

April 20

Self determination is one of the basic principles upon which our Republic rests. We know that this principle has been cruelly distorted in Cuba, and that a tyrant now rules only because he deceived his people into a belief that freedom and liberty would be the fruits of their struggle. But this deception of itself cannot justify the direct intervention of our country, much though our sympathies are with the gallant insurgents who have undertaken the overthrow of Castro tyranny.

WARNING TO THE COMMUNIST WORLD

(Mr. KING of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the President has just issued a stern warning to the Communist world and has suggested that this Nation will resort to violence if necessary to throttle further Communist inroads into this hemisphere.

I arise to applaud his courageous stand, and to declare my wholehearted support.

I believe the warning he has sounded accurately reflects the mood of the American people. He has, I believe, voiced their determination.

He has wisely warned our neighbors of Central and South America that the stake in the Cuban crisis is their freedom—not ours. It is their sovereignty and their aspirations for self-determination which are at stake—not ours.

I respectfully advocate that the administration follow up this historic message immediately with another directed to the Peace Committee of the Council of the Organization of American States. The President should, I believe, go this second step and demand that this Committee review the developments in Cuba and rule on whether the assistance which the Soviet sphere has given the Castro regime constitutes intervention.

In my judgment, the evidence would seem to indicate that the technicians, jet fighters, tanks, and other arms which the Reds have given Castro do, in fact, constitute intervention, in violation of the Declaration of San Jose.

On this point, the Council should have the benefit of an immediate review and recommendations by this Committee. The Council, in turn, and this country should be guided by the Declaration of San José in framing positive action to deal with the menaces of Communist intervention and subversion in this hemisphere.

It is quite apparent that the President intends to be guided also by our own Monroe Doctrine in countering the Communist moves, and for this I am deeply pleased.

The Declaration of San José, made at the conclusion of the Seventh Consulting Conference of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs at San José, Costa Rica, pledged that the American Republics, through the OAS, would resist vigorously the intervention, or the threat of intervention, of any extracontinental power in the affairs of the American

Republics. The declaration further rejected any maneuvers by the Sino-Soviet powers to use political, economic or social situations in any American state as a pretext for intervention, when such intervention would affect the peace and security of the hemisphere.

The Cuban crisis furnishes evidence that these principles have been violated, that the presence of Soviet arms in the fighting constitutes a clear threat of intervention, if not intervention itself. The Peace Committee should convene immediately to weigh the evidence.

I urge again that our President demand that the Council convene this Committee.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION MEETING

(Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the membership of the House that the American group of the Interparliamentary Union will meet on Tuesday, April 25, at 9:30 a.m., in room F-82 of the Capitol.

All Members interested are urged to attend the meeting.

Mr. GROSS. What is the purpose of the meeting?

Mr. COOLEY. The purpose of the meeting is to elect officers. I am retiring as president of the American group after having served as president for the past 2 years. I hope the gentleman from Iowa and all other Members of Congress who are interested in the Interparliamentary Union will attend the meeting on Tuesday morning. Sixty nations of the world are now affiliated with the Interparliamentary Union. These parliamentarians from all parts of the world actually represent more than two-thirds of the population of the earth. The Union is growing year by year. I urge all Members of the House to familiarize themselves with the purposes and the programs of the Interparliamentary Union and to take an interest in the activities of the Union.

Mr. GROSS. This is a prelude to a first-class junket?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not like the word "junket." I have never been on a junket. I hope the gentleman from Iowa will attend some of the meetings of this great international organization. I am certain, if he does, he will change his mind concerning the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. O'NEILL. There were 27,000 tons of back-door sugar that has arrived up in my area from Cuba, being sent to Canada or one of these other countries. I am sure the gentleman is familiar with the situation. What is going to happen?

Mr. COOLEY. Well, I think I can assure the gentleman that we have tried to make it perfectly plain to those in charge of administering the sugar program that it was the intent and the purpose of the committee and of the Congress to prevent Cuban sugar coming into our markets either directly or indirectly, and certainly we intend to prevent the sugar from Cuba going to

Canada and being refined and then going to the Boston market.

