, particularly the northern Negro, in national politics.

It is to be noted that all suggestions for change mentioned in this article are alike in that they modify the electoral college. If the change is to come it must be by amendment, for State reform is unlikely especially in the big industrial States. The same considerations of interest and pride, chiefly the increased weight accruing from an undecided block of electoral votes, which originally induced one after another of them to give up the earlier district system plan can be counted upon to frustrate any attempt, within their own boundaries, to revive it or anything resembling it.

One thing is certain. The elimination of the electoral college system is practically an impossibility. The use of the popular vote as the sole determinant is not practical. Our representative system is based on a compromise between population and regional needs.

From a practical point of view, since the polls closed on November 8 some Republican leaders thought that there should be a recount in 11 States. Some of these recounts were started. A recount in all 11 would have provoked considerable uncertainty and political passion.

But, if the Presidency depended on a majority of the popular vote in the entire Nation, we would then have a recount of the votes in all 50 States. This would open the door to extensive opportunities for fraud in every area where one party had decisive control of the election machinery.

The electoral college system, if it does nothing else, restricts the area of argument to a limited number of States. It does not put the whole country at the mercy of political machines determined to grab everything in sight.

No one really questions that the electoral college system is cumbersome and anachronistic. But it is still very much a question as to whether the change should be made now. The real issue has been posed by President John F. Kennedy: "If we are considering a radical shift in the balance of power in the United States, it should not be undertaken lightly." The cure is often worse than the disease.

## The Ad Hoc Committee on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, under leave to extend my remarks, I included in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence with the ad hoc committee, composed of Milwaukee, Wis., residents, who were critical of our Federal Government for its alleged failure to take any steps to seek peace in Laos.

The other day, I received another open letter from the ad hoc committee. In this letter, the committee has in effect urged the Government to give the Communists a free hand in Cuba.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD the text of the ad hoc committee's letter, as well as my reply to them. The two letters follow.

## AN OPEN LETTER

To President John F. Kennedy, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, Senators Alexander Wiley, William Proxmire, Congressmen Henry Reuss, Clement Zablocki, Robert Kastnemer, editors of the Milwaukee Journal, and the Milwaukee Sentinel:

We strongly support the declaration of President John Kennedy at his news conference on April 12, 1961:

"There will not under any conditions be an intervention in Cuba by U.S. Armed Forces. This Government will do everything it possibly can, and I think it can meet its responsibilities, to make sure that there are no Americans involved in any action inside Cuba. I wish to make clear also, that we would be opposed to the use of our territory for mounting an offensive against any foreign government."

We affirm this stand because:

1. We see in armed intervention the risk of world war III.
2. We do not wish to adopt the methods of the Soviet action in Hungary or the British-French action in Suez.
3. We have faith that there can be negotiated solutions to international disputes.
4. We believe that intervention would forfeit the confidence and friendship of the Central and South American Nations.

While many of us may look upon the Castro regime with disfavor, puzzlement, and disappointment, we are no less concerned with the folly of our Cuban policy which now causes the American people so much anguish. Now is the time for open discussion. It is our conviction that an informed public opinion will make its influence felt upon those who are in positions of leadership.

There are questions deserving serious and immediate attention. For example: (1) What are the minimum conditions for re-establishment of diplomatic relations with Cuba? (2) What should be our attitude toward social and economic upheavals in Central and South America? (3) In what specific ways does the social revolution in Cuba threaten the fundamental interests of the American people as a whole? (4) Is there anything in American policy toward Cuba which has contributed to her dependence on the Soviet bloc? (5) What are our obligations under the Charter of the Organization of American States?

We think that James Reston, political analyst of the New York Times, has clearly stated the principle involved:

"Everywhere in the world the United States is trying to defend or establish a simple overriding principle: That force shall not be used, directly or indirectly, to achieve political ends, and that all international disputes shall be settled by negotiation. This is the principle we are trying to sustain in Laos, where we are arguing against the shipment of Soviet arms for use against a government we support. This is the principle we supported even against the British and French in the Suez war. This is the principle we are trying to defend in the Congo in Indonesia, in the Middle East, in Algeria, and in Berlin.

Surely that same principle applies in our relations with Cuba and the other Central and South American nations.

People striving for economic betterment, political freedom, and national independence, sometimes use methods we abhor or go to extremes we deem unwise. Even in such cases we must uphold the principle of nonintervention. Our claim to moral leadership demands it. Intervention points to disaster.

Sincerely yours,

The ad hoc committee: Rev. Roy Agte, W. Robert Brazelton, Louis Becker, Dr. Neal Billings, William Brown, Dr. Gladys Calbick, Dr. Martin Cohnstaedt, Wilma Ehrlich, Jack Eisen-drath, Rev. Roger Eldridge, Dr. Hugo Engleman, Donald Esker, Mrs. Maxine Franz, Richard Franz, Wayne Gourley, Dr. Alar Grossberg, Mrs. Ruth Grossberg, Mrs. Leon M. Hamlet, Dr. Dorothy Harvey, Rev. Herbert J. Huebschmann, Edward Jamosky, Harvey Kitzman, Dr. David Luce, Dr. Willie Mae Gillis, Mrs. Virginia Parkman, Mrs. Louise W. Peck, Dr. Sidney M. Peck, Mrs. Annette Roberts, Mort Ryweck, Dr. Gordon Shipman, Dr. James W. Skelton, Rev. Kenneth L. Smith, Max Taglin, Mrs. Thelma Taglin, Corneff Taylor, Arthur Thrall, Nick Topping, Frieda Voigt, Rev. Lucius Walker, Theodore Warshafsky, Jack Weiner, John Werner, Rev. Herbert Zebarth, Leonard Zubrensky.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1961.

Dr. S. M. PECK,  
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR DR. PECK: This will acknowledge your open letter of April 25, outlining your ad hoc committee's views on the situation in Cuba.

I have noted your views and I wish to reassure you that, as in the past, I will continue to support efforts made by our Government to resolve international problems through peaceful negotiation. However, we can only expect constructive results from such negotiations if we negotiate from a position of strength, not of weakness.

I must add that I am amazed at your committee's apparently unshakable faith in the peaceful intentions of the commies and their willingness to reach negotiated settlements. It would seem to me that your belief in the sincerity of Communist statements and pledges should be wearing thin. What do you find in the record of the past 15 years—and in the record of recent developments in Cuba, Laos, Vietnam, and other areas—to sustain your faith? I would be interested in receiving your reply.

There is one last comment that I would like to make: Apparently history has failed to persuade you about the true nature and the real objectives of communism. You are, of course, puzzled and disappointed with Castro; according to your letter, many members of your committee even look upon

him with disfavor. But the last paragraph of your letter indicates to me that you still consider Mr. Castro, and others in his category as basically well-meaning agrarian reformers, social reformers, or political reformers who—on occasion—may go to extremes which you consider unwise. Your advice in those instances is that we should sit tight and do nothing.

I do not believe that we should try to run the affairs of any nation other than our own, or attempt to rule the world. At the same time, we should not sit back and watch the Communists swallow up the free world bit by bit until they accomplish their objective—world domination. As a free nation, as a responsible world power, and as a leader in the free world, the United States has a responsibility to its neighbors which goes beyond sitting back and engaging in intellectually stimulating discussions, or in passing resolutions, or in composing open letters. I am confident that the vast majority of the American people are conscious of that responsibility and are determined to live up to it.

Yours sincerely,

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,  
Congressman, Fourth District.

## Lessons and Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there are many dangers and lessons in the article here presented—Human Events, April 21, 1961:

GERMANY IGNORED ECONOMIST HELLER, AND PROSPERED

Imposing evidence has only recently come to light to show that leading New Deal economists, including Prof. Walter W. Heller, are capable of giving some mighty bad advice. This is important because Mr. Heller is now Chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers.

