

the oft rejected multiple price system long resisted by the Corn Belt and by small, family-sized farmers of the East operating under the 15-acre exemption.

The Kennedy-Freeman-Cochrane proposal would bypass the Congress in two major respects. Whatever 1962 wheat program the Secretary may devise would be put into effect without any review or opportunity for amendment by the Congress. The overall fantastic control scheme envisaged by this bill would allow the Congress only 60 days to look at its "basic features." And, second, the proposal would allow all this to be carried out through the back door of the Treasury without the prior approval of the Appropriations Committee.

That in substance is this new frontier for agriculture. What is it? Certainly not the land of freedom and plenty. This new agriculture frontier for all of us—farmers and consumers—is an arid desert of Government dependency, economic disaster, and individual despair.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman intimated as I recall in the debate that took place in connection with the grain sorghums program bill that probably what he has described here today could occur. I also remember that in one of the original statements concerning the legislation it was said that some 8 million people have departed from the farms of our Nation in the last several years.

Does the gentleman feel as a result of the new program possibly additional farmers will be added to those who have not been able to remain on farms?

Mr. ARENDS. It is possible that trend will continue, but far and above that is the pattern as we visualize it here today, the complete regimentation of every segment of agriculture. We cannot get away from that. We are automatically going into controls on livestock as well as other things.

Mr. BECKWORTH. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to make this comment, that controls have been most rigid in connection with the cotton program for 20 years. In my opinion this has caused many small farmers to be compelled to leave farms.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3935) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to \$1.25 an hour, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? The Chair hears none, and ap-

points the following conferees: Messrs. POWELL, ROOSEVELT, DENT, KEARNS, and AYRES.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4884) to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal financial participation in aid for dependent children of unemployed parents, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume this has been cleared with the leadership on this side of the aisle?

Mr. KEOGH. I am sure of it.

Mr. GROSS. Well, is the gentleman so stating?

Mr. KEOGH. I am stating it. I just left our committee, and it was at the direction of the chairman of the committee, with the members of the minority, who will be on the committee of conference, present.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, KING of California, O'BRIEN of Illinois, MASON, and BYRNES of Wisconsin.

Cuba

SECRETARY UDALL AND CUBA

(Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, during a television interview, Interior Secretary Stewart Udall made an appalling remark about the Cuban crisis.

At a time when President Kennedy is striving to insure bipartisan unity in this deepening crisis, Mr. Udall saw fit to drive a wedge between our parties by attempting to place the blame for the Cuban debacle upon the shoulders of former President Eisenhower and Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Udall had the remarkable bad taste to say that the anti-Castro Cuban invasion was conceived by General Eisenhower and Mr. Nixon a year ago and that "they started it and handed it over to Mr. Kennedy. Eisenhower directed it. Another administration carried it out."

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee of the House I have had the benefit of background briefings on this evolving situation. Therefore I can say with conviction that Mr. Udall's statements are pure and unadulterated hogwash.

If Mr. Udall is seeking to place the responsibility for a grave situation on other shoulders than those of the administration he represents let him look elsewhere for his scapegoat.

The Secretary did refer to the picture of American unity that the eyes of the world must behold if we are to be effective in this, and other, crises. The meetings President Kennedy has been having with Republican leaders such as Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Nixon, and his forthcoming meeting with Governor Rockefeller will contribute substantially to such unity. I submit that this is the way in which the administration can assure bipartisan support, not in the shoddy manner Mr. Udall has seen fit to employ.

It is my sincere hope that the Kennedy administration will see fit to brief its cabinet officers in such a way that they will be properly informed before making appearances in which they are sure to be asked to comment on issues of the day.

In the meantime, I would suggest that the Interior Secretary undertake to smooth the waters of bipartisanship which he has so greatly troubled by his rash and inaccurate statement.

Mr. Speaker, because of its background information and commentary in this entire matter, I would like to include at this time for insertion in the RECORD a column by Mr. Stewart Alsop entitled, "Matter of Fact", from this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald:

IF YOU STRIKE AT A KING

(By Stewart Alsop)

Sometimes it is useful to state the obvious. After the events of the last tragic week, and especially after what President Kennedy said in his speech to the editors, Fidel Castro cannot indefinitely be permitted to survive in triumph. The prestige and even the honor of the United States are now obviously and wholly committed to Castro's ultimate downfall.

There is hardly anybody in the higher reaches of the Kennedy administration who does not agree that this commitment to Castro's destruction now in fact exists. And yet President Kennedy and his advisers certainly did not plan the commitment. On the contrary, the President's key decision in regard to the Cuban operation were specifically designed to avoid such a commitment.

There were two key decisions made by the President after he decided to give the operation a green light. The plan for the operation which the President inherited from President Eisenhower involved the use of American armed force—for example, naval airpower—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.

After the operation began to go bad, at an all-day meeting at the White House on Wednesday, certain of the President's military and civilian advisers favored active American intervention. They argued that the operation simply could not be allowed to fail, if only because the United States would in that event become in the eyes of the world the most pappy of paper tigers. The President might well have favored this course

6226

himself, if he had not so publicly tied his own hands in advance. Why did he do so? This reporter has tried hard to find the answer to that question, and must confess a partial failure. The fact is that there has been something oddly uncharacteristic about the President's role in the Cuban affair. To be sure, since the operation failed, his actions have been wholly characteristic of the man—he has taken the whole responsibility for the failure on himself and he has passed the word down the line that there will be no recriminations and no scapegoat hunt. The uncharacteristic phase came earlier.

Throughout his career—as for example in his decision to enter the key Wisconsin and West Virginia primaries last year—Mr. Kennedy has always looked before he leaped. He had looked very hard, carefully weighing every conceivable factor likely to affect the outcome. And then he has leaped very hard, using every conceivable means to assure success.

In the looking phase of the Cuban operation, Mr. Kennedy was certainly the victim of bad intelligence. But intelligence is and always has been two-thirds guesswork, and it is hard to believe that the President adequately weighed the consequences of failure. This is further borne out by the fact that the leaping phase of the operation was, by past Kennedy standards, so uncharacteristically tentative. The idea that Castro could be brought down without any risk at all of using American men or arms recalls the old rhyme of dubious origin:

"Mother, may I go out to swim?
 "Yes, my darling daughter;
 "Hang your clothes on a hickory limb
 "And don't go near the water."

At least part of the explanation for the markedly un-Kennedylike quality of the President's role in the first phase of the Cuban operation lies with United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, whose voice is listened to with respect in the Kennedy administration.

From his own point of view it was quite natural that Stevenson would strongly favor a categorical promise that American forces would not be used in Cuba. The peculiar holler-than-thou public stance which succeeding American delegations to the UN have always thought it necessary to assume was difficult to sustain in any case, in view of the obvious American complicity in the Cuban operation. Without the Kennedy promise, it would have been impossible to sustain.

Kennedy has spoken of "the lessons we have learned" from the tragic Cuban episode. One lesson, surely, is that what pleases the majority of the strangely assorted gaggle of more or less sovereign nations which now constitute the UN General Assembly does not necessarily serve the national interest of the United States. Another lesson is summed up in the old adage, "If you strike at a king, you must strike to kill."

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.

WINNER OF COOK COUNTY, ILL., AMERICAN LEGION ORATORICAL CONTEST

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion, Department of Illinois, has recently, through its official oratori-

cal judicial staff, under the auspices of the Americanism committee, made its selection of the 1961 oratorical winner's speech for the first division council contest, entitled, "America and the Constitution: Past, Present and Future," by Thomas L. Brejcha, Jr., of Mount Carmel High School, Chicago, Ill.

The American Legion has fostered and promoted many patriotic movements among our youth, such as girls' and boys' states, poor boys' camps, and welfare and charitable programs, but none are as far reaching as the oratorical and essay contests.

The thousands of youngsters throughout the public and parochial primary and high school grades in Illinois, compete for this high honor.

The hours spent in research of patriotic subjects and historical works stimulate patriotic thoughts and knowledge of both our patriotic leaders and their concept of our Constitution in its use and control of our Government.

Thus, we give our youth an opportunity to study our Government and the intricacies of its constitutional operation. This training is of tremendous value in molding our future citizens for their civic responsibilities in the future.