Mr. O'NEILL. Perhaps some bootleggers bought this at a cheap price and put the sugar in a warehouse in Boston, and they are trying to dispose of it.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, if I understand it, the sugar that the gentleman has reference to is now in bond, and it can only be released from bond by those in charge of the program, and it can only come in under a quota, so that I do not see how it could be possible to bootleg sugar from Cuba into our market.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(Mr. KEITH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to reach the House floor in time to cast my vote on rollcall No. 40, which was just concluded on the question of the extension of social security. I wish to announce that, had I been here, I would have voted in favor of this legislation which was just passed by the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6169. An act to amend section 201 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 912) entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. HRUSKA to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) entitled "An act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas."

ISRAEL BECOMES BAR MITZVAH

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the same subject I am about to address the House on.

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

1961

6119

All Americans will rejoice over the achievements of many kinds which have come to pass in the Holy Land, the spiritual homeland of Christianity as well as of Judaism.

In the 13 years that Israel has been a free and independent nation, her population has grown from 790,000—less than the population of Washington—to 2,128,000—considerably less than my home State of Connecticut. Its area is about the same as Massachusetts, and about 60 percent greater than my own State.

Israel's exports have grown since 1948 from \$29 million to \$265 million, and her imports last year were \$520 million, compared to \$253 million in 1948. Israel has three times as many acres under cultivation as she had when the republic was founded, and has increased her agricultural production more than eight-fold.

Israel has a merchant marine of 53 ships, which carried almost half a million tons of cargo in 1960. She has 600,000 children in schools, and has 22,400 teachers, to compare with the 5,964 in 1948.

These are statistics which are as bare as most statistics are, but they make proud not only the Israelis in the homeland, but men of good will all over the world.

Yet, Israel is a long way from economic independence. She might have been closer to self-sufficiency if she had not re-settled in such a short time a million refugees and immigrants. Over a longer period, these people, like the stream of immigrants who came to America all through the 19th century, will be among the country's greatest resources.

The price of security for Israel is a dear one, but so is it for all the free world in these times. Israel might now be standing on her own feet without aid if she were not forced to spend so much of her treasure for security. But, so would our own country be able to do more, much more for all our people, and for the world, if we didn't have to spend \$40 billion a year to remain strong in a world which yet knows no peace but the peace of the sword.

Israel's aspirations are great. Her friends all over the world are eager for her to progress, even more rapidly than she has in these first 13 years. But progress is a relative term, and sometimes it is progress just to survive.

Israel has weathered every storm in her brief national life. She has the determination to survive and to join her sister states on every continent in seeking to achieve and to maintain a lasting peace.

On this 13th birthday, the people of America salute the people of Israel.

SENIOR CITIZENS SERVICE CORPS

(Mr. WILSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have today written letters to the President of the United States and to

the Director of his Peace Corps which suggests correction of the No. 1 flaw of the whole Peace Corps idea—sending a boy to do a man's job.

I propose that the accent on the Peace Corps be shifted from untried and untested youth to the maturity and experience of senior citizens, creating a "Senior Citizens' Service Corps." Such a corps will do the most for our own country and its people.

My suggestion can be accomplished without legislation. It can be realized simply by accepting only senior citizens at or near retirement age for this corps.

By doing this we will be sending overseas Americans trained by experience and the maturing process, Americans dedicated to the ideals of our Republic, Americans in position to do yeoman service for the Nation. These senior citizens want to remain productive and the Senior Citizens' Service Corps will give them this chance.

Costs of this program will be less than the present program. Senior citizens already have skills, have learned by doing and have learned life by experience, not through textbooks or lecturers.

I have reminded the President that his idealistic statement of January 20, when he asked Americans to "ask what you can do for your country," can be realized in a concrete manner by allowing senior citizens a chance to serve in their own corps.

We should use this wellspring of talent that is our senior citizens. We should take advantage of the mature talent, tempered by years of experience. We should put this talent to use where it will do the most good.

I believe my proposal to be a part of the answer and not another part of the problem. We have heard much about youthful enthusiasm that will drive the Peace Corps. Enthusiasm knows no age level. Mature, responsible people can and do have just as much enthusiasm as anyone else, but it is tempered with experienced wisdom and guided by mature judgment and will avoid the pitfalls of youthful exuberance.

It is this mature enthusiasm I want to see put to work helping promote the role of the United States in the free world and helping make the world a better place in which to live. This can be done by establishment of the Senior Citizens' Service Corps.

Cuba EVENTS IN CUBA

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

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the past week, I have become increasingly disturbed over the course which events seem to be taking in Cuba, for I fear that the actions of the United States have been greatly distorted and misunderstood throughout the world, particularly in South America and in other areas where the development of stable political institutions has not yet been completed.