The State Department has declassified a 1951 report in which Mr. Heller, Prof. Alvin Hansen, and several others solemnly warned that the German economy could not possibly improve without a thorough immersion in Keynesian-New Deal philosophy (reported in Human Events, Mar. 17, 1961). Events have proved that the forecast was silly.

The professors were members of a Marshall plan team whose mission was to tell the new German Government how to manage its economy. Their 400-page report, said to be largely the work of Mr. Heller, expressed the opinion that the German economy was bogged down on a sort of plateau and that proper measures must be taken if the possibilities [of further progress] are to be realized.

Fortunately for Germany, the Bonn government disregarded the report. In every important matter it kept on doing precisely what Mr. Heller and his colleagues said it should stop doing, and Germany has wound up better off than the report considered possible even if its recommendations had been followed.

The report said Germany would never achieve the necessary rate of industrial expansion if it continued to worry about inflation; that it should not confuse wartime inflation with the normal operations of peacetime credit; that it had an excessive concern for price stability; and that it was



Russia, he can equip, train, and maintain quite a sizable force. And in all probability he is working toward that end right now—day and night.

For Russia to accuse America of fomenting the recent small invasion is to be expected. Russia says nothing about what she has given Cuba in the way of arms, guns, planes, tanks, and technical assistance. But she points the ugly finger at us and tells us "you are to blame," while at the same time trying to scare us off from any other help. We do not know how much help America has given to the Invasion. But it stands to reason that we have not given very much. After all any private in the U.S. Army knows full well that one division of American marines or soldiers, well trained, well equipped and with proper air support, could go into Cuba today and defeat Castro's army. And it could be accomplished quickly.

If we are in the business of offering wholesale help, then why has such a quick invasion failed? Surely it would not have failed if America had taken even a small part in the planning and execution of the invasion.

Within a matter of hours, America could take over Cuba now if she wished to do so. When charges are made, and when the defeat of the invading army is made to sound like an American defeat, it does give rise to serious thinking in this land of the free and home of the brave.

Americans today are vitally concerned, and they have a right to be.

### U.S. Taxes Cost Hawaii \$230 Million

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HIRAM L. FONG

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I read with great interest that Hawaii leads 10 other States in the Union in contributions to the Federal Treasury.

In a bylined story in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, veteran newsman Frank Hewlett has written a succinct article noting Hawaii's rank in the Internal Revenue Service Report of 1960.

Mr. Hewlett, who now heads the Star-Bulletin's Washington bureau, is a former United Press correspondent and was the last war correspondent to escape from Corregidor at the outbreak of World War II.

I ask unanimous consent that this news report published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of April 21, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

U.S. TAXES COST US \$230 MILLION

(By Frank Hewlett)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—Hawaii taxpayers shelled out \$230 million to Uncle Sam last year for another record. It was \$41 million more than in 1959.

A report issued today by the Internal Revenue Service shows Hawaii contributed more to the Federal Treasury in the calendar year 1960 than 10 of the States.

Furthermore, two Southern States which only a few years ago were far ahead of Hawaii are rapidly being overtaken by the 50th State.

Total internal revenue collections for Arkansas were \$230 million and Mississippi \$240 million compared with Hawaii's \$230,589,000.

States with smaller Federal tax collections than Hawaii were Alaska, Nevada, Montana, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine.

A breakdown of the tax collections by the Honolulu Internal Revenue Service office showed: Corporation income and profit taxes, \$41,530,000; individual income and employees taxes, \$176,102,000; gift, excise and other miscellaneous levies, \$12,956,000.

### Our Immigration Law

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD, the text of a letter sent by Mr. Edward F. L. Bruen, chairman of the committee on American citizenship of the New York County Lawyers Association, to the chairman of the subcommittee on immigration of that committee. Mr. Bruen's letter reads as follows:

NEW YORK COUNTY  
LAWYERS ASSOCIATION,  
COMMITTEE ON  
AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP,  
March 28, 1961.

SAMUEL PAIGE, Esq.,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Immigration,  
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. PAIGE: As you know from time to time I send comments to the chairmen of the subcommittees which I think should be in the hands of the entire committee.

I am sure you understand that I do not wish to in any way limit the scope or direction of your work. The following is submitted merely as thought provoking background material for the questions which are likely to come before our members.

Our present immigration and nationality law is the act of a sovereign power which could, of course, keep out all persons who are not citizens of the United States and deport any already within the country merely on the ground that they are aliens. This power was derived by the Federal Government from the people of the individual States. During its early history our National Government like the colonial governments had encouraged immigration largely because of the sparsity of the population on a great continent.

With the need for immigration no longer a practical requisite for survival or rapid development, there still remains a belief that neither our country nor people of other lands seeking U.S. citizenship would be the gainer by barring further immigration. This belief is generally shared by the patriot and all men of good will. We are, however, with the rest of the world experiencing in the United States a population explosion which reliable authorities have estimated will bring our population past 200 million by 1970 and 230,800,000 by 1980. Without any increase from foreign lands, for these new citizens to be born here, we will have to greatly expand opportunities for gainful employment.

There are some few people who have apparently so far detached themselves from

the realities of distressed or depressed areas, critical shortage of proper housing, hospital, medical, educational and training facilities as to urge that the United States should adopt a policy designed to drain off the excess population of certain other countries. History shows that migratory movements are not the correct answer to overpopulation. The solution lies within the control of the over-populated countries. For the United States such a task would prove useless. The sovereign ship of state can refuse to take on more passengers for the sake of the comfort of those already aboard. It may keep loading until the safety point is reached; it may ignore the safety limit or it may take on those calculated to scuttle it. Neither of these last courses would be permitted by one loading a lifeboat regardless of whether he was hoping for rescue himself or planning to go down with the mother ship. What is best for the United States may be best for the world also.

The patriot's faith that his country will be the gainer by never closing the barrier would not be matched by his intelligence if immigration should be open to all. Some standards must be met. Guesswork and emotionalism are not proper bases on which to rest a sound immigration policy. The present law, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 163; 8 U.S.C. 1101) like most laws is not perfect. It is, however, an understandable standard for the open door. With this standard in effect well over 2 million, quota and nonquota, immigrants have been admitted to the United States during the last 8 years.

This law which like a tax law can never be popular in all quarters is based on the national origin quota system. The quotas are based upon the proportion of our people having a particular foreign national origin. If we look at the ethnological composition which has made our country the greatest on earth and enables us today to offer a better life to those of other lands, we can better understand the basic theory of this system. Our people have demonstrated that they can live together in comparative peace and harmony notwithstanding the fact that they originated in various proportions from different foreign countries. Similar proportions of quota immigration will not only tend to maintain our ethnological composition, but will promote a continuance of the peace and domestic harmony. While it is possible that our people could continue to live together in peace and harmony under different proportions of foreign national origins, no one can guarantee it, and only a few seem willing to risk it outside of the special interest and minority pressure groups who seem to be thinking largely in terms of the desire of the people they favor to immigrate, rather than the unbalance in people, economy, politics and other conditions it threatens.

There are advantages in having each quota computed under the identical formula. This mathematically fixes all quotas at one-sixth of 1 percent of each of our foreign national origin groups. No country knowing in advance what its quota, and that of all other countries will be from year to year, can offer just criticism. The fact that some foreign countries do not fill their quotas does not seem a valid argument for unbalancing the proportions further by admissions from countries whose quotas are oversubscribed. During the last 30 years Congress has consistently declined to accept this idea of jackpot, which would be a source of misunderstanding as a quasi-guarantee that the United States would receive immigrants to the total number of all the quotas. The basic reason for the failure of the "jackpot" bills in previous Congresses was that the scheme is based upon a misconception of the purposes of the quotas. Neither the quotas nor the total

Both also are superior spellers. For minute after dramatic minute they fielded such challenges as "meningitis" (spelled correctly by Patricia) and "interlocutor" (mastered by Ellen). When the tournament ended, thunderous applause greeted winner and runner-up alike for a truly spectacular demonstration of achievement.