Mr. Frank C. Bottigliero, State director of rehabilitation, manager of the Chicago office, and formerly chairman of the State Americanism committee, who trained under my deceased brother, Eliodor Libonati, chairman of the Americanism committee for many years before his death, and who was responsible for many of the American Legion's Americanism programs, sent me the following letter:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
 Chicago, Ill., April 20, 1961.

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
 U.S. Congressman,
 Seventh District,
 Chicago, Ill.

DEAR LIE: Enclosed please find the oration of the 1961 oratorical winner for the first division council contest which I talked to you about and you said that if we would send a copy to you you would have it entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

FRANK C. BOTTIGLIERO,
 State Director of Rehabilitation, Manager
 of the Chicago Office.

AMERICA AND THE CONSTITUTION: PAST,
 PRESENT, AND FUTURE
 (By Thomas L. Brejcha, Jr., Mount Carmel
 High School, Chicago, Ill.)

The scene is State and Madison Streets—the "crossroads of the world"—in Chicago, Ill., my hometown. It is any hour of the working day, almost any day in the year. Everywhere there are people here, all the different types and sorts of people imaginable—Protestants, Catholics, and Jews—whites, Negroes, and orientals—shoppers, executives, and plumbers—all moving and pushing in a ceaseless surge, each going his own way and minding his own business. And yet, all those different people, all those different races, religions, and occupations have something very much in common: all are freemen; all are Americans.

Yes, here in America we are all freemen, regardless of origin, race, or creed. We are free to ply our trades, enjoy our leisure, and accept the challenge of a New Frontier. We are free to scale the tallest mountain—to write poetry—to raise our families as we see fit. In America you and I are free to dream

the dreams that no mere man has ever dared dream before * * * and see those dreams become reality before our very eyes. All these things we may choose to do because we are freemen, each and every one of us, and this is America.

But many years ago, this blessed and prosperous land that we know today as the United States was but a hapless conglomeration of political factions, guided by selfish interest, bitterly opposed to any notion of union. However, soon were the advocates of the Articles of Confederation to realize that a house of dissension offered no security to a fledgling America, that the best guarantee of individual liberty and freedom was a Constitution that was also a ligament of national unity.

And so it was that a group of eminent statesmen, representing some of the best talents in the land, gathered in Philadelphia in 1787 to rescue a nation from the crucible of political chaos. During the many days and weeks that followed, the red brick walls of the Pennsylvania State House were to resound with the clash of harsh voices and strained tempers. There was Jefferson, young and impetuous, who opposed any modification of a pure Athenian democracy; there was Hamilton, arrogant and aristocratic, who scorned any attempt at Government by mere "common men"; and there was Washington, august and determined, whose only concern was to preserve a hard-won independence from internal dissolution. There were many others—the Gouverneur Morris, the Franklins, the Madisons—and almost as many different points of view. But within that turbulent chamber an even greater spirit would prevail—a spirit that could not be dispelled by faction. From Hamilton's Federalism and Jefferson's Localism came an equitable distribution of power between national and State government; from the interaction of aristocracy and democracy came the ideal middle ground of a popular Republic; by conciliation and compromise both the radical and the conservative idea were synthesized to form the foundations of the American society which we enjoy to this day.

But as the signatories pressed their seal upon the newly formed Constitution of the United States, they realized that only the first obstacle had been hurdled. The document that British Prime Minister Gladstone had once described as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given moment by the brain and purpose of man" was, nevertheless, only a mere document * * * a piece of parchment. The only true test for a system of government is the test of time.

The Founding Fathers envisioned for their young Nation a long and glorious history. And under our Constitution we have had that long and glorious history, but only through the devotion, sweat, and blood of our predecessors in their unswerving resolution to protect and cherish our way of life and its vital institutions. During the nearly two centuries that have elapsed since the ship of American statehood was launched toward its ultimate destiny, men have had to strive to overcome the evil that hates freedom—not only on the battlefield, but in their everyday lives. In face of economic and military crises alike, the Federalist, the anti-Federalist, the Democrat, the Whig, and the Republican have together rallied around their common Americanism. And only once throughout all these many years has the Constitution ever failed us, and that was during the time of the Civil War—when we failed it.

And now, in this very day, Americans face a greater time of trial than ever before. A short, squat man has thrust a pudgy finger in our direction with the foreboding message: "We will bury you." The communistic evil which he embodies threatens not only the economic superiority of our enlightened capitalism, but our very existence as free

There are philosophers and historians who, while they may dispute the Communist interpretation of the outcome of inevitable forces, nonetheless believe that the decisions of men are determined by the operation of vast forces beyond their control.

But we who uphold freedom believe that men determine events; that men can, by the exercise of their reason, by their free choice, change themselves, change their community, change their country, and change the course of the world struggle.

We must believe, therefore, that sufficient foresight and proper reading of clear Communist intentions by Western statesmen could have saved Eastern Europe; that proper evaluation and determined action could have saved China; that boldness at the critical hour could have saved Indochina; that a determined will to win could have saved North Korea; that simple commonsense could have saved us from the present Cuban fiasco.

Wrong decisions result in defeat; right decisions result in victory. We of the free world have consistently lost because we have made a whole series of wrong decisions, based on faulty philosophy and poor information. That is our trouble.

It is senseless to say, in a spirit of misplaced sportsmanship or in a gush of superficial unity, "Let's not look back; let's not be Monday morning quarterbacks; let's not blame individuals for what has happened. Let's hope that the future will be better and move forward with the same philosophy, the same policies, the same team."

I believe that only new policies and new attitudes can reverse the decline of the West. Unless, after such a fiasco as our 3-year Cuban policy, we find out and nail down which recommendations, which misinformation, which decisions, which attitudes, which particular men brought us down to defeat, we will gain nothing from our reverses and will only proceed to newer and greater disasters.

It is in this spirit that I wish to examine certain aspects of the American policy failure that brought Fidel Castro to power in Cuba.

It has become customary to blame Castro's emergence on the poverty of the Cuban peasant masses, on the abuses of the Batista dictatorship, on American identification with the Batista dictatorship, on everything but our own lack of understanding and our own misconceived policy.

I agree that there was poverty in Cuba, that there was a need for social reform, that the Batista dictatorship was repressive and unpopular, that until near the end we did not take the necessary measures to indicate that we did not approve of its excesses. But all this still does not explain Castro's rise to power.

I am convinced that the situation could have been saved had we embarked upon an intelligent and energetic policy as late as 1958 or even 1959. An examination of our policy during this last period will reveal, at the very least, a consistent wrongheadedness which is nothing short of frightening.

If Batista had fallen and had been replaced by a democratic, and therefore pro-Western, government, there would have been every reason to rejoice. But the fact is that when Batista fell, his regime was replaced by an infinitely more evil dictatorship, and a dictatorship, to boot, controlled from the Kremlin and dedicated to the subversion of Latin America.

I say that there was nothing inevitable about this.

There was opposition to the Batista dictatorship, especially in the cities. But this did not mean that the Cuban people were pro-Castro. At no time did Castro have more than 2,000 men under him in the Sierra Maestra mountains. Although they engaged in sabotage, Castro's "barbudos" fought no important engagements and had not serious military significance.

The real opposition to Batista was based on the middle class and the student body and the Catholic Church in the cities. This opposition was pro-democratic, overwhelmingly anti-Communist, and only vaguely sympathetic to Castro because he appeared to be moving in the same direction. It has been estimated that the urban opposition to Batista suffered 11,000 casualties compared with the 1,000 casualties suffered by Castro's forces from the beginning to the end of their insurrection. But this urban opposition movement lacked leadership, lacked unity, lacked publicity and, above all, it lacked American encouragement.

If the State Department was really convinced that the Batista regime had so lost the support of the people that its downfall had to be accelerated, why was no effort made to encourage the formation of a democratic middle of the road movement as an alternative to Castro? Surely it would have required very little encouragement to foster such a movement.

Why did we not take the initiative in urging elections under the supervision of the OAS? And why did we turn a deaf ear to Batista in 1958 when he seemed disposed to consider such elections?

Why was there no alert to the danger that if Batista were toppled while Castro, with his scattering of followers, commanded the only united and cohesive opposition movement, the consequence, the clearly inevitable consequence, would be the emergence of a Communist dictatorship in the heart of the Caribbean?

Why did we close our eyes to the operation of Castro agents on American soil, to the shipments of arms that went out from Florida to Castro and to the constant departure of reinforcements for the Sierra Maestra guerrillas?