In his note to Premier Khrushchev on April 19, the President made our policy towards Cuba extremely clear. "I have previously stated," said the President, "and I repeat now, that the United States intends no military intervention in Cuba." Similarly, Secretary of State Rusk said in a press conference on April 17 that "The present struggle in Cuba is a struggle by Cubans for their own freedom. There is not and will not be any intervention by U.S. Forces." And finally, Adlai Stevenson, the American Ambassador to the United Nations, answered Cuba's charges of aggression by saying that "These charges are totally false and I deny them categorically. The United States has committed no aggression against Cuba and no offensive has been launched from Florida or from any other coast of the United States."

Mr. Speaker, I commend these statements of policy by the leaders of the United States and the position taken by the President and his administration. My particular admiration goes to the President for the tone of his answer to the communication from Premier Khrushchev. The President made it indisputably clear that the United States will not tolerate, under any conditions, an armed intervention on the part of the Soviet Union in the internal affairs of Cuba, but he made it equally clear that America will never intervene in Cuban affairs unless the Soviet Union intervenes first.

It is my firm belief, Mr. Speaker, that the President has taken a position which will greatly benefit the United States throughout the world, for we have provided proof positive to those of our world neighbors who have insisted that the United States, unlike the Soviet Union in Hungary, would never move to destroy a neighboring regime merely because its views are opposed to our own.

The present insurrection in Cuba has presented an extremely difficult test case for the determination of U.S. intentions throughout the world. Is the United States really willing to permit the newly developed nations of the world to develop governments according to their own will, or will it insist that nations are to be free only if they follow American policy? The eyes of the world have been on America for the last week, and we will be known by our works.

The President's choice has not been an easy one. Because of the moral support we have given anti-Castro forces, Communist propaganda has sought to convince the world that America has actively intervened, and demonstrations in front of American embassies throughout the world indicate that the United States is already being punished for an action we have never taken.

In the weeks to come, the President is going to meet with even greater challenges to his decision. Particularly if the invasion of the insurgents goes badly—and the news dispatches suggest that this is a very real possibility—he will be pressured from many sides to change his position and to finally take those steps which will eliminate the thorn of Cuba from our side.

1961

The President of the United States has kept his head in this matter. The President of the United States has made clear that it is not the policy of the United States, nor the intention of his administration, to advocate any military intervention in Cuba.

Mr. President, it is also true that we cannot merely let the situation in Cuba drift. It may be that, no matter what is attempted, the final outcome will be a drift. We hope, if that is the only course that proves to be available, the drift will be toward more peaceful relations, rather than toward war. But I have a great deal of confidence in the rules of reason, and I have a great deal of confidence in the application of the rules of reason in differences between disputants. I have an abiding faith that if the proper procedures, based upon the application of rules of reason, are applied to any given dispute, there is always the good chance that a peaceful solution can be worked out.

Mr. President, in many Latin American countries there are demonstrations and overt manifestations of misunderstanding toward the United States. There has been an acceptance by many persons in many of those countries of Communist propaganda as being true. That propaganda, of course, is propaganda that misrepresents and distorts—in fact, lies about—the policies that the United States is following in relation to Cuba. But, whether we like it or not, we shall be called upon by the forces that mold public opinion in many countries to demonstrate, beyond a question of a doubt, that the United States is willing to submit to peaceful procedures any issue which exists between the United States and Cuba.

I have said for many, many months—in fact, the record is clear that I said it almost immediately after it became evident that a parting of the ways was developing between the United States and the Castro regime in Cuba—that we ought to take the necessary steps to demonstrate to the world who it is that seeks a peaceful solution and understanding as to the disagreements which have developed between Cuba and the United States.

When emotions run high and deep, when Americans still in Cuba are taken by the Castro forces and charged with various forms of crime against the state, resulting in their execution, the American people are bound to be deeply and bitterly resentful.

THIRD PARTY MAY HELP

Mr. President, history proves that when disputes between nations have reached such a serious proportion that, if they go unattended, they might result in a collapse of peace, peaceful solutions are usually the result of the intervention of good faith friends of both disputants.

A valiant effort ought to be made at this time by third parties, acting through the Organization of American States or through the United Nations, to seek to bring to an end the state of tension which has developed between Cuba and the United States. It may be hopeless,

but we shall never know until we try, Mr. President.