Steve Fitz of WSNY was announcer-pronouncer for the bee, which was broadcast as it took place over WSNY. Judges were Dr. William M. Murphy, Union College English professor, chairman; Miss Margaret Walsh, head of the Mont Pleasant High School English department; Miss Marguerite Bostwick, Mohonasen High School English department head; and Joseph Porter, English teacher at Schalmont High School.

Words for the spelldown were taken from "Words of the Champions" booklets distributed by the Union-Star to participating schools for study purposes, and from Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, second edition.

#### THIRTY-SEVEN FINALISTS

Each of the 37 finalists appearing on the chapel stage Saturday was a school champion speller. They were chosen from among approximately 8,200 seventh and eighth grade pupils in nearly 270 classes. Eight boys and twenty-nine girls made it to the finals.

Winning through to the 11th of 12 rounds was 13-year-old Anna Hood, a seventh grader at Duaneburg Central School, who placed third. Judith Smith, a 13-year-old eighth grader at Fort Plain Central School, placed fourth, and 12-year-old Gail Shaffer, a Gilboa-Conesville Central School seventh grader, earned fifth place.

Paper Mate inscribed two-tone pens were presented each school champion at the close of Saturday's bee. As runner-up, Patricia also earned a \$25 U.S. saving bond, while to Ellen went a complete, current set of the Encyclopedia Britannica, the Britannica's World Language Dictionary, a Zenith all-transistor portable radio, and her choice of a Paper Mate inscribed Mark IV pen or desk set.

Ellen now will represent Schenectady and its neighboring communities as a finalist in the 34th Annual National Spelling Bee, sponsored by Scripps-Howard newspapers. She will leave Schenectady May 31 to join 72 youthful spelling champions for several days of a specially planned program that will include sightseeing and other events, in addition to the national bee finals.

### Roy Swanigan, West Virginia Legislator, Overcomes Handicap To Enjoy Fruitful Life—Operates U.S. Senate Subway Car

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, with the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped meeting today and tomorrow in Washington, D.C., it is an appropriate occasion to call attention to one of the Senate subway car operators who has overcome a handicap and is taking an active part in public affairs.

I refer to Roy Swanigan of Fayetteville, W. Va., who is a member of the house of delegates of the West Virginia Legislature.

Today's editions of the Washington Evening Star contains an interesting column by George Kennedy, who writes as "The Rambler," and depicts the story of Mr. Swanigan in a most stimulating manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the newspaper column to which I have made reference.

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

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 27, 1961]

THE RAMBLER IS TAKEN FOR A RIDE

(By George Kennedy)

Roy Swanigan, a young-looking man with brown hair, good complexion and a soft voice—not of the Deep South but with the slightly higher note of the hill country—operates one of the cars on the new subway to the New Senate Office Building.

He is a member of the West Virginia Legislature.

"We had a 60-day meeting in January and February," he said yesterday. "We went all out. We increased taxes and expenditures by about \$30 million. West Virginia must advance. We also ratified the amendment giving the citizens of the District the vote."

He began work on March 30 after the biennial session. There will be a short session, 30 days, in January 1962. He has already arranged to attend it on annual leave.

He has not yet decided whether he will stand again in the 1962 primary election.

He is from Fayetteville, southeast of Charleston the capital of the State. Fayetteville is near the New River which flows into the Kanawha. The capital is in the valley of the Kanawha which flows into the Ohio. Fayette County is Democratic. The four Democrats leading the primary are sure to be elected to the legislature.

He was one of the 18 candidates in last year's primary—the same one which was so decisive in the selection of the Democratic candidate for President. He was first among the 18. It was his initiation in politics.

He had applied for this job 2 years ago—before he ran for the State legislature. But there was no place for him then.

Senators JENNINGS RANDOLPH and ROBERT BYRD were very helpful and especially Representative CLEVELAND BAILEY, of Clarksburg.

Mr. Swanigan is very well qualified for the job. For years he was an electrician for the New River Coal Co. He operated a motor in the mines pulling a string of cars loaded with coal blasted from the face. Like all jobs in the mine, an electrician is a member of the United Mine Workers.

There was an accident in 1955. Roy Swanigan fell below the cars and his legs were mangled just below the knees.

He did not lose consciousness and he was able to give himself some first aid by improvising tourniquets.

Four months later he was back on the job with artificial legs.

When asked about it yesterday, he jumped out of the car and walked briskly up and down the platform.

He said, "The physical rehabilitation people say I'm one of the best walkers in their experience."

"I don't know about that but I do know this. I am the only double amputee in the United States who is a licensed airplane pilot."

He produced a card to prove it. That wasn't necessary. Something about Roy Swanigan is insistent that anything he says is so.

"I've been with the New River Coal Co. for about 20 years. They are pulling in their

operations. As an electrician I had charge of the motors and the powerplant in one part of the mine.

"They told me my job would be over April 1 of this year. An electrician with seniority would be able to take care of the operation."

Roy Swanigan, who is 41, now lives in Falls Church at 1438 Patrick Henry Drive with his wife and two children, an 18-year-old son and a 15-year-old daughter.

This conversation was gleaned going back and forth between the Capitol and the New Senate Office Building.

At the latter end, a distinguished-looking, gray-haired man boarded.

"Hello, Senator," said Roy Swanigan.

The Senator cordially acknowledged the greeting. When he alighted at the Capitol end, Roy Swanigan got out a little book of pictures of the Senators.

"That's CARROLL of Colorado," he said. "I know about 55 of them now. I've only been here 6 weeks. I will know them all pretty soon."

*Cuba*  
Americans Very Concerned

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I enclose an editorial from the Washington Daily News, Washington, N.C., which I think is most timely. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the editor of this paper, Ashley Futtrell, for the clear and understandable manner in which he has pointed out the situation in Cuba and the obligation the Congress and the Government of the United States owe the people in an effort to prohibit the establishment of a communistic government on our eastern coast:

#### AMERICANS VERY CONCERNED

Americans in all walks of life have become vitally concerned with what is taking place in Cuba. This is not a sudden concern, but it has been one which has grown upon the people.

When Fidel Castro first came to power, Americans generally were content to sit back and pay scant attention to what was taking place at our back door step. Bit by bit, as Castro turned his island into a communistic fort, concern of rank and file Americans seemed to grow.

This concern has grown until today we wonder if the Kennedy administration is not somewhat behind the general feeling in the United States as to definite steps.

Ask the man on the street what he thinks we should do about Cuba, and he will express disgust and disdain at the situation. He will say immediately that we have put up long enough with Castro's actions, and that the time is past due for more concerted American action. President Kennedy minced no words last Thursday when he spoke before the editors of America. He told Russia America would tolerate no interference, and that for security reasons we could not allow Cuba to be a Communist satellite. That sounds most reasonable and Americans generally will stand behind the President in this crucial hour.

Americans do not want war. Somehow the feeling has existed for a long time that "we hope Castro will be overthrown by his own people." But how long must we keep hoping while Castro builds an ever stronger military camp there? With the help of

colleagues the fact that the West Virginia University rifle team has won the 1961 national intercollegiate team rifle championship conducted under the auspices of the National Rifle Association of America.

Not only did the Mountaineer quartet of sharpshooters win the national team title, but its captain, Bruce A. Meredith, made it a sweep for West Virginia University by winning the national individual title with a score of 299 out of a possible 300. In second place was his teammate, Robert I. Davies with a score of 295.