These are questions that require answers. I think the answer to this is that our State Department was inclined to look upon the Castro movement as an agrarian reform movement, as it was once inclined to look upon the Chinese Communists as agrarian reformers. And so we decided to put all of our eggs in the Castro basket, to force Batista out so that Castro could take over, and to hope for the best.

The Subcommittee on Internal Security has taken testimony indicating that this was so from three former U.S. Ambassadors: Ambassador Arthur Gardner, Ambassador Earl E. T. Smith, and Ambassador William Pawley. According to them, the State Department either ignored or appeared not disposed to believe their repeated warnings that most of Castro's chief lieutenants, and probably Fidel Castro himself, were Moscow Communists.

Raul Castro, Che Guevara, and some of Castro's other top henchmen had received training in Moscow; this was commonly known. Fidel himself had played a leading role in the Bogotá riots of 1949, which cost the lives of 1,000 people, and he had been publicly denounced at the time by the Colombia radio as a foreign Communist agitator.

For a long time there was a lot of wishful thinking to the effect that Fidel Castro was probably not a Communist because there was no proof that he carried a Communist membership card and the Communists sometimes appeared to have differences with him. What a tenuous assumption on which to base American foreign policy.

Fidel Castro may not carry a Communist membership card to this day. But for all practical purposes he is a Communist. No one, I think, would now challenge this statement.

This was as true of Fidel Castro yesterday as it is today. He was known to be pro-Soviet, and anti-American. His own brother and others of his chief lieutenants were graduates of Moscow. And finally, there was his role in the Bogotá riots. Latin American students, by tradition, have a penchant for joining revolutionary movements in their own countries. But it is not part of their national tradition to travel to other countries for the purpose of instigating murderous riots. The pattern here is almost conclusively suggestive of Communist affiliation. Certainly, the Colombian police had no doubt on this score.

The question must be asked: Why was the information about the Communist direction of the Castro movement not given to the people of the United States and of Cuba before Castro seized power? Why were the American people permitted, if not encouraged, to believe, for a period of more than a year, that the Castro movement, although it might contain certain Communists, was essentially an agrarian reform movement?

I am certain that Secretary Herter did not willfully suppress information of such critical importance. But if the State Department had this information and it was not passed on to the Secretary of State, or if it was passed on in a diluted manner, or if Secretary Herter was "protected" from his ambassadors, then it is important to know who in the Department was responsible for this delinquency.

I have said that our Cuban policy disaster may be traced back to the same fallacious political policy that has led us to disaster after disaster in the postwar period.

We have suffered from an almost ob-
sessional attitude toward all the failings
on our side, toward every aberration
from simonpure democracy in our own
society and on the part of our allies.

I believe that this exaggerated, ultra-
liberal preoccupation with the failings
on our side, has induced a tendency to
minimize the failings and evils that exist
on the other side. The proponents of
this philosophy have felt that there exists
on both sides good and evil, the same
human frailty, the same capacity for
human failing, the same desire for peace
and understanding. Coexistence, there-
fore, is possible and it must be sought
after even at the cost of further com-
promises.

This tendency to believe the best of
communism while believing the worst
about ourselves and the free world has
wrought massive and irreparable damage
since the close of World War II.

In the case of China, there were our
desk-position policymakers who hated
Chiang Kai-shek so much that they were
happy to see him defeated and to help
precipitate his defeat, even though the
obvious consequence was the establish-
ment of a Communist regime in China.

In the case of Korea, American influ-
ence only last year exerted itself to force
Syngman Rhee out of power, ostensibly
because his regime was autocratic and
inefficient. In doing so, we did not stop
to ask what the consequence of this
would be. In my opinion, the successor
governments had suffered from the same
characteristic Asian autocracy and in-
efficiency, but they have lacked Syngman
Rhee's iron determination to stand up
against communism.

In the case of Cuba, as I had pointed
out, we were guilty of the same error,
when we accelerated Batista's downfall
at a time when no democratic alterna-
tive had been prepared, and when his
downfall could only lead to a Castro
government.

What I find particularly perplexing
is that many of those who protest against
the autocratic features of the Syngman
Rhee regime, of the Chiang Kai-shek
regime, are prepared to swallow autoc-
racy and dictatorship wholesale if they
have a "progressive" label pinned on
them.

The regime of Kwame Nkrumah in
Ghana is infinitely more dictatorial and
oppressive, for example, than the Syng-
man Rhee regime was at its worst. But
it is not criticized, presumably because
it speaks in the name of "social reform"
and "anti-imperialism." The Toure re-
gime in Guinea has already assumed
many of the trappings of Soviet totali-
tarianism. But we are urged to avoid
abuse in dealing with Guinea and to seek
to win Toure over to our side.

It is time to take inventory of our
position. We can no longer afford the
luxury of toppling friendly anti-Com-
munist regimes simply because they do
not adhere to the norms of democracy
that civilized society has taken centuries
to evolve.

In World War II, to save ourselves
from the evils of Nazism, we entered
into a military alliance with Soviet to-
talitarianism, which was equally as

evil. As Churchill put the matter: "If
a lion were about to devour me, and a
crocodile came along and started biting
off the lion's foot, I should welcome this
assistance, even though I have no par-
ticular fondness for crocodiles."

It is time that we start building our
alliances as best as we can, never en-
dorsing dictatorship, using our influence
and example in the interest of greater
freedom, but seeking military agreements
as frank arrangements of convenience,
as we did in World War II.

The President of the United States
has spoken and in words not easily mis-
understood. The Nation is with him,
indeed the entire free world will rally
to his support. He has come forward
with the kind of leadership the West has
demanded—strong and forceful. He has
approached the Cuban crisis with a vigor,
a clarity, and a determination calculat-
ed to crystallize in the minds of national
leaders everywhere the true nature of
aggressive, imperialistic communism.
President Kennedy is generating a unity
among nations not previously experi-
enced—a unity that will thwart the Com-
munist threat while it is consumed by its
own evil.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this
past week it was my privilege to join
with the junior Senator from Pennsyl-
vania [Mr. CLARK] in cosponsoring a bill
to establish a Department of Urban Af-
fairs and Housing.

Because of the importance of this pro-
posal and the widespread interest in it,
I ask unanimous consent that the letter
from the President submitting to the
Congress a draft of the proposed leg-
islation, the bill itself, along with a sec-
tional analysis, and a letter from the
Director of the Budget describing the
measure in detail, be printed at this
point in the RECORD.

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

APRIL 18, 1961.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT, and DEAR Mr.
SPEAKER: I am transmitting for considera-
tion by the Congress draft legislation to
carry out the recommendation in my March
9 message on housing and community de-
velopment calling for the creation of a new
Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs and
Housing.

Two problems standing near the top of
our national priority list are first, preventing
the appalling deterioration of many of our
country's urban areas and rehabilitating the
cities of our Nation which currently con-
tain 70 percent of our people—a figure that
is constantly growing—and second, insuring
the availability of adequate housing for all
segments of our population. Since the Na-
tional Housing Agency was established in
1942, the activities of the Federal Govern-
ment in housing and in working with States
and local communities in the rebuilding of
our urban areas and in preventing their
deterioration has increased steadily. The
importance of this area of Federal activity
merits recognition by the establishment of
the Department of Urban Affairs and Hous-
ing. Thus, the new Secretary of Urban Af-
fairs and Housing will be in a position to
present the Nation's housing and metropol-

itan development needs to the Cabinet and
will by virtue of his position provide the
necessary leadership in coordinating the
many Federal programs in these fields.

In addition to the draft bill, I am en-
closing a letter from the Director of the
Bureau of the Budget describing the legis-
lation in detail. A letter identical to this
one is being sent to the Speaker of the
House of Representatives.

I hope that prompt action can be sched-
uled on this important legislation and that
the Congress will act favorably on the
proposal.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1961.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed
herewith a draft of a bill, "To establish a
Department of Urban Affairs and Housing,
and for other purposes."

The bill carries out your recommendations
for the creation within the executive
branch of a new Cabinet-rank department
to administer Federal programs for com-
munity development and housing contained
in the state of the Union message dated
January 30, 1961, and the message on our
Nation's housing dated March 9, 1961.