I say to friendly Latin American governments who are members of the Organization of American States, I am exceedingly disappointed at their apparent reluctance to pursue this goal. It is almost a "hands-off" policy that is being followed. It might even seem to be a sympathetic toleration of unfair criticism of the United States on the Cuban issue.

We have been a staunch defender of Latin American independence. We have been a staunch defender of it for years. This is demonstrated by the protection we have made available to Latin America through the Monroe Doctrine and through the position we have taken at various western hemispheric conferences such as the Caracas Conference of 1954, the Rio Conference of 1958, and earlier conferences.

We have been a staunch defender of this part of the world, protecting the territorial integrity and guaranteeing the security of the nations of the Western Hemisphere. The time has come when the member nations of the Organization of American States have a great responsibility to make an offer to seek, through the procedures of the Organization of American States, to find an accommodation which will permit the ending of misunderstandings between Cuba and the United States. These misunderstandings have reached such a point that we no longer even have diplomatic relations with Cuba and have to rely upon the Swiss for any diplomatic intercourse between the two nations.

It is probably true that Castro would have none of such good offices. At the present time he may be flushed with excitement and the anticipation that perhaps, with the help of his Russian ally, he can "go it alone" in the Western Hemisphere.

He could not be more wrong. With the passage of time I think he will soon discover the error of such a judgment, if that is the judgment he is making. If Castro does not desire to look for a peaceful solution of his difficulties with the United States through the Organization of American States, I then respectfully say the United Nations has a responsibility, and our friends—yes, the friends of Cuba and Russia, too, in the United Nations—have a responsibility to act. The signatories to the U.N. charter, including Russia and the United States and Cuba, recognized at least when they signed it that they were undertaking an obligation to use the procedures of that charter to remove the threat of war whenever tensions reached the point that peace was endangered. I assume that none among us will tonight deny such tensions exist in the world.

Speaking for myself alone, but expressing my individual view as a Member of this body, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and as chairman of the subcommittee which deals with Latin American affairs, I suggest that members of the United Nations interested in preserving the peace also have a responsibility.

POSSIBILITY OF ADJUDICATION

I hope it will be suggested in the United Nations that there be submitted to adjudication the conflict which has developed between Cuba and the United States.

Oh, there are those who say that any such procedure is highly theoretical and idealistic, that it ignores the ugly realities. But the ugliest of all realities is this continued conflict in the Caribbean. We had better put our ideals to work, I say to the nations of the world. The United Nations is a framework of great ideals which can be put to work if mankind or the member nations of the United Nations have the will to live in peace.

I hope that the nonparticipants in the misunderstandings which have developed in the Western Hemisphere who are members of the United Nations will offer to come forward with a procedural solution which seeks to submit these disagreements to the judicial processes of the United Nations.

What is the alternative?

The alternative is the extension of the cold war.

The alternative is the increasing use of international balance-of-power politics by both the West and the East.

The alternative is to enhance the danger of a nuclear war.

It is very difficult for those of us in the United States who recognize the injustices of the Castro regime, and who recognize the misrepresentation of our peaceful intentions on the part of the Castro regime and the Communist bloc, to approach this problem calmly and rationally. But I respectfully suggest that peace is worth our being willing to lay aside our deep feelings on this subject. We should urge the world to join in a rational approach to put into practice the very procedural principles of the United Nations to which virtually all civilized nations in the world have attached their signatures.

Mr. President, unless the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has something he wishes to present, I am about to make a motion.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it is satisfactory to make the motion.

AUTHORIZATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign enrolled bills.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY AT 12 O'CLOCK NOON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 24, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 20, 1961:

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Howard Bertsch, of Oregon, to be Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Julian B. Thayer, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for terms expiring March 31, 1967.