I am sure West Virginians generally join in paying tribute to Bruce Meredith and Robert Davies, and to their teammates, Charles L. Rowan, who scored 289, and Robert I. Gosnell, who shot a 286 score. Their combined team score was 1,164 out of a possible 1,200 points.

Captain Bob Means, coach, and M. Sgt. Charles Haley, assistant coach, of the Army ROTC staff at West Virginia, were appropriately praised for their work with the rifle team by Col. W. E. Roberts, head of the Army ROTC program at the university.

Colonel Roberts pointed out that three of the four varsity rifle team members also fire on the university ROTC team.

I join him in his comment that "those concerned at the university are extremely happy and proud of this achievement," and I concur in his remark that this team championship "will go a long way toward encouraging even more success in the sport or rifle shooting."

Along with complimenting our West Virginia team for its success, I wish also to extend tribute to the women's team of the University of Alaska, winner of the coed rifle team national title with a score of 1,085 points.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the newspaper account of the national intercollegiate rifle competition as published in the April 25, 1961, editions of the Dominion-News, Morgantown, W. Va.

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

**WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY NAMED NATIONAL RIFLE CHAMPION—MEREDITH IS RANKED TOP STAR**

WASHINGTON.—West Virginia University won the 1961 national intercollegiate team rifle championship, the National Rifle Association of America announced Monday.

Bruce A. Meredith of the West Virginia team made it a sweep for the Mountaineer club by winning the national individual title.

The team score was 1,164 out of a possible 1,200 points, and Meredith scored 299 out of a possible 300.

The West Virginia victory broke a 6-year domination of the title by Western squads. It was the first win for West Virginia in the 33-year history of the contest, and Meredith's win was the first individual crown won by the school.

Meredith tied a record set by Robert E. Hickey, of Illinois College, in 1959. His victory came in the biggest field ever to shoot in the event—1,376 contestants. There were 295 college and university teams entered.

Other members of the West Virginia team and the scores are: Robert I. Davies, 294;

Charles L. Rowan, 289; and Robert I. Gosnell, 286.

Following West Virginia in the top 10 teams were: Arizona State University, 1,154; Kansas State, 1,154; St. John's University, 1,152; University of California, 1,147; St. John's University No. 2 team, 1,145; City College of New York, 1,145; U.S. Naval Academy, 1,145; U.S. Coast Guard Academy, 1,144; and Oregon State College, 1960 defending champion, 1,141.

Second to 10th places in individual standing were: Davies, West Virginia, 295; Bill G. Davis, Kansas State, 293; Kenneth T. Wessels, St. John's, 292; David W. Kimes, University of California, 292; Robert T. Mellen, Jr., Ohio State, 292; John S. Watkins, University of Alaska, 291; Rowan, West Virginia, 291; Ronald J. Pellar, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 291; and Walter S. Draper, Northeastern, 291.

The women's team of the University of Alaska took the national coed rifle team with a score of 1,085, and Jean Linton, of Akron (Ohio) University was individual titlist with 285.

High ROTC team in the competition was Cornell University with 1,142, and high ROTC individual was Nicholas C. Steen, Michigan State, 292.

#### CHAMPS LAUDED BY COLONEL ROBERTS

Col. W. E. Roberts, head of the Army ROTC program at the university, last night hailed news of the varsity rifle team's national championship as a great step in advancement of the sport here.

"I confine my interest mainly to the ROTC team," he explained, "but I can't help but feel closely associated with those who participate on the varsity rifle team."

All but one member of the varsity team also fires on the ROTC team.

"Capt. Bob Means and Sgt. Charles Haley have done a fine job with the varsity," Colonel Roberts noted. "I think their men deserve the victory. It's a great tribute to them."

"Those concerned at the university will be extremely happy and proud of this achievement," he added. "It will go a long way toward encouraging even more success in rifle shooting here."

### Secrecy in Government Wastes Time and Money

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News of April 24, 1961:

SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT WASTES TIME AND MONEY

"You can't find out what's going on in Washington," is one of the oldest complaints against the Federal Government. Several events since the inauguration provide a basis for the secrecy charges being made against the Kennedy administration. It is difficult to know which individuals are most to blame, but there can be no doubt that the charges have some justification.

This is a matter of prime concern to news-men, of course, but it affects all citizens. Most taxpayers feel certain that money is wasted to some extent by the Government, but few seem to realize that economy would

be easier to enforce if government had to operate more in the open.

Secrecy charges are coming from a variety of sources. Representative GEORGE MEADER has commented several times recently on the growing tendency toward needless secrecy in Washington. He is a member of the House foreign operations and monetary affairs subcommittee, which recently persuaded the President to overrule a secrecy order issued by Secretary of State Rusk. Before Rusk's order was withdrawn, however, the Soviet propaganda machine made use of it by ending direct censorship of news sent from the U.S.S.R.

Another example: The American Society of Newspaper Editors, which met last week in Washington, is studying a report which says neither Kennedy nor his administration has lived up to a promise of a freer flow of news. Prepared by Eugene S. Pulliam, managing editor of the Indianapolis News, the report says access to individual White House officials is freer than in the Eisenhower administrations, but tells of increased restrictions on news from the State and Defense Departments—which spend a major share of the Federal budget.

Also: Herbert G. Klein, formerly Richard M. Nixon's press secretary and now editor of the San Diego Union, has said flatly that the Kennedy administration curbs the free flow of news more than any other administration in this century. It may be said that this is only sour grapes from a man who wishes he were working in the White House, but there is no denying that Klein is in a position to know what he is talking about.

Rusk's order is only the best publicized of several events which have stymied the work of Washington newsmen in recent weeks. It grew out of a controversy that started in the last weeks of the Eisenhower administration. The subcommittee of which MEADER is a member asked Secretary of State Herter to furnish certain information regarding aid to Peru. Herter said the subcommittee lacked jurisdiction and Eisenhower supported him. Rusk similarly ordered State Department employees not to give the subcommittee information. MEADER and other subcommittee members complained to the press, and the resulting publicity led to withdrawal of the order.

It also led Senator JOHN A. CARROLL, of Colorado, to introduce a "freedom of information" bill (S. 1567), which would require Federal agencies to publish their rules and procedures, and would expand the definition of public documents. Its purpose is to restrict the tendency of bureaucrats in Federal agencies to stamp "secret" on material which has no bearing on national security. Senator CARROLL's bill deserves wide support.

No one denies that there is a great deal of material which must be classified for security reasons. But there is also a natural tendency among employees at all levels of government, from townships up, to keep their activities from the public eye until they can present completed, dramatic programs. No one but the public, acting through legislators and the press, can discourage this tendency.

### Missile Force for Alaska

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in the April 2 edition of *Jessen's Weekly*,

been interpreted as meaning that all men regardless of race, creed, religion, or color are equal with uniform rights. It is mandatory that we amend this definition to include every man, no matter what shape, form, or condition, having equal rights and opportunity. Let us not forget this great American ideal which also leads us to believe that since all men are created equal they must each be created for a purpose; and that God wants us to love and help our neighbor. Let our Nation and our society be a perfect model to all nations by showing that we believe that the handicapped are a functional and integral part of our American community.

### Air Pollution

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER**

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, earlier this session I introduced S. 1187, on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] to amend the air pollution control law. That bill dealt directly with interstate air pollution. It did not deal with the particular problem of air polluted over a relatively small area by automobile exhausts.

On April 22, the Washington Post and Times Herald ran an editorial entitled "Bye, Bye, Blowby." It dealt with the attitude of Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Ribicoff, and his predecessor, Secretary Flemming, currently the president of the University of Oregon, toward the practicability of a simple device for destroying automotive crankcase fumes, and thereby reducing automotive air pollution.