The purpose of this legislation is to pro-
vide for full recognition and consideration
of the problems resulting from the rapid
growth in the United States of our urban
and metropolitan areas and needs. Estab-
lishment of the Department of Urban Af-
fairs and Housing will help in achieving
consistent and flexible administration of the
Government's community development and
housing programs, give more effective leader-
ship within the executive branch to the co-
ordination of Federal activities affecting
urban and metropolitan growth and develop-
ment, and foster consultation among Fed-
eral, State, and local officials to contribute
to the solution of urban and metropolitan
development problems.

The bill sets forth a new declaration of
national urban affairs and housing policy,
which states that the welfare and security
of the Nation requires the sound and orderly
growth and development of the Nation's
urban communities. It is declared that the
national policy shall be to assist communi-
ties in developing and carrying out local
programs to meet the problems resulting
from growth and change. Included would be
appropriate Federal concern with and leader-
ship in comprehensive community planning,
eliminating slums and blighted areas and
providing decent homes in a suitable living
environment for the Nation's population,
providing adequate industrial and commer-
cial locations, developing effective urban
mass transportation, and providing public
and recreational facilities and open spaces
around our major population centers.

To help achieve this national policy, the
bill establishes a new executive department,
the Department of Urban Affairs and Hous-
ing, to be headed by a Secretary appointed
by the President with Senate confirmation.
The Department would be under the super-
vision and direction of the Secretary. An
Under Secretary, three Assistant Secretaries,
a General Counsel and an Administrative
Assistant Secretary are also provided for and
would perform duties prescribed by the Sec-
retary. Responsibility would be vested in
the Secretary for all functions currently per-
formed by the Housing and Home Finance
Administrator.

The proposed legislation directs the Sec-
retary to conduct and make available con-
tinuing comprehensive studies of urban de-
velopment and housing. He would advise
the President with respect to Federal pro-
grams contributing to the achievement of

April 24

6200

equal, that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.

Down through their history, the American people have always sympathized with the aspirations of other people for freedom. Nor have we hesitated to intervene on the side of freedom. It was for freedom that we intervened in Cuba in 1898, and in Korea in 1950. And this is why we are intervening in Laos and Berlin today.

If we had seriously intervened on behalf of the Cuban freedom fighters, this, as I see it, would be nothing to apologize for. What we should apologize for is the fact that our intervention was negligently and halfhearted.

If American arms had intervened in last week's battle of the Cochinos beachhead on the same scale as Soviet arms intervened, the outcome of this battle, I am sure, would have been different, and the Castro dictatorship would now have become an evil memory of the past.

Had we intervened effectively, there would today be every reason for rejoicing. The trouble was that our intervention was deficient in planning and determination and scope. This, I believe, was our error; this was the lesson to be learned.

I do not suggest that we should have sent in the Marines to put down the Castro dictatorship. This would have been completely unnecessary. The majority of the Cuban people have come to realize that the Castro regime is not an indigenous reform movement, but a quisling tyranny created by the Kremlin as a base for the subversion of Latin America.

The 100,000 Cuban refugees who have escaped to American soil attest to the intense hatred of the Cuban people for this regime of oppression and misery and national treason. The thousands of Cuban patriots who are fighting in the mountains, in open defiance of Castro's fringing squads, also attest to this.

No regimes in history have created as much popular hatred and revulsion as have the Communist regimes in every country where they have been installed.

The press has made much of the fact that no popular uprising occurred to greet the invasion by the brave band of 600 or 800 patriots that went ashore on the beach at Cochinas. Many newspapers have concluded from this that the estimates of popular discontent in Cuba were greatly exaggerated.

In my own opinion, it proves no such thing. In the first place, we have now learned that, the instant the invasion began, the Castro regime instituted a reign of terror without parallel in this hemisphere. According to newspaper accounts, within a matter of 48 hours, 50,000 people had been rounded up. Think of it. Fifty thousand people in a country of 6 million. This was as though a Communist dictatorship had rounded up 1,500,000 people in the United States and placed them in concentration camps.

In the second place, I believe it is only natural for people living under so cruel a dictatorship to wait for 2 or 3 days, to see how things are going before they decide to risk their own lives.

From the many contacts I have had with Cuban exiles, I am convinced that,

had the battle of the beachhead been decided against Castro, a national uprising would have taken place despite the mass terror and mass executions.

In short, I disagree with the pessimistic, defeatist attitude of those who now say that the invasion was premature. True, it lacked coordination. True, there was bungling. True, more could have been done to soften up the Castro regime in advance. But the chief weakness, as I see it, was the fact that on the eve of the invasion we had not yet faced up to the problem that President Kennedy, in his speech of last Thursday, posed and answered so resolutely.

The first battle was bound to be of critical importance. Yet we had not decided what we were prepared to do and just how far we were prepared to help if the freedom fighters ran into difficulty.

According to the accounts which have reached the press, the battle of the Cochinos beachhead was really decided when Castro threw into the fight Soviet tanks and jet fighter planes. About the presence of Soviet jet aircraft over the beachhead there is still some doubt. But there is not doubt about the role played by Soviet tanks and other Soviet weapons. Nor is there any doubt about the fact that Cuban Communist pilots are in Czechoslovakia today, receiving training in Soviet fighter aircraft.

In my opinion, had we equalized the position on the Cochinos beachhead by providing the freedom fighters with close air support, there might be a different story to tell today.

I say that we should have done so, and that we should be prepared to do so.

We can no longer tolerate a situation in which a quisling totalitarian regime, directed at the subversion of the entire Western Hemisphere, is able to maintain its hold over the Cuban people because of the massive quantities of arms placed in its hands by the Kremlin.

The time is long past due for a firm announcement that we will tolerate no further shipments of Soviet arms to the Western Hemisphere. I believe we should advise both Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Castro that we will tolerate no Soviet military aircraft in Caribbean skies.

I believe that if in the next round of battle we are prepared to give the Cuban freedom fighters the air support necessary to obliterate Communist air power in Cuba, the Cuban freedom fighters will take care of the rest.

In saying these things, I do not mean to ignore or underestimate the bungling which unquestionably took place on our side. The point I wish to make is that this bungling was of secondary importance. The first attempt to liberate Cuba from the Castro tyranny failed for the simple reason that we had yet to make the stern resolve that this fight must not be permitted to fail.

I feel that the entire episode should be subjected to careful review, in executive session, by a committee of Congress. I am opposed to public discussion because I believe that too much has already been said publicly, on the basis of fragmentary or inaccurate information,

about CIA involvement and CIA bungling. Indeed, I feel that the press of our country, in its desire to present all the news, or everything that passes for news, sometimes does a disservice to our national security. Simply by reading the American press, Castro could have learned about the preparations for the invasion, in the most exquisite detail—where the camps were located, how many men were in training, what equipment they had, what their plans were. Castro could truly boast in his first television broadcast that all he had to do to find out about rebel intentions was to read the American press. There is something wrong with such a situation.

In the New York Times for April 22, Mr. Cyrus Sulzberger made the point that CIA's operations have been much too public, that it has not taken sufficient camouflage precautions.

Compare the "Made in U.S.A." label on the Powers case—

Said Mr. Sulzberger—

with the anonymity of Britain's Commander Crabbe or Russia's Colonel Abel, who still denies he worked for Moscow. We must obscure our methods of cold warfare and get the CIA right out of public life. Democracies can sometimes be too curious.

I concur with Mr. Sulzberger. At the same time, I believe that it would help to reassure Congress and reassure the country if CIA's very great powers and its massive operations were placed under the surveillance of a small, tight, joint committee of Congress. I plan to submit such a proposal formally within the next several days.

Some months ago, one of our ablest political analysts said to me that the only thing that can save the United States is a serious but nonfatal defeat. I believe that we have suffered precisely such a defeat in Cuba. But this defeat can only save us if we draw all the hard and bitter lessons from it.

It can only save us if we are prepared to face up to the fact that the installation of the Castro regime in Cuba was the consequence of the same fallacious political philosophy that has led to disaster after disaster in the postwar period.

There is an enormous paradox inherent in the superiority of the free world over the Communist world in the essential elements of strength, and the consistent record of defeat of the free world by communism.

The material resources of the free world in skilled manpower, wealth, arms and machinery are unquestionably greater; our political system demonstrably better; our intellectual resources incontestably superior; our moral and ethical values incomparably higher.

Why, then, do we consistently lose?

Are these defeats due to uncontrollable forces with which the statesmen of the West cannot cope and for which they cannot be held responsible? Or are they the result of specific, recognizable failures—failure of this policy or that source of information, failures of particular men and particular agencies?