Joe B. Zeug, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for term expiring March 31, 1967.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to the rank indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be chief warrant officers, W-4

Orvall K. Beall	John S. Cameron, Jr.
Joseph E. Acker	William A. Mauch
Hugh S. Hanna	William H. Mattson
Richard V. Bercaw	Anthony F. Glaza, Jr.
John F. Malley	Franklin H. Wix
Peter D. Shost	Gentry J. Cooke
Joseph C. Daniels	Harold G. Welchert

To be chief warrant officers, W-3

Charles L. Maxwell	Roy E. Needles
Arch D. Grainger, Jr.	James W. Johns
Arnold A. Adams	Warren G. Tubbs
John A. Flynn	Isadore L. Souza
Alfred A. Kolb	Herbert L. Simpson
William H. Blaylock, Jr.	Wallace E. Hulteen
William P. East	Carl L. Smith
Leroy F. Bent	Bernhart A. Wicks
Frederick W. Rix	Keith H. Jorgenson
Lloyd R. Smith	Harold E. DeYoung
Arthur E. Vincent	George R. Peck
Howell M. Joynes, Jr.	David F. Ray
Lester H. Green	Claude A. Robinson
Joseph E. Franken	Herbert S. Lyman
Albert L. Lingenfelter	Paul Schuttpelz, Jr.
Emmett J. Gossen	James P. Avila
Charles R. Smith	Fred A. Shabo
Frank M. Miller, Jr.	Frank N. Campagna
Lyle E. Cable	Earl W. C. Harris
John J. Gunson	William R. Hendricks, Jr.
Merrill W. Allison	Max Trepeta
Arthur F. Myers	Sherwood N. Patrick
George F. Weadon	Albert N. Dill
Frank Bartling	Kenneth N. Black
Mitchel K. Opsitnik	James L. Cropper
Raymond W. Olson	Newton P. Caddell, Jr.
George F. W. Ehrsam	George Mathews

Wayne R. Glenn
Lee D. Wooden
Louis L. Bayers
Randall H. Spooner
Harold W. Collins
Herbert L. Gordon
Raymond L. Williams
James R. Kane
Thomas J. Hushion
John G. Schwelm
Gustave F. Scholz

To be chief warrant officers, W-2

Norman E. Fabri
Archie C. Yano
John H. Kittila, Jr.
Giles M. Bailey, Jr.
Robert G. Townsend
John S. Kennedy
Clifford R. Wattam, Jr.
Gilbert E. Morris
Leo L. Richmond
Melvin D. Mabry
Dale E. Strohecker
Braxton B. Bell
Clarence B. Scarborough
Charles A. Thornton
James V. Barth
Robert F. Stager
Harold C. Wadey
John W. Parker
Edwin M. Smithers
Billy L. Sturgell
Horace F. Stephens
Tugg P. Heimerl
Charles A. Lester
Elmer Lovan
Byron L. Swearingen
Victor E. Kendrick
Robert M. Clunie III
Cleo W. Mackey
James F. Eckman
Wayne J. Fisher, Jr.
Jack Peterson
Robert E. Bowlby
Roger F. Paquin
William A. Lewis
William J. Reinhart
Harry K. Smith
Edward V. Sapp
Harry P. Earley
Loy J. Russell
Penrose C. Dietz
Robert C. Imler
Basil V. Burrell
Albert H. Tremlett, Jr.
Joseph H. McKenna, Jr.
Leo J. Degraw
Cecil M. Morris
John H. Suchon

Harold R. Dycus
Marvin E. Ginn
James C. Rosemergy
Charles W. Griffiths
Charles E. Bunkley
Charles E. Holden
Earl A. Boles
James M. Mauldin
John H. Bunting
John H. Westbury

John A. Keller
Clarence L. Miller
Maxie M. Berry, Jr.
Henry L. Nixon
Alan G. Anderson
William M. Rickett
Julian Hatch
Clinton J. Tatro
Mario J. Camuccio
Harry T. Lyons
John M. Howarth
Charles M. Burleson
William E. Simmons
Robert A. Burjoice
Marvin C. Fields
Norman G. Goben
Jack B. Meadowcroft
Theodore E. Schaeffer
Artis L. Whitford
Donald J. Cleveland
John M. Deaver
Robert E. Bagley
Frank W. Kattein, Jr.
Charles W. Busby
Thomas P. Buby
Hugh M. McCreery
Thomas C. Volkle
Ronald D. Stenzel
John B. Friel
John J. Smith, Jr.
Paul L. Lamb
John J. Clayton
Charles L. Fraulzer
Bobby G. Burns
John C. Secor
Mitchell J. Whiting
Howard C. Beeler, Jr.
Gilbert Shaw
Harold U. Wilson, Jr.
Dalton J. Beasley
Mathew Woods
Dick G. Taylor
Donald B. Goodwin
Jack A. O'Donnell
Herman G. Pinter
Floyd A. Rice
Hershel A. Drury
Roy E. Nichols, Jr.
Ara E. Midgett, Jr.
Thomas D. Keith
Wallace A. Herrington
Hugh T. Williams, Jr.
Sanford H. Pierpoint
Samuel A. McDowell, Jr.
Paul E. Peterson
Rea F. Fetzer
Richard H. Wight
Gene N. Cooper