The Post editorial indicates that both Secretaries have been enthusiastic about a factory-installed device that would cost about \$5 and would control raw gasoline hydrocarbons. I share this enthusiasm.

The automobile industry now has the opportunity to clean its own tailpipe. It can take the initiative in cutting down what I have referred to as "garbage in the sky." Should the automobile industry fail to introduce this depolluting device on its 1962 models as standard equipment, Congress may feel impelled to require it on every car shipped in interstate commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred appear at the conclusion of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

#### BYE, BYE, BLOWBY

Secretary Ribicoff of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, like his predecessor, Secretary Flemming, has taken a clear, strong stand on the practicability of a simple device for destroying crankcase fumes of the type called "blowby." Such a device is now available as factory installed optional equipment to buyers of new automobiles throughout the country. "It seems

to me," said Secretary Ribicoff the other day, "that this method of reducing air pollution should be put into use as rapidly as practicable." And he added an unmistakable warning: "If the automobile industry does not make the device standard equipment, then legislation to require it should be considered."

We cannot escape a conclusion that the identical view expressed by two HEW Secretaries makes the attitude of the automobile industry seem unreasonably recalcitrant. The industry asserts that no clear need for the device has been demonstrated anywhere save in California and that it is willing therefore to do no more than make the device optional to any individual buyer—with installation to be done by dealers at approximately twice the cost of doing it on an assembly line.

The cost of the device, factory installed, is no more than about \$5. It is effective in controlling a secondary source of automotive air pollution, the raw gasoline hydrocarbons that blow by the piston rings. To make this standard equipment would not raise the cost of a car appreciably; and it would indicate a consideration for the public's health and the public's comfort which the automobile makers can hardly afford to forgo.

*Cuba*  
**Cuban Imports**

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. PAUL G. ROGERS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 24, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, all loyal citizens of the United States were proud of the strong stand taken by our President last week in his speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in regard to Cuba and communism in the Western Hemisphere. We feel our true friends in Latin American will respond to vigorous leadership in Washington against communism.

Today the National Security Council is meeting to make a full reappraisal of our position toward Cuba and Communist activities in general, and it is my hope that a very strong and firm policy to be backed up by actions will be decided upon.

A complete economic boycott of Cuba should be instituted by the United States, then a meeting of the Organization of American States should be called to invoke first complete economic sanctions against Castro's government; second, diplomatic isolation of Castro's government; and, third, initiate action to form an inter-American force sufficient to prevent a continuation of communistic activity in this hemisphere.

One thing that should be done by the United States immediately, which has been under consideration for more than 1 year by our State Department although action along this line has been urged by many of us Members of Congress, is to stop Cuban imports into the United States. Does it make sense to buy Cuban products and supply Castro with American dollars to continue his domination of the Cuban people, when we have already cut off exports to Cuba, broken diplo-

matic relations, and stated in an official Government publication that there is no further doubt about Castro and his Communist police state in Cuba?

Just using one port in Florida as an example, in January of this year over 10 million pounds of agricultural products were received from Cuba. During February over 14 million pounds were imported. During March and April up to date, some 23 million pounds of produce have been imported from Cuba.

Aside from the fact that these products, which include pineapples, oranges, tomatoes, tobacco, cucumbers, and native vegetables, compete with the same produce grown in this country to the detriment of our domestic agricultural industry in many States in the Union, the Castro government is paid U.S. dollars for these products.

The time to act to stop these imports was over a year ago. But action was not taken. There can be no further excuses for delay and inaction. The President has spoken out publicly and the world is waiting to see what we will actually do now. Stopping these imports would be a logical first step, and one which should be taken immediately. Almost 50 million pounds of produce has been shipped into one port during the first 3½ months of this year alone.

I have introduced a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States ban all imports from Cuba. This resolution should make it clear beyond doubt to the State Department that it is the wish of the American people that these imports be stopped. We stopped exports to Cuba long ago, we should complete the economic boycott by banning all imports also.

The resolution is House Concurrent Resolution 215, and is pending before the Ways and Means Committee. I urge every interested Member of the House to join with me in asking for an early hearing on this measure, and to again ask the State Department to act.

### West Virginia University Team Wins National Intercollegiate Rifle Championship and Two Team Members Place First and Second in Individual Scoring

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 27, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the legend of the feud of the Hatfields and the McCoys in the hills of West Virginia no longer rates top billing in the recording of the prowess of the mountaineers with the rifle.

We proudly acclaim our new champions who achieved fame through pursuit of a peaceful and a thoroughly law-abiding utilization of their firearms.

In this instance I am proud to be privileged to call to the attention of my

From the mouth of the Columbia to the California border, the Oregon coast offers vistas unmatched in the United States except for California: Prominent headlands, beaches of silky white sand, occasional outcroppings of rock standing high offshore and endless pallsades covered with twisted pines, furze or vines.

Except for a few sections, as in parts of Clatsop and Lincoln Counties, this fiord-like coast, often bathed in mist or fog, is sparsely settled and relatively undeveloped.

The equable climate has attracted many year-round residents, especially elderly retired people. Settlements are generally small and cluster around a sandy beach, a quiet cove or the estuary of a winding river. Except for logging operations and a few paper mills, industry is absent.

The resort towns such as Depoe Bay, Newport, Reedsport, Florence, Brookings and Gold Beach, dependent mainly on tourists and fishing enthusiasts, are somnolent in winter and spring but come alive in summer and early autumn.

Many people regard the area from the Siuslaw to the Umpqua with its spectacular dunes as the gem of the Oregon coast. This region has been in the forefront of controversy in recent years because it is proposed as a new kind of national park—a national seashore area. Pushed vigorously by late Senator Richard Neuberger, the battle for the Oregon Dunes National Seashore is led by his wife and successor, Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER. Its most vigorous opponent is Representative EDWIN R. DURNO of the First District.

Newspapers in Oregon, including The Journal, have almost uniformly lined up in favor of the seashore.

As outlined in Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER's bill, S. 992, introduced in the 86th Congress, the proposed seashore consists of about 35,000 acres of land and lakes bounded on the north by the Siuslaw River and on the south by Tenmile Creek.

Heart of the area are the famous dunes, a vast expanse of moving sand which has been—and is continually—swept up from the shore. In places the glistening dunes are low and gently rolling, but many rise almost vertically 200 feet above the wind-swept beach. In their relentless march the dunes have almost swallowed a dense coniferous forest, except for tiny islands of treed hills protruding above the sand.

In addition to the moving dunes, there is a long stretch of stabilized forest-covered dunes which reach a maximum of 450 feet above sea level and are from one-fourth to one-half mile up to 2 miles wide. Three freshwater lakes, Cleawox, Woahink and Siltcoos, lie within the forested dunes, but only the last two are encompassed in Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER's bill.

With their irregular shorelines, small quiet bays, and tranquil water vistas, the lakes add immeasurably to the scenic beauty of the area which attracts many thousands of visitors each year. Few, however, venture into the expanse of moving dunes that are accessible only by dune buggies (jeeps with balloon tires).

#### GO SLOW ON PEACE CORPS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the establishment of a Peace Corps—to combat communism as well as to better spread the ideas and ideals of freedom—is now receiving stronger emphasis than at any time in the past. The objectives are meritorious. The big question is, Can it be done successfully?

We recognize, of course, that this is not a new concept. Back in history there were children's crusades; for centuries,

also, missionaries have served in outposts around the world.

In more recent times, we have had student exchanges under both publicly and privately sponsored programs. The Peace Corps, as now proposed, differs somewhat from the previous endeavors.