The Communists believe that inevitable forces of history are determining the cold war in their favor.

During this period of political half sleep, the whole of central Europe, China, North Korea, North Vietnam, Cuba, and now large portions of Laos and the Congo, have fallen under Communist sway.

There were periods when we seemed to be escaping from our bewitchment. But after each apparent awakening, there was an apparent relapse. After our successes in Greece and Iran, there came the Louis Johnson defense budget. After the Korean war, there came the Korean armistice and the spirit of Geneva. After our shocked reaction to the suppression of the Hungarian revolution, there came the test ban moratorium. After our defiance of Khrushchev's Berlin ultimatum, there came the Khrushchev visit and the spirit of Camp David.

While we have sought after coexistence and grasped eagerly at each new Soviet blandishment, the Communists have been able to take over one position after another in the free world. Today, we stand with our backs to the wall. There is no room for further retreat, because further retreat will threaten us with final disaster.

Now the President of the United States has warned the American people that we face a relentless struggle in every corner of the globe that goes far beyond the clash of armies or even nuclear armaments. He has warned them that conventional and nuclear arms are only a shield, behind which the Communists operate by means of subversion, infiltration, and other underhand tactics; that in this way they occupy vulnerable areas, one by one, in a manner which makes armed intervention difficult or impossible for the free world. He has warned that our national security may be lost piece by piece, country by country, without the firing of missiles or the clash of arms.

In response to the challenge, the President has called for an intensification of our efforts in every field, and in many ways more difficult than war. He has accepted the struggle in which we are engaged as a struggle for the very survival of our way of life; and he has told the American people that we must take up the challenge, regardless of the cost and regardless of the peril.

If we as a nation are now prepared to stand, it is obvious that the first place where we must stand is Cuba. We cannot tolerate, 90 miles from our shores, a Soviet Socialist Republic, modeled slavishly after the Kremlin's own brand of tyranny, armed by the Kremlin, commanded by the Kremlin, and openly dedicated to the establishment of a Soviet Latin America. We cannot tolerate it; neither can our Latin American neighbors tolerate it.

I find it difficult to understand the strange paralysis of understanding and of will that seems to have infected so many of our good friends in Latin America. The word "intervention" seems to have befuddled their senses, so that they stand hypnotized and inactive in the face of imminent destruction.

I do not think there is in the English vocabulary a single word that has gen-

erated more confusion than the word "intervention."

Thus, the United States now finds itself accused of intervention by the Soviet Union, which pretended that it was simply helping the popular will to assert itself when it sent 5,000 Red army tanks into Budapest, to crush the Hungarian revolution.

The United States finds itself accused of intervention by Prime Minister Nehru, who apparently could not make up his mind that the massacre of 50,000 Hungarians by the Red army constituted intervention.

Our country finds itself accused of intervention by liberal European newspapers, some of which have charged that the United States has—unsuccessfully—tried to do in Cuba what the Soviet Union was—successfully—able to do in Hungary.

Our country finds itself accused of intervention, at the United Nations, by the delegations of many of the recently created African and Asian nations, who have been led to believe that the United States is endeavoring to establish some kind of imperialist empire in Latin America, and who equate all intervention with imperialism.

Our country finds itself accused of "intervention" by Latin American political leaders, whose heads would be the first to roll if Castro succeeded in exporting revolution to their own countries.

And even in our own country, there has been much confused talk about the American "intervention" in Cuba, as though we had done something wicked, something of which we should be ashamed, something that we could not possibly explain to our friends in the United Nations.

World opinion, in general, outside the Communist bloc, has been so bemused by the word "intervention," in relation to the Cuban situation, that it has lost all sight of the basic moral and human issues.

The word "intervention" by itself is intrinsically neither good nor evil. Intervention can serve the cause of evil; and it can also serve the cause of good and the cause of justice. The entire structure of civilized law is, in fact, based on the concept that when an individual engages in wrongdoing, it is essential, in the interest of moral order, that society intervene against him, sometimes to restrain, sometimes to set right, sometimes to punish.

The Communists have intervened, are intervening today, and will continue to intervene in every situation where they can serve their own evil ends.

Sometimes they have intervened by direct and massive military action, as in Korea, Hungary, and Tibet.

Sometimes they have intervened through quisling minorities, operating under the protection of Red army bayonets. That was how they seized power in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Hungary.

Sometimes they have intervened by fostering, training, equipping, and directing guerrilla and terrorist movements.

In that way, they almost succeeded in seizing power in Greece; they threatened and seriously retarded the postwar recovery of the Philippines, Burma, and Malaya; they conquered the greater part of Vietnam; and they are now threatening the democratic republic of South Vietnam. And it is in that way, and with logistic support from the Soviet Union, that today they have occupied large parts of the Kingdom of Laos, and now threaten its total subjugation.

Sometimes the Communists have intervened by stealth and fraud, posing as anything but Communists, so that they could seize the leadership of reform movements and could install themselves in power before dropping their masks. That was the pattern in Guatemala, and that was the pattern in Guatemala, and—again—it is the pattern in Cuba.

The Communists have never apologized for intervening. Indeed, they openly use threats of intervention as an instrument of foreign policy.

At the time of the Suez crisis, they threatened to raise an international brigade to fight at the side of Nasser; and in repeated public statements Khrushchev brandished his nuclear weapons. In the case of Cuba, he has again vociferously and arrogantly brandished his nuclear missiles.

When, therefore, Nikita Khrushchev talks about intervention as some heinous crime, committed only by depraved capitalistic nations, this should be enough to make the "cows of Kazakhstan" laugh.

But it is what Soviet intervention stands for, rather than intervention per se, that makes their intervention, whatever form it may take, a crime against mankind and against freedom.

The installation of a Communist regime in any country, whether by revolutionary action, or by stealth, or by military occupation, is a crime against humanity for the simple reason that communism is inherently evil. It is evil because in those countries where it has taken power, it has cost the lives of scores of millions of people; because it is militantly opposed to belief in God; because its totalitarian government violates all of man's God-given rights; because it subjects man to the cruelest slavery in history; because, while traditional autocracies can be overthrown by popular revolt, communism has perfected the techniques of repression to the point where successful popular revolt is virtually impossible.

Some of our critics say that, by our intervention in Cuba, we have violated our own principles. Those who make this charge cannot have thought very deeply about it. After all, what are our own principles?

If this country stands for anything, it stands for freedom. It stands for freedom not merely for the American people, but freedom for men and nations everywhere.

The Declaration of Independence did not confine its opening argument to the God-given rights of Americans. On the contrary, this immortal document argued for the universal rights of mankind; it said that all men are created

available directly to sectarian schools "are the clear case of what is proscribed by the Constitution." With respect to long-term low-interest loans the brief states "this proposal is no less a form of support than grants and is equally prohibited by the Constitution." Special purpose programs depend for their validity on "the extent to which the specific objectives being advanced are unrelated to the religious aspects of sectarian education." Not too much hope is suggested for programs which go beyond those which happen to be in effect now.

These conclusions follow logically enough from the negative considerations advocated earlier in the memorandum. They are no stronger, however, than the premises on which they are based. Both the premises and conclusion reveal a basically hostile attitude toward non-discriminatory Federal grant-in-aid programs. The absence of any attempt at reconciliation is apparent from the whole tone of the brief. Lipservice is given to the dual principles of nondiscrimination and disestablishment, but isolation of nonpublic education is the dominant motive of the memorandum.

V. HIGHER EDUCATION

A sharp distinction is drawn in the brief between elementary and college education largely on the basis that elementary education is compulsory while higher education is voluntary. The college student who chooses an institution where religious instruction is mandatory "is merely asserting his constitutional right to the 'free exercise' thereof," it is said in the brief.

Moreover, the brief points out, at the college and graduate levels, public institutions alone could not begin to cope with the problems involved. Accordingly it concludes that to the extent that Congress finds it appropriate to encourage the expansion of our university and college facilities, Congress must be free to build upon what we have, the private as well as the public institutions. On this basis the brief justifies scholarships for sectarian schools, and both direct assistance and loans to such colleges, all of which happen to be provided for in the administration's bill. The readiness of the brief to record unqualified recognition to grant-in-aid programs to sectarian universities sharply contrasts with its attitude toward aid to sectarian elementary schools. The distinctions outlined in the brief are relevant, but they would hardly be considered decisive by any objective observer.