Walter L. Martin, Jr.
Joseph M. Tanguay
Jack E. Van Zandt
Jack W. Dunn
Ralph T. Martin
Kenneth R. Rider
Bruce E. Timmerman
Charles A. L. Linder
Phillip R. Spiker
Emil Capinha
Oliver W. Barber, Jr.
William E. Whaley, Jr.
Robert L. Armour
Donald S. Mackenzie
Charles R. Corbett
George M. O'Brien
Robert D. St. Aubyn
Marvin D. Henderson
James D. Webb
Gerald H. Olson
William R. Bell
Richard J. Akridge, Jr.
Claud V. O'Neal
Ralph Winn
Daniel N. Sessions
Rodney D. Harder
Eugene E. E. O'Donnell
Ronald L. Herpolsheimer
Michael Baron, Jr.
Charles R. Hinrichs
Jackie S. Thornhill
Arthur J. Walsh
Robert C. Van Eaton
Charles J. Kelly
Marcus W. Lonsberry
Richard G. Booth
Robert E. Whitley
Lonnie L. Mixon
Ernest W. Hedgpeith
Irving G. Sauer
Roy E. Dash
Donald C. Welner
Dewey R. Seiber
James M. Carpenter
Roland H. Bazajou
Max E. Zbinden
Robert D. Merritt
James B. Kane
William R. Hudson
James E. Curry
Joseph C. Russo, Jr.
Richard B. Ramsey
Edward C. Pangrass
George M. Heinrich
Paul P. Sova

1961

rights projects of widely varying nature and significance. These activities, conducted under the auspices of Human Rights Commission and its Subcommittee on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, UNESCO and other U.N. bodies and specialized agencies, have included wide-range undertakings of scientific, educational, and social action character.

Less well known in this country is the human rights effort projected within the European regional system. Here, linked to the Council of Europe, is an already operative system based on a Convention of Human Rights with implementation measures that include a Commission, functioning as a kind of grand jury to sift complaints which are receivable both from governments and private parties; and a court to hear those complaints which the Commission passes on to it. Parties to this system are most of the non-Communist nations of Europe, not including France and the United Kingdom.

And hardly known at all in the United States—not unnaturally, in view of its relative recency—is the effort to emulate within the Inter-American system the human rights development which is still in the projection stage in the U.N. and actually in force in the Council of Europe. This undertaking is complex and in some respects controversial, and it would be difficult in this limited space to deal satisfactorily with all the problems involved.

Suffice to mention only the central issue, on which sharply opposing views exist even within the liberal camp, as to the feasibility, in the present state of international relationships, of hoping to protect human rights domestically by means of legally binding treaties with international measures—commissions and courts—for implementation or enforcement. Allied to this issue are others: Differing attitudes toward treaty commitments; problems posed by legally binding conventions for Federal as compared with unitary states; difficulties of formulating standards in language which will have agreed upon applications in different social and cultural settings—especially where philosophies and practices differ sharply in regard to the role of the state—and hence will be amenable to adjudication and enforcement in any meaningful sense.

THE BACKGROUND

The term "Inter-American system" embraces the various expressions—including regional agencies, treaty relationships, and joint declarations—of the bond among the nations of the Western Hemisphere. To this system, the Organization of American States (OAS) may be viewed as bearing a relationship comparable to that which the U.N. bears to the world community. The OAS currently embraces the 21 independent nations in this hemisphere, including the United States but not Canada. Like the U.N., the OAS encompasses a large array of programs and activities, and of councils, agencies, commissions, and committees established to implement them.

The OAS came into being in its present form in 1948 at the ninth International Conference of American States in Bogotá, Colombia. Like the U.N., however, it had antecedents reaching back many decades. The 1826 Congress of Panama, in which Simon Bolívar played the leading role, is usually regarded as the starting point of the Inter-American movement. A subsequent milestone was the 1890 (First) International Conference of American States (Washington, D.C.) at which was created the International Union of American Republics, and its central office or secretariat, the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics. The Union and Bureau were the predecessors, respectively, of the OAS and the Pan American Union.