The corps, in my judgment, has a real potential for good. At the same time, serious mistakes could be committed that would adversely affect our interests abroad.

Overall, I believe we need to go slow.

I ask unanimous consent to have a supplemental statement on the Peace Corps printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Generally, the program would involve the selection and training of individuals to serve—by mutual agreement between the United States and the host country—to fill a need in special fields. These would include: Teaching, agriculture, health and sanitation, government administration, development or improvement of business or industrial enterprises, and other areas in which the host country could better benefit.

Fundamentally, the Peace Corps, or any such program, depends upon the quality, capability, orientation, and dedication of individuals involved in its activities. In regard to the corps, these factors should be considered:

1. The careful screening of personnel to assure enlistment only of individuals of high integrity, capability, dedication, and patriotism.

2. Proper training in the language of the host country.

3. Obtaining the necessary skills to be of real help to the people of the land.

4. Proper education to avoid actions that violate the culture, customs, and sense of good conduct among the local people.

The question also arises on the ability of individuals to adapt from our relatively high standards of living to conditions in a host country, sometimes at almost a primitive level.

For the volunteers—even though dedicated and idealistic—this will be no joy ride.

As to size for the program, pilot projects, I hope, will be conducted to determine its workability; to establish criteria for selection of individuals and assignments; and to develop the kind of education and training program that would enable individuals to most effectively serve the objectives of the program in other lands.

They should be sent only after it is ascertained that they are adequately trained and equipped to do the job. Eventually the program may expand, but I believe it would be a serious mistake to shotgun ill-trained, ill-equipped students—regardless of how well meaning and dedicated they may be—around the globe.

#### NEEDED: SPEEDY ACTION ON FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in agriculture, we need a program designed to meet the special problems of the 1960's.

Among other objectives, it must create a positive—not a negative—image of the American farmers' contribution to our economic progress; attempt to establish a relatively good supply-demand balance for production or consumption of farm commodities; find better ways to

utilize farm surpluses, plus reducing costs of storage, and using these invaluable resources as assets, not as economic millstones around the neck of the economy; and assure the farmer of a fair share of our ever-growing income.

Today, there are about 7 million people working on farms. Sixteen million additional persons process and market farm products. Farm sales for cash total about \$32 billion a year—twice that of total auto and truck sales. Farms also employ 10 times as many people as automobile manufacturing and 14 times as many as in steelmaking.

These highlights of the farm picture help to illustrate the significance of agriculture to the overall economy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement on various aspects of the farm picture, as well as the President's recommendations.

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

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

##### INCREASE IN PRICE SUPPORTS

The recent increase in price support of manufacturing from \$3.22 per hundredweight to \$3.40—a moderate one—will help to act as a bulwark against lowering of milk prices, particularly in the flush season ahead.

The milk production in Wisconsin—the No. 1 producer in the Nation—amounts to over 17.9 billion pounds annually. As the major dairy State, our farm economy is particularly sensitive to the up-and-down fluctuations of the milk market.

##### PRESIDENT'S FARM PROGRAM

The highlights of the President's farm message included recommendations for establishment of the National Farmer Advisory Committee system. The committees would be established to handle production and marketing programs for each commodity in which supply adjustment is required. The developed programs involving controls over production and marketing, however, would not go into effect until approved by two-thirds of the producers.

The committees would make recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture. If approved by the Secretary—and not vetoed by Congress within 60 days—the programs would go into action.

Personally, I have long felt that (a) the farmer should have a stronger voice in programs affecting his economic future; (b) that solution to the supply-demand imbalance of farm products can best be resolved on a commodity-by-commodity basis; and (c) that self-help as a principle should be encouraged—reducing the load on Uncle Sam.

However, there are serious questions to be resolved, including how much authority should be granted the committees and the Secretary of Agriculture in controlling production and marketing of farm products? Can the farmers and their organizations—until now unable to agree on a national farm policy—develop acceptable plans for separate commodity programs? How complex will be such a multicommodity program? How much will it cost the taxpayer, and what effect will it have on consumers?

Congress, of course, will have to examine these recommendations very carefully. As yet, the farm message has not been followed up by proposals for legislation. It's expected, however, that this will come to Congress in the near future.

Additional recommendations that deserve sympathetic consideration of Congress include improving rural electrification pro-

be surprising to those who for several years have judged American foreign policy by the standard of something they called prestige and accepted Communist-inspired riots abroad as evidence of failures on our part.

Unfortunately, the Kennedy administration is to some degree the prisoner of its own pre-election propaganda. By making a high rating in prestige polls taken in other countries the major object of our foreign policy, they have given to the Communists, the neutralists, and the uninformed in other lands a virtual veto over American policy. They should remember that one of the lessons of history is that the strong are never popular. It is enough that they should be respected and just.

I am confident that I speak for my party when I say that Republicans will not make the task of this administration more difficult by criticism that might weaken the forces of freedom in any way. Rather, we propose for the resolution of the Cuban crisis some positive principles to which all who believe in freedom should be able to subscribe:

First. We believe that freedom will win out over communism throughout the world.

Second. We believe that the United States, in association with other freedom-loving peoples of the Americas, must act more energetically to make free institutions more secure in this hemisphere.

Third. We believe that the establishment of a Communist regime in this hemisphere cannot be tolerated.

Fourth. We believe that the security of the United States and of its people is threatened by the existence of a Soviet military base in Cuba.

Fifth. We believe that we cannot allow any nation, or group of nations, to veto a course of action needed for the security of the United States or of other freedom-loving States in this hemisphere.

Sixth. And we believe that a decent respect for the opinions of mankind requires that we promptly establish whether the Pan-American system which has grown up over generations of generous statesmanship throughout the hemisphere is, in fact, capable of protecting the freedom and security of the Americas.

To implement these principles and to determine whether the Monroe Doctrine need be invoked in this crisis, I propose the following course of action:

First, let the President call a meeting of the Presidents of all the American Republics and ask their cooperation in carrying out the provisions of the act of Rio de Janeiro and related treaties under which the Organization of American States sought to provide against non-American nations establishing a bridgehead in the New World such as that erected by the Moscow-sponsored Communist regime in Cuba. Let us not forget that the island of Cuba lies strategically athwart the communications between North and South America and through the Panama Canal.

If the Presidents of our sister-Republics in this Hemisphere do not, for

whatever reason, want such a meeting, President Kennedy should invoke the Rio Treaty and ask the Secretary of the Council of American States to convoke a meeting at the Pan American Union at Washington. He should lay before that meeting the considerations and circumstances which demand united hemisphere decisions if there is not to be unilateral action by the United States. We should, if this failed, make clear that we intended to carry out our obligation to defend the Hemisphere under the Rio Treaty alone if necessary.

Since action by the United Nations would be subject to a Soviet veto, there would be no point in involving the sanctions of that body against a Caribbean puppet which is armed, directed, and supported by Moscow.

I recommend this course of action for two reasons which seem to me to be conclusive.

First, it is the only honorable course by which, if our Western Hemisphere policy is to revert to the Monroe Doctrine, we can establish the practical necessity for such a decision.

Second, it is the only manly, straightforward, open-and-aboveboard manner of obtaining national and world respect for the courage and power of the American people when faced with a crucial challenge to the survival of freedom in the very heart of the Western Hemisphere.

It is essential that we dispel the impression that we are quite willing to urge other people to have the courage of our convictions but shrink from accepting difficult and dangerous responsibilities, even when our own vital interests are threatened.

Above all, it is essential that a time when the administration is struggling with the threatened Communist capture of Laos and with the massive peril to NATO which results from the current Algerian crisis, the world, in general, and the Soviet Union in particular should be under no illusion as to our will and ability to defend ourselves and our friends as well in the Caribbean as in Western Europe or southeast Asia.