Compulsory education laws are satisfied by attendance at either sectarian or nonsectarian institutions. The grant of aid to both would not make attendance at either type of institution any more or less compulsory. And the practical distinction falls completely when it is recognized that more than 5 million children now attend sectarian schools. It is about as unrealistic to plan a comprehensive aid-to-education bill at the elementary school level which isolates this huge group of children as it would be to plan an aid to higher education which ignored these students attending sectarian colleges.

The section of the brief on higher education gives away the essentially preconceived character of the whole document. Plans have been proposed for grants, loans, and other aid to higher education. Of course they are constitutional. It has been proclaimed that similar aid to elementary schools would be unconstitutional, and the brief sets out to prove that such is the case. I do not doubt that the administration is entitled to ask for a brief supporting its predetermined position. But the resulting document must be evaluated for what it is, namely, an advocate's defense of an already prescribed point of view. No brief is entitled to the weight of a court decision, but least of all a brief written to justify a position reached before the research was even begun.

VI. JUDICIAL REVIEW

This section of the brief is the most constructive, since it outlines a method for providing judicial review of Federal expenditures for aid to education. I agree that the method outlined is feasible and would be valid, and I would expect that any aid-to-education bill would contain provisions along the lines suggested.

Now I would like to discuss briefly my views as to what the proper criteria are for judging the constitutionality of specific proposals. I would not contend that my opinion will inevitably be substantiated any more than I would concede that the administration's views will find ultimate vindication. This is a difficult subject about which to make any forecasts with confidence and the best thing all of us could do is recognize this difficulty and not try to act like Supreme Court Justices. Therefore, all I intend by my analysis is to show that there is another side to the argument and that the views of the administration are by no means conclusive.

The standards for judging any proposals must be based on the opinion in the *Everson* case. As I have already noted, the holding of this case was that Government reimbursement out of tax funds to parents for money expended by them for the bus transportation of their children to Catholic parochial schools was constitutional.

The majority opinion of the Court by Mr. Justice Black makes these points, among others:

First. These church schools give their students, in addition to secular education, regular religious instruction conforming to the religious tenets and modes of worship of the Catholic faith.

Second. Due process is not violated because the children are sent to these church schools "to satisfy the personal desires of their parents, rather than the public's interest in the general education of all children. The fact that a State law, passed to satisfy a public need, coincides with the personal desires of the individuals most directly affected, is certainly an inadequate reason for us to say that a legislature has erroneously appraised the public need."

Third. The State cannot "contribute tax-raised funds to the support of an institution which teaches the tenets and faith of any church, nor can a State

hamper its citizens in the free exercise of their own religion. Consequently, it cannot exclude individual Catholics, Lutherans, Mohammedans, Baptists, Jews, Methodists, Nonbelievers, Presbyterians, or the members of any other faith, because of their faith, or lack of it, from receiving the benefits of public welfare legislation."

Fourth. Measured by these standards we cannot say that the first amendment prohibits—a State—from spending tax-raised funds to pay the bus fares of parochial school pupils as a part of a general program under which it pays the fares of pupils attending public and other schools.

Fifth. The fact that such support "helped" children to get to parochial schools or encouraged them to remain in such schools does not violate the first amendment.

Sixth. The first amendment requires the state to be a neutral in its relations with groups of religious believers and nonbelievers; it does not require the state to be their adversary. State power is no more to be used so as to handicap religions than it is to favor them.

I have taken the time to quote from the *Everson* opinion because of the widespread misinterpretation to which it has lately been subjected. How different the words of the Court are from the inflexible, unaccommodating tone of the Government's brief. The essence of the Court's approach is neutrality as between religious and public schools. The essence of the Government's approach is isolation of the non-public schools. The *Everson* case is the law today and must be accepted as such until the decision is overturned or modified. It gives scant support to the hostile and antagonistic approach in the Government's brief to nondiscriminatory aid-to-education proposals.

Another critically important decision on this subject is *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*—268 U.S. 510. In that case, the Supreme Court held unconstitutional an enactment in Oregon compelling the attendance at public schools of children up to the 8th grade. The Court noted in its opinion that the Constitution "excludes any general power of a State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only."

The case of *Cochran v. Board of Education*—281 U.S. 370—is similar in import. It was contended in that case that a State enactment providing tax funds for the purchase of schoolbooks was unlawful since its purpose was to aid private, religious, sectarian and other schools not embraced in the public educational system of the State. A unanimous Supreme Court rejected this contention. The opinion of the Court by Mr. Chief Justice Hughes accepted the view of the State court that the "school-children and the State" rather than the schools, were the beneficiaries of the appropriations for books. The State court had noted that what the statute contemplated was that "the same books that are furnished children attending public schools shall be furnished children attending private schools" and that

"among these books, naturally, none is to be expected, [sic] adapted to religious instruction." The Supreme Court concluded that "the legislation does not segregate private schools, or their pupils, as its beneficiaries, or attempt to interfere with any matters of exclusively private concern. Its interest is education, broadly; its method, comprehensive. Individual interests are added only as the common interest is safeguarded."

These cases offer the guidelines for a proper approach to the constitutional problems involved in a comprehensive aid to education legislation. They refute any notion that all forms of nondiscriminatory Federal assistance applicable to public and nonpublic schools are unconstitutional. On the contrary, they strongly suggest that a deliberate policy of excluding from the benefits of general welfare legislation, schools with religious affiliations may raise substantial constitutional questions. The Supreme Court has given clear recognition to the historic fact that we have a dual system of education in this country at the elementary as well as the college level. It has been at pains to point out that this dual system is constitutionally protected against governmental action which would destroy church-supported elementary schools.

In our efforts to adhere to the limitations of the 1st amendment, let us not forget the limitations of due process in the 5th and 14th amendments, and the provisions vouchsafing the free exercise of our religious beliefs. Fairness and balance in our approach to the subject of Federal aid-to-education may be a legal as well as a moral obligation.

Neither the Constitution nor the cases construing it tell us what kind of aid-to-education bill to enact. We must devise a program which will meet the practical as well as the legal problems involved.

Personally, I have always believed that a great deal could be accomplished by giving tax relief to individuals for their educational expenses. Under the provisions of a bill I have introduced for this purpose (S. 792), individuals filing Federal income-tax returns would be permitted to deduct from their gross income, fees and tuition up to \$300 paid to educational institutions for themselves and their children or dependents. Included would be outlays to any recognized educational institution, including colleges, universities, graduate schools, private school, parochial schools, technical training schools, and service schools. Such a program could serve as a supplement to direct Federal assistance to public schools, and the two programs together would be well designed to foster our dual systems of education.

The Internal Revenue Service has informed me that the annual revenue that would be lost by permitting such a tax deduction would be about \$300 million. This is a substantial sum but it is less than is proposed in many of the other aid-to-education proposals. The tax deduction approach has the great merit of not interfering with the free choice of schools by the families and children involved.

Investment in education is one activity to which the Federal Government should give every encouragement. Businesses are now permitted to deduct promotional expenses on the ground that these expenses generate further business and in the long run additional revenues. The same is certainly true of investment in education. The difference in income levels among those with high school, college and graduate degrees is a well-known fact. And in a larger sense, the whole country is enriched by a better educated populace.

One final word and I shall conclude. Recently a separate bill was introduced to authorize loans to private nonprofit schools for the construction of elementary and secondary school facilities. It was suggested at that time that this measure should be acted upon separately from bills for public school aid in order to avoid any church-state controversy in our consideration of Federal aid-to-education legislation.

Personally, I do not believe that separation of these two school aid bills avoids the constitutional questions which have been raised. What separation really does is initially to determine the constitutional issue adversely to the position of the church-supported schools, for it implies a rejection of the principle that both systems of education should be treated in a nondiscriminatory manner by the Federal Government. If Congress goes too far in this direction, it may impair the freedom of choice principle declared by the Supreme Court in the Pierce case. There is no doubt that the Supreme Court said in that case that governmental action which forced all children to accept instruction from public schoolteachers only, would be unconstitutional.

Moreover, provision for Federal aid only to church-supported schools places such aid in its most difficult constitutional posture. It has never been contended that the Federal Government could aid church schools as a separate proposition. Rather, the argument for such aid has been that it is justified to avoid discrimination against the non-public school system. This rationale is substantially blurred by the separation of the two systems of education in our legislative deliberations.