The OAS Charter, adopted in 1948, defines the nature and purposes of the Organization, the principles on which it rests, its conception of the fundamental rights and duties of member states, its procedure for the pacific settlement of disputes and for collective security, and its arrangements for cooperation in the promotion of higher economic, social, and cultural standards. The charter also sets forth the functions and powers of its principal organs: the Inter-American Conference, the meeting of consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, the Council, the Pan American Union, and the specialized organizations; and also those of subordinate bodies of the Council—the Inter-American Cultural Council. The names of these latter agencies suggest the U.N. bodies to which they bear an analogy in purpose and function, if not in authority or hierarchical position.

"COLLECTIVE" CONCEPTS ARE INCREASING

The Inter-American Conference is the supreme organ of the OAS; it decides general policies and formulates general courses of action. The consultation of Foreign Ministers considers emergency or urgent problems between conferences. The Council is the OAS permanent executive body. The Pan American Union is the General Secretariat.

Acceptance in Latin America of the concept of collective protection of human rights was preceded, inevitably, by a long period in which concepts of sovereignty and non-intervention received predominant emphasis. These are still the dominant emphases, though they have been counterbalanced in recent years by increasing emphasis on collective concepts, aimed at collective security against external aggression, peaceful solution of differences between states by judicial means, and, more recently, by the concept of international protection of human rights, which has received increasing support since the end of World War II.

The 1945 Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace (Mexico) called on the American states to develop a system for the international protection of human rights, and charged the Inter-American Juridical Committee with drafting a declaration of human rights. The 1947 Inter-American Conference (Rio de Janeiro) reiterated these aims. The 1948 conference (Bogotá) moved toward these objectives in two concrete ways—by adopting the OAS Charter, which contained provisions on human rights, and the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man, a document comparable to the U.N.'s Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The fifth meeting of Consultation of Foreign Ministers (Santiago, Chile, in August 1959) attempted to move forward these earlier, more general, undertakings. In a historic resolution, which became known as the Declaration of Santiago, it affirmed the interdependence between peace among the American Republics and respect for human rights and the exercise of effective representative democracy. It formulated a set of eight principles and attributes of the democratic system in this hemisphere intended to aid public opinion in gaging the character of political regimes.

BACKSTOPPING RESOLUTIONS

This declaration was backstopped by a series of other resolutions aimed at implementing its principles. Of these, perhaps the most important was resolution VIII on Human Rights, which called on the Inter-American Council of Jurists to draft conventions on human rights, on the creation of an Inter-American Court for the Protection of Human Rights, and of other organizations for the protection of those rights. This far-reaching resolution went even further: it resolved to create at once a Commission on Human Rights.

The Council of Jurists—scheduled, fortuitously, to convene the week after the Foreign Ministers' meeting closed—responded enthusiastically to its request and with remarkable speed produced a four-part draft convention. This convention will be reviewed at the forthcoming Inter-American Conference, scheduled to be held in Quito, Ecuador, in May, 1961.

There were two reasons why the Council of Jurists was able to act so expeditiously: it was able to draw on the fruits of drafting experience of the UN and the Council of Europe; and its members preferred to ride the tide of enthusiasm then prevailing and to complete a draft instrument—even one with the flaws that are inevitably present in hastily drafted documents—rather than delaying completion for another session in order to produce a more refined document. The majority of the Council of Jurists inclined, in regard to substantive rights, to the precedent of the all-embracing U.N. draft covenants, rather than to the more modest European Convention on Human Rights. The Council's draft thus comprised not only civil and political rights, as does the latter, but also economic, social and cultural rights. For this reason, it will pose for would-be ratifying states in the Americas many of the same problems as are presented by the U.N. draft covenants.

PROPOSALS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The Inter-American Draft Convention, like the U.N. draft covenants, provides for two schemes of implementation, one to be applied to civil and political rights and the other to economic, social and cultural rights. For the former, the implementation scheme provides for a seven-member Commission on Human Rights, to be composed of persons with judicial or legal experience, serving for 4-year terms in their personal capacities. The Commission would have power to receive state-against-state complaints as well as complaints against a state party by "any person or group of persons, or associations or corporations, legally recognized by the public authorities, alleging violation of any of the rights in the Convention."