It is my conviction that the American people have the faith and the fortitude, the strength and the restraint, to make good their commitment to the cause of human freedom, whenever and wherever it may be threatened. And I am sure that in these troubled times the President and the administration can count on this Nation's unstinted devotion and support in any course of self-reliant action which is frank, honorable, and worthy of 10 generations of patriotic Americans who have gone before us.

#### OREGON DUNES NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, ceaseless motion of the sea shapes and molds our Nation's coastline every hour of the day. But the inexorable changes thus wrought pale in significance when compared to another force at work on our vanishing shoreline. I refer, of course, to the pressures of population,

increased industrialization and erosion by commercialism.

Like King Canute, we cannot slow the tides with wishes but we can provide legislative safeguards to the outstanding scenic grandeur of our seacoast. This, of course, is the moving spirit behind the efforts to give national park status to recreation areas at Cape Cod in Massachusetts, Padre Island in Texas, Point Reyes in California, and the magnificent sand dunes of Oregon.

At a recent meeting in Portland, Oreg., a group of citizens formed a statewide committee to support establishment of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore Recreation Area. I was pleased to learn of the program undertaken by these public-spirited individuals. They have adopted a worthy and significant objective.

Because of the interest in the Oregon Dunes National Seashore proposal, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Eugene Register-Guard of February 16, 1961, and one of a series of three articles written for the Oregon Journal by Mr. Anthony Netboy, an outstanding authority on conservation and natural resource development in the State of Oregon.

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

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Feb. 16, 1961]

#### USE OF PARKS

Our park systems, whether they be Federal, State, county or city, continue to get increasing use by the public.

The Lane County parks system, in operation only a relatively few years, had an estimated 1,266,500 visitors in 1960, nearly a 100-percent gain over the use of the 27 county park areas in 1959.

The county park receiving the largest number of visitors was Harbor Vista Park overlooking the outlet of the Siuslaw River near Florence. Here, an estimated 737,000 people came in 1960. It is obvious this attraction, along with other nearby recreation areas, meant considerable to the economy of the Florence area.

This being the case, imagine the visits a National Dunes Seashore Park would create. It would gain nationwide tourist attention by virtue of being a national park. Because of nationwide publicity it would generate huge numbers of tourists. This would not only be a tremendous boost for the Florence area but also for the entire Oregon coast.

[From the Oregon Journal, Mar. 22, 1961]  
PLANNED SAND DUNES SEASHORE STILL PART OF PUBLIC DOMAIN

(By Anthony Netboy)

There is little unspoiled and accessible seacoast left in the United States. In its survey of the Atlantic and gulf coasts, the National Park Service a few years ago found only 240 out of 3,700 miles of shoreline in Federal and State ownership and open to the public.

On the Pacific coast, where settlement began much later, a considerably larger area of untarnished coast is still open to the public. Oregon has more accessible coastline than any other State in the Nation, thanks to its foresighted policy of putting its beaches in public ownership. As we drive along the coast we rarely see such signs as are common along the Atlantic Coast—"Private Property," "No Trespassing," or "Subdivision: Lots for Sale."

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, THROUGH  
ITS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,  
CALLS FOR PASSAGE OF COLD  
WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the State of California has seen the great and pressing need for a program of education and job training assistance for our post-Korean veterans and its State assembly has adopted a State resolution urging passage of S. 349, the cold war GI bill that was introduced by 37 U.S. Senators in January. California thus joins a number of other States which have adopted resolutions favoring legislation for cold war veterans' education.

There is particular significance in the resolution from California, for in the next 5 years 127,000 California veterans, more than in any other single State, are expected to go to school or undertake vocational training under the proposed cold war bill.

Figures show that through June 30, 1960, more than 233,000 California veterans were trained under the Korean GI bill. This was tops for the Nation.

The California Legislature, taking note of the great number of Korean veterans that have been benefited from the Korean G.I. bill in its State, now goes on record as supporting the proposed cold war GI bill that would give another large number of deserving young cold war veterans the same educational opportunities.

In its resolution, California cites two needs of the Nation the cold war GI bill will meet.

A portion of the bill states:

Our Nation has found it necessary to its security, well-being, and position among nations to increase the educational level, professional competence, and the technical skill of the citizens.

In reading from another portion of the resolution, the California Legislature states that:

The increased earning power, increased efficiency in commerce and industry, and increased national production in income directly attributable to the program of education and training benefits for servicemen results in increased tax revenues of the Government so that the cost of the program is largely repaid by the increased tax revenues.

Mr. President, it becomes increasingly evident with each passing day that legislation such as the proposed cold war GI bill, is one of the great and most immediate needs of the Nation.

Dangers confront us on every side, and, as never before, this Nation must present a strong, intelligent proficient citizenry.

Our hope for the future rests in our young people, our cold war veterans. We must not deny them a chance to realize their every potential.

If this Nation is to remain strong, if this Nation is to remain the leader of the free world, we must provide for the educational needs of our young people.

Today there are in college only half the number of students there should be in college.

Two of the greatest needs of our youth are education and vocational skills. The cold war GI bill gives assistance in both fields. And, since only 45 percent of our young men see military service under the present operation of the draft law, the cold war GI bill is an act of justice that will help this otherwise discriminated-against group regain their lost time and lost educational opportunity, which may otherwise be lost forever.

The cold war GI bill is no longer legislation we should merely enact, it is legislation we must enact to safeguard this land and all we hold sacred.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution from the State of California, supporting the cold war GI bill, with the official certificate from the California Assembly, be printed in the RECORD.

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

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION B

Joint resolution relative to the extension of educational and training benefits to persons entering the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955

Whereas the Congress of the United States has recognized the justice, equity, and benefits to the Nation arising from giving educational and training benefits to veterans by enacting the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346 of the 78th Cong.) and the Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1952 (Public Law 550 of the 32d Cong.); and

Whereas the benefits under these acts are no longer provided to servicemen who entered the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955, notwithstanding the fact that the Nation has continued its compulsory military service program; and

Whereas the result is that many young men who serve in our country's armed services will lose educational and economic opportunities even though the need for education for the purpose of competing in civilian life continues to be of great importance; and

Whereas our Nation has found it necessary to its security, well-being and position among nations to increase the educational level, professional competence, and technical skill of its citizens; and

Whereas the increased earning power, increased efficiency in commerce and industry, and increased national product and income directly attributable to the program of educational and training benefits for servicemen results in increased tax revenues of the United States Government so that the cost of the program is largely repaid by the increased tax revenues: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to extend educational and training benefits similar to benefits provided by Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress as amended, to all persons who served, or who may serve, subject to such changes by law or regulation as Congress may deem fit to impose, in the Armed Forces of the United States during any period in which compulsory military service was or remains in effect; and be it further*

*Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from*

California in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted in assembly March 26, 1960.

RALPH M. BROWN,

Speaker of the Assembly.

ARTHUR A. OHNIMUS,

Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Adopted in senate March 26, 1960.

GLENN M. ANDERSON,

President of the Senate.

J. A. BEEK

Secretary of the Senate.

FRANK M. JORDAN,

Secretary of State.

By WALTER C. STUTLER,

Assistant Secretary of State.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all whom these presents shall come,  
greetings:

I, Frank M. Jordan, secretary of state of the State of California, hereby certify:

That the annexed transcript has been compared with the record on file in my office, of which it purports to be a copy, and that the same is full, true, and correct.

In testimony whereof, I, Frank M. Jordan, secretary of state, have hereunto caused the great seal of the State of California to be affixed and my name subscribed, at the city of Sacramento, in the State of California, this 20th day of April 1961.

FRANK M. JORDAN,

Secretary of State.

By WALTER C. STUTLER,

Assistant Secretary of State.