Accordingly, I believe that such separation would raise unintended additional hazards to the fair treatment of both types of education by the Federal Government. A separate bill for church-supported schools, actually would serve to buttress the arguments against support of such schools by favoring them solely as religious institutions, rather than as coordinate members of the educational community. This would raise regrettable, practical consequences, and it would be inconsistent with the sanction the Supreme Court has given to reasonably nondiscriminatory treatment of all educational institutions.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize again that what I have discussed in this statement are the constitutional criteria pertinent to the aid-to-education issue. I have not attempted to analyze the

policy considerations which should shape any specific legislative proposals. My only purpose has been to offer, as a lawyer, some understanding of the highly important legal problems which this subject poses. I submit these observations in all modesty, but I hope I have succeeded in clarifying, in some measure, these difficult questions.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DODD. In my opinion, the Senator from New York has made a most scholarly, highly intelligent, and highly informational speech on a very critical subject. I know the Senator from New York has introduced a bill, as have I and other Senators, the purpose of which is to afford relief to parents in the form of a tax deduction. It seems to me that this is one way in which assistance might be given to parents who wish to send their children to private schools. Has the Senator considered this proposal?

Mr. KEATING. Yes; and I have never heard anyone raise an issue regarding the constitutionality of that approach to the subject. I myself like that approach. I am glad to know of the support for that proposal from the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, and I am happy to hear that he apparently shares my view that it is the most constructive way to approach this problem, which is a difficult one, and raises emotional issues.

Mr. DODD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure there is no possible question about the constitutionality of that approach.

Mr. DODD. I quite agree; and I believe that the Senator from New York has made a real contribution by introducing the bill. I assure him that I support him in its introduction.

Mr. KEATING. I am very grateful to the Senator from Connecticut.

Cuba LESSONS TO BE LEARNED FROM THE CUBAN SETBACK

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I believe that President Kennedy's speech before the National Press Club, last Thursday, marked a turning point in our history and a turning point in the course of world affairs. It signifies that the humiliating period of retreats and defeats is now at an end. We accept the fact that we are locked in mortal combat with an implacable adversary. We are prepared to stand and fight wherever it may be necessary. We are prepared to fight together with our allies; but, if necessary, we will go it alone.

Ever since the close of World War II, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, we have been beguiled and bedeviled and pushed around and defeated by the forces of international communism. We had overwhelming military and political power in our hands, but we had neither the understanding nor the will to use it. Our good faith was absolute; our innocence was boundless; our blunders were seemingly endless.

April 24

is economic help to remove poverty and illiteracy.

Something sinister has been introduced which must be faced squarely if the holocaust is to be averted.

The simple fact is that the Soviet Union, which spends billions of dollars annually on the cold war, is convinced that the free world will not fight—that its alliances are weak and that it is disunited. That's what Hitler, too, believed, especially after the summit conference at Munich in 1938.

Every day there are signs that the Munich philosophy of appeasement pervades many of the free governments. Why should Moscow change its policy if it can make headway toward complete conquest by peacefully taking over government after government?

Nikita Khrushchev rants against colonialism, but hypocritically maintains a system of tyranny that has made colonies for the Soviets out of several countries in Eastern Europe which once enjoyed independence.

What shall the free world do about all this? Shall it continue to hand out hundreds of millions of dollars every year and have no real voice in what happens to those funds? The propaganda against making grants with "strings" attached is of Soviet origin. So is the much-vaunted "neutrality," the whole object of which has been to put strings on America's policies and to prevent us from making our funds effective.

The time has come to stop fooling ourselves.

Not a dollar of "foreign aid" ought to be appropriated for use by any government which tolerates Communist agents or intrigue or a political party with affiliations in Moscow or Peking.

If the countries which we are to help will rid themselves of Communist influence, we can support them to a certain extent, but we must not be expected to do that job alone. The nations aided must show some signs of a capacity to establish and maintain their own independence and self-governing system.

A showdown in Latin America is due.

The Monroe Doctrine warned European governments in 1823 to stay out of this hemisphere. It is still a valid doctrine today.

The Soviets have established a base in Cuba and are invading other Latin-American countries.

A warning should be issued to the Soviet Government to get its agents, spy rings, and munitions depots out of Latin America.

If necessary, an armed blockade must be imposed—as was done recently along the coasts of Nicaragua and Guatemala—to enforce our position. Unless we show we are ready to fight, there will be no peace in the world.

The Soviets can't afford a war in the Caribbean. They are bluffing. It is time to call their bluff, or soon we will face a tragic climax—the big war.

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL CLUB FOR FOREIGN DIPLOMATS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Washington Post and Times-Herald of this morning, April 24, 1961, has published an article to the effect that the Office of Protocol of the Department of State is planning to come before Congress and give strong support to a proposal to establish in Washington an international social club for foreign diplomats.

I think it would be a blemish on our history for Congress even to consider such a ridiculous means of wasting taxpayers' money. A great number of people do not belong to exclusive clubs, but we do not propose legislation to ex-

propriate taxpayers' money to satisfy the social needs of those citizens. I think it is ridiculous to spend money to build a private club for foreign diplomats simply because they have not been invited to private clubs in the Washington area.

If the United States were to construct such a social center for foreign diplomats, we know that it would be nothing more than a 24-hour nightclub. Naturally, we would have to operate the center and probably would be forced to underwrite the giving away of free liquor, food, and forms of entertainment. The backers of this plan says they will need about \$2 million to construct the center.

I wonder how many hungry children in depressed areas of the United States could be provided with a bottle of milk with this \$2 million. I wonder how much closer to outer space the United States could be with this \$2 million. The proposal is one of wanton waste.

We recently saw pictures of the exclusive dining rooms, club rooms, and other lavishly furnished quarters of the State Department as published in newspapers and magazines. I should think this would be club enough for visiting dignitaries that have business with our Government. It is not our responsibility to construct private entertainment facilities for visiting diplomats.

In my opinion, it would be a slap in the face to millions of American taxpayers, as well as an act of immorality, for the United States to spend \$2 million on building such a monumental international country club.

We are engaged in a life-and-death struggle for the survival of freedom in this world, and we are also engaged in a struggle to free our own Nation of poverty, disease, and depression.

With all these very real problems facing us, it would be the act of an idiot to waste money on such a project. I hope Congress will dismiss this plan.

NATIONAL POLICY FOR WILDERNESS PRESERVATION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, 3 years ago this spring I recall an occasion when one of the great conservationists this body has known, the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger, had a copy of a national magazine placed on the desk of each of his colleagues because it had devoted its entire issue to the beauty and wonders of natural America. That was the July 1958 Holiday magazine.

On Friday it was my privilege through the courtesy of the publishers of Life magazine to have a copy of the April 21, 1961, issue of that magazine delivered to the desk of each of my colleagues, because that magazine features a 10-page picture-and-text essay on wilderness, a matter of important concern to the Senate.

The beautiful and impressive photographs presented by Life magazine in this feature and the earnest and urgent comments that accompany the illustrations encourage us to move forward with the legislation now before us for establishing a national policy and program for wilderness preservation.

As the sponsor of the wilderness bill, S. 174, as the chairman also of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to which the legislation has been referred, I am glad to call attention to this new demonstration of the widespread interest in our remaining areas of wilderness. This public interest has grown remarkably in recent years and is now a constant evidence of the national concern with wilderness preservation.

Dick Neuberger, speaking in this Chamber on June 18, 1958, said:

I can remember the time—not too long ago—when the wilderness was considered a matter of interest only to a minority.

Yet today widespread recognition of the fundamental values which wilderness offers to all Americans has been evidenced by public expressions of interest from individuals and by the press in all parts of the country.

In the nearly 3 years since then these expressions have continued to increase both in number and urgency.

The Holiday magazine of 1958 devoted exclusively to natural America emphasized editorially the special importance of wilderness.

Americans—

Said its editors—

tend to love natural nature best, wild forests and big mountains and nonirrigated deserts and unpopulated stretches of the coastline.

We prefer the untended, the fresh, the unmanhandled.

Americans—

Holiday declared—

admire most in nature a primal force which has not been subdued by man.

Senator Neuberger quoting these sentiments nearly 3 years ago called attention to the earlier version of the wilderness bill then introduced by Senator HUMPHREY, himself, and others, and declared:

It is the purpose of the wilderness bill to see that we shall always have some areas in America where these primitive forces have not been subdued.