In contrast, the implementation plan for economic, social, and cultural rights does not provide for a judicial or quasi-judicial procedure. As in the U.N. draft covenant, implementation of these rights is limited to promotional devices. Thus the Commission will not have the authority to receive complaints, but it will be able to collect data, make observations, recommendations and reports, engage in studies and research (including on the spot), and give publicity to measures adopted.

The convention also provides for the establishment of a Court of Human Rights composed of jurists, equal in number to that of the ratifying states and elected by the OAS for 9-year terms from lists nominated by these states. Its jurisdiction would be limited to interpreting and applying the civil and political rights.

As might be expected, the Inter-American Draft Convention was not approved without serious reservations from several of the most powerful OAS member states. Argentina noted that it had voted for approval of the draft, on the understanding that it was preliminary and that it had many technical defects which needed correction. A similar reservation was made by Mexico. Uruguay, while voting affirmatively, subject to reservations of a constitutional nature, also objected to the immediate creation of the Commission on Human Rights which, it held, should follow rather than precede the adoption of the convention, lest it endanger the principle of nonintervention.

THE U.S. POSITION

The U.S. position was, in effect, the same as that which it has taken in the U.N. with

respect to human rights conventions generally—namely, that because of its Federal-State problem it did not find it possible to join in multilateral human rights conventions, though it had no objection to other states doing so.

As noted, the August 1959 meeting of the consultation of Foreign Ministers had resolved that a Commission be created at once. This resolution was implemented by the OAS Council in May 1960, when it adopted a statute spelling out the Commission's objective, structure and functions.

The Commission's statute describes it as "an autonomous entity" of the OAS, its function being to promote respect for human rights, these being those set forth in the American declaration on the rights and duties of man. The Commission is to be composed of seven members elected by the OAS Council from lists proposed by members States.

The Commission is given these functions and powers: to develop an awareness of human rights among the peoples of America; to make recommendations to member governments concerning human rights measures; to prepare studies or reports; to invite member governments to supply it with information on human rights measures adopted by them; and to serve as an advisory body to the OAS on human rights.

It is not authorized to consider specific complaints. It could hardly be expected to be given such authority outside the context of a rigorously debated, drafted and ratified convention. Even so, its functions and powers are very flexibly formulated, and can be given either a liberal or a narrow construction. Obviously, the authority to make recommendations and reports can be exercised in far-reaching ways, if the members wish to do so. However, since the Commission is a creature of the consultation of Foreign Ministers and the OAS Council, its members are not likely to interpret its powers more liberally than these bodies are likely to accept.

At its first session, in October 1960, the Commission, whose permanent seat is in the Pan American Union in Washington, conducted an exploratory discussion concerning its authority, policies and procedures, and decided to initiate its activity with a limited program of studies and reports. The session revealed a considerable ambiguity in the minds of the members as to the nature and scope of their mandate. But it was anticipated that, in time, the projected studies and reports, each assigned to a different member for preparation for submission to the next session in May 1961, would lead gradually to more concrete recommendations and activities, and also to a clearer definition of its realistic role.

Although this is the most interesting recent human rights development in the inter-American system, it is not the only one that has taken place there. Many other projects in the economic, social, and cultural fields, which are properly classifiable as "human rights" activities, are underway under the auspices of various bodies in the OAS, including the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, the Inter-American Cultural Council, and the Council of Jurists. All of these projects—whether legal, educational, or social action—warrant the attention and encouragement of the American people, and surely of agencies devoted to the cause of human rights.

SIDNEY LISKOFSKY,
American Jewish Committee.

MARKUP OF THE PUBLIC-AID-TO-EDUCATION BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today I issued a release announcing that the Education Subcommittee of the Com-

mittee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is considering the administration's Federal aid-to-education bill for elementary and secondary public schools, will start its markup of that bill on April 27, at 9:30 a.m.

This is the administration bill which I had the honor to introduce in the Senate, at the same time that a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey introduced an identical bill in that body.

I wish to stress that there has been an unavoidable delay in holding the subcommittee executive sessions on this important measure. We had to postpone meetings while the Senate considered the minimum-wage bill, because several members of my subcommittee serve also on the Labor Subcommittee.

I endeavored to proceed with the executive sessions sooner than next Thursday; but some members of my subcommittee will necessarily be absent from the Senate, on official business—one of them, abroad. I find