INDEPENDENCE DAY IN SIERRA  
LEONE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that today is Independence Day in Sierra Leone. As Americans, we are glad to see more peoples of the world join the ranks of freedom, and we welcome to the community of free nations this West African State. A former British dependency, Sierra Leone will replace South Africa as the 12th member of the Commonwealth and, in all likelihood, will become the 100th member of the United Nations.

Most Americans are now very much aware of Africa. The press carries daily reminders of the revolutionary forces bringing change to that continent. We see distinguished African diplomats playing constructive roles at the United Nations and realize that their presence there affects the balance of world power and promises to be a force for peace.

I cherish the belief and hope that the United States will win the confidence and respect of the new and nascent African nations. It must be admitted, though, that our advantage today is certainly not as great as it was 5 years ago, 1 year ago, or perhaps even 1 week ago.

Too often our actions have not been based on sound, long-term policy, but have been short-range responses to immediate crises, responses which have sometimes been determined not by African considerations but by non-African ones. Tanganyika's Julius Nyerere has said that we have made African policy with one eye on Moscow, one eye on NATO, and no eyes on Africa. I think this is a severe judgment, but

there may have been instances that tend to give it validity.

Regardless of our attitude toward Sékou Touré, he may have expressed the attitude of other African leaders when he said:

We judge our relations with other countries on the basis of their attitude and political concepts toward Africa as a whole, toward colonialism, the right to self-determination and economic development. There can be no middle way, no compromise between colonial interest and African interest which are contradictory by nature and by definition. The United States cannot rightly hope that Africa will be erected on a foundation brought about by zones of influence and colonial interests.

We have been plagued by our ambivalence on the colonial question. Even worse has been our use of a cold war analysis for Africa. Those who know Africa will tell us that the surest way to alienate Africans from the West is to insist on active participation on our side in the East-West conflict. It may be that we misunderstand the questions African countries are asking. They do not ask, "How can we be pro-West?" Nor do they ask, "How can we be pro-Communist?" Let us assume that they sincerely seek from us an answer to a question of greater importance to them, "How can we make use of Western ideas, institutions, and techniques without ceasing to be African?"

President Kennedy has demonstrated his desire to assist Africans to develop solutions to their problems. He has shown a determination to forge positive and constructive relations between African nations and the United States.

The things we can offer are of the mind and spirit as well as material. We will find echoes in Africa of the words, principles, and valor of our own fight for independence, the vitality of our unstratified society, our true and often misunderstood generosity, and the vast humanitarian efforts made possible by our technologically advanced but kindly people.

#### CUBA

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the events of last week in Cuba constitute a serious setback for the cause of freedom and, because the cause of freedom is our cause, for the United States.

Of necessity, the American people are compelled to reappraise their position, not only in the Western Hemisphere but also in the whole free world, and to assess the policies and assumptions under which so disastrous a miscalculation was possible.

Already there have appeared eloquent demands that this country revert to the unilateral position which underlies the Monroe Doctrine and find ways to reconcile our commitments to the United Nations and the Organization of American States with the clear imperatives of national self-defense.

On one and the same day, Monday, the 24th of April, two distinguished commentators voiced the identical concept of an American nation which was prepared to break away from its formal en-

agements and go it alone in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Stewart Alsop, substituting for his brother, Mr. Joseph Alsop, in the column "Matter of Fact" voiced one concept. He is a distinguished writer and a keen student of foreign affairs and national security. In his column, Stewart Alsop editorially complained of President Kennedy's two key decisions in the Cuban fiasco.

The plan for the operation which the President inherited from President Eisenhower—

He wrote—

involved the use of American armed forces—for example, naval air power—if necessary to assure the success of the operation. President Kennedy's first key decision was to rule out the use of any American forces whatever, under any conditions whatever. His second decision was to announce the first decision, just as the operation began.

The public announcement that American forces would under no circumstances be involved was reiterated twice by the President himself and four times with even more emphasis by Secretary of State Dean Rusk. The announcement obviously greatly reduced the likelihood of a general uprising in Cuba, which was the main purpose of the Cuban operation. It also quite unnecessarily tied the President's hands in advance.

Mr. Alsop's column concluded with these statements:

Some day, one way or another, the American commitment to bring Castro down will have to be honored. The commitment can only be honored if the American Government is willing, if necessary, to strike to kill, even if that risks the shedding of American blood.

The same concepts were voiced in less agonized terms by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, the responsible and progressive-minded commentator of the New York Herald Tribune. Mr. Drummond pointed out:

While we say that a Soviet military and political base in the Western Hemisphere is intolerable, we stand committed to a policy of noninterference which was made for a different world and set of circumstances than we now face.

The dilemma is: Do we continue to stand aside and watch the mounting buildup of Soviet power in Cuba? Or do we act alone, even if this action is unpopular with our Latin American neighbors, who prefer to close their eyes to the problem?

By treaty and policy we are bound not to interfere in the internal affairs of the Organization of American States. This is the longstanding United States and inter-American policy of nonintervention.

But through these same inter-American treaties we are committed to resist the spread of communism to the Western Hemisphere and penetration by any non-American power. I am sure—

Mr. Drummond concludes—

that Mr. Kennedy means exactly what he says—that the United States will not indefinitely tolerate a Cuban Soviet Socialist state anchored in the Communist bloc of Russia and that we will act alone, if necessary. \* \* \* The struggle must not be ended until the tyranny is overthrown.

These views reflect generally the broad mood of patriotic resentment at the failure of an American-backed and supported attempt by Cuban exiles to overthrow the Castro dictatorship and

thus abate the Soviet nuisance only 90 deadly miles from our shores.

They also reflect, in my judgment, the sense of national humiliation at the way in which the Cuban rebels were exposed to military disaster, while we stood by and watched their doomed expedition crushed by Soviet planes, tanks and artillery. Not only the American people but also our friends throughout the free world share distaste for the self-righteousness of our U.N. representative in disclaiming any responsibility for the expedition and for the lack of candor and straight-forwardness on the part of our Government. There is a general feeling, which I share, that the time has come for our Government to sing bass in world affairs and not take refuge in shrill Byzantine ambiguities in a matter which involves our very safety as a nation and as individuals.

The real tragedy in the Cuban situation is that it failed. When the United States gets in any way involved in such an undertaking as we did in Guatemala, as we did in Cuba, the effort must succeed. Such a situation requires bold actions equal to bold words. Communist jet planes in Cuba should have been met with jet planes. Communist arms of 1961 in Cuba should have been met with arms of 1961 and not with arms of 1945.

But that does not imply that we should jump to the conclusion that the immediate solution is to ignore our treaty obligations and revert to a policy of glorious isolation or completely unilateral action. On the contrary, I say that it is the duty of Americans to avoid any actions which exaggerate the gravity of this setback or which divert attention from the important task ahead of us.

I regret that President Kennedy did not see fit to consult any Republican leaders, either congressional or national, before he committed his administration to the action in Cuba. But I applaud his honesty in accepting full responsibility for the blunder and his humility in now calling on the Republicans to give him understanding and support in this hour of failure. This support, of course, has been readily forthcoming and to a degree which is sufficient commentary on the outspokenly critical attitude of some Democrats toward previous international actions by the Eisenhower administration. I will simply ask the country and the Congress to consider what the Democratic leadership and spokesmen would have said had Dick Nixon landed us in this predicament.

But now is not the time for recriminations or postmortems. Today it is the duty of Americans to refrain from any utterance which limit the President's freedom of action in coping with the danger which the advance of communism presents to freemen everywhere.

For example, there may have been exaggeration of the consequences of the defeat by Castro of a pitifully inadequate invasion force dispatched, as the whole world knows, with the approval and material support of the United States. This exaggeration should not