To the warning of Holiday's editors that the ever-growing mechanistic aspects of our civilization could lead to our becoming more and more out of touch with the great flows of meaning which nature sends out to her creatures, Dick Neuberger replied:

The wilderness bill can help prevent such an occurrence by perpetuating the opportunity to come in contact with nature in unspoiled wild country.

Mr. President, these exciting pictures in this issue of Life magazine inspire us anew with the pride we know in the great frontiers where unspoiled wild country still stretches beyond the end of the road:

"Haven for Seaside Birds, Bird Bank in Cape Romain National Wildlife Refuge, S.C."

"Moss Laden Trees Form a 'Hall of Mosses,' Olympic National Forest in Washington's Olympic Peninsula."

"Wading Buck on Olympic Shore."

"Alligator in Georgia's Okefenokee Swamp."

"Purple Lupine and Arnica in a Glacial Meadow, Cascade Pass, Wash."

salmon "thrice a week" in order to get employment.

For some peculiar reason salmon also was once associated with insobriety. According to Charles Dickens, when Mr. Augustus Snodgrass, a charter member of the Pickwick Club, returned from an annual cricket match, his was a condition to alarm the ladies.

"Is anything the matter with Mr. Snodgrass, sir?" inquired Emily (the host's daughter) with great anxiety.

"Nothing the matter, ma'am," replied the stranger. "Cricket dinner—glorious party—capital songs—old port—claret—good—very good—wine, ma'am—wine."

"It wasn't the wine," murmured Mr. Snodgrass, in a broken voice. "It was the salmon."

There are several bodies of water that are famous for this prince of fishes. Probably the most notable is the Loire River of France. In America, salmon comes from the oceans and—in season—from the rivers of both the east and west coasts. The peak of the season will be reached within the next few weeks.

Tinned salmon is available, of course, the year round and it is a creditable ingredient in many cooked dishes.

SALMON NEPTUNE

One 1-pound can of salmon, drained, boned and flaked.

Two cups fresh breadcrumbs.

One-third cup sliced pitted ripe olives.

One cup grated sharp Cheddar cheese.

One-half cup finely chopped parsley.

One cup milk.

Three eggs.

One-fourth cup minced onion.

One teaspoon salt.

One-fourth teaspoon freshly ground black pepper.

One-fourth cup lemon juice.

Additional sliced pitted ripe olives for garnish.

1. Preheat the oven to 375°.

2. In a large mixing bowl combine the flaked salmon with the breadcrumbs, sliced ripe olives, grated cheese and parsley.

3. In a small mixing bowl mix lightly with a fork the milk, eggs, minced onion, salt, and pepper.

4. Add the milk mixture and the lemon juice to the salmon-breadcrumb mixture and mix thoroughly.

5. Pack into a well-greased 1½-quart mold or a 9-by-4-by-2-inch loaf pan.

6. Place the mold or loaf pan in a larger pan containing water 1-inch deep. Bake until set, about 1 hour.

7. Let the mold stand 5 minutes. Then turn it out onto a serving dish and serve garnished with additional sliced olives.

Yield: Six servings.

SALMON EGGS MONTAUK

Six hard-cooked eggs.

One 7¾-ounce can of salmon, drained, boned, and flaked.

One teaspoon minced onion.

One pimento, chopped.

One-fourth cup mayonnaise.

One tablespoon lemon juice.

One teaspoon salt.

One-fourth teaspoon cayenne pepper.

1. Slice the eggs in half and remove the yolks.

2. Mash the yolks and mix in the salmon, onion, pimento, mayonnaise, lemon juice, salt, and cayenne.

3. Fill the egg whites with the salmon filling and garnish with lemon wedges if desired.

Yield: Six servings.

NEEDED: STRONGER EFFORT TO COMBAT COMMUNISM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the military advances of the Communists in

Laos; the firmer entrenchment of the Red-tinged Castro regime in Cuba; the unceasing troublemaking of Mr. Khrushchev and his cohorts in the Congo; the tension in Berlin.

These, and other Red-agitated trouble spots in the world reflect the diverse, multi-pronged way in which the Communists are attempting to expand their influence.

Since World War II, the Reds have gained control over nearly a billion people and vast land, military, industrial, agricultural, scientific, and manpower resources.

Overall, there are an estimated 36 million Communists operating in about 86 countries.

The free world, in my judgment, must soon develop more effective ways for combating Red expansionism—if we are to survive.

The balance of power—and of world opinion—for example, once was largely on the side of the Western nations. Now, this balance is teetering precariously. If we are to defeat the Communists' aim of world conquest, then we need to adopt a stronger, nonmilitary offensive against the Communists. Among other things, this, in my judgment, should include:

First. Strengthening our information-spreading program to beat—not be beaten by—the Communist propaganda machine.

Second. Adopt more effective machinery against infiltrative penetrations—the fruits of which are being witnessed in Cuba and Laos. Today there are an estimated 26 million Communists operating in 86 nations around the globe. Time and events—and the global Red strategy—will determine the next explosion.

Third. A sharper counteroffensive to penetrate the Iron and Bamboo Curtains—not leave this as untouchable territory for the Reds.

Fourth. Better tailored U.S. programs, such as the Latin-American plan, to meet special needs in Asia, Africa and elsewhere in the world; and

Fifth. Finally, undertake a more dynamic effort to present the efforts and objectives of U.S. policies to the people of the world.

In summary, the U.S. needs to adopt a stronger political, economic, social, and ideological counteroffensive against the Communists. By experience, we know that a so-called containment policy is obsolete and unworkable. For the most part, the result has been loss of more and more land and people until the Reds now control nearly a billion people and vast natural, manpower, industrial, scientific, and military resources.

Unless we are willing to dedicate the effort, manpower and resources to stopping the Communists now, they survival of our way of life—indeed, of freedom itself—will be in serious jeopardy.

PUSSYFOOTING WITH THE SOVIETS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate an editorial entitled "The Climax Is Here!" written by David Lawrence, and published in the U.S. News & World Re-

port of May 1, 1961. The editorial was first printed in U.S. News & World Report for January 9, 1961, and at that time was entitled "The Coming Climax."

It is so absolutely applicable to our present condition that everyone should read it. Mr. Lawrence has covered the Soviet threat against this country in a nutshell. He has compressed into a single package of words the intolerable position which the United States now suffers as a result of Soviet plotting and planning for world revolution.

As Mr. Lawrence says, "The Climax Is Here!" and this is an hour of decision for the United States. We cannot be pushed back any farther. We cannot allow ourselves to be heeled under by the Soviet boot in our own hemisphere. Pussyfooting and politicking with the Soviets on this score will gain us no more than what has happened in Laos.

The time has come for us to kick Soviet spies, revolutionists, and agents out of the Western Hemisphere. If we fail to act now, the cost later will be very dear—perhaps our own freedom.

Mr. President, 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:

THE CLIMAX IS HERE!

(By David Lawrence)

The cycle of events that inevitably precedes a war is beginning to emerge.

The free world is tormented by a desire to pay almost any price to avoid a catastrophe. Yet bitter experience tells us that this is the very thing that can plunge us into bloody conflict.

We are being threatened today in every continent.

Soviet imperialism is subverting government after government—in Latin America, in Africa, in Asia, and in Europe.

Even in our own country, there are some misguided newspaper editors, some misguided businessmen and some misguided intellectuals who pooh-pooh the menace. They raise smokescreens about the need for trade or to defend Communist activity as a right of "free speech."

It was Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes who, in a famous decision, said that free speech does not include the right to cry "Fire" in a crowded theater. Nor is there in our Constitution any guarantee of protection for a Communist Party which organizes demonstrations and tries to infiltrate the churches and the colleges, the radio and the press—all at the behest of an enemy government.

This technique of infiltration is being applied throughout the free world—in Britain and in France and in Italy, as well as in North America.

When will we wake up to the fact that we are engaged in a world war—Communist style?

We call it a cold war as if this makes it remote from a hot war and hence a mere routine of modern diplomacy.

No country in this hemisphere apparently is free from the Soviet invasion.

We have placed our hopes in the Organization of American States, but its members are themselves weak because their own governments are threatened from within by Communist-inspired opposition.

We read of the troubles in Laos and in the Congo, and we are misled into believing that they are just part of the process of evolution from colonialism to independence. But the truth is that Western democracies are being fooled by the argument that all that's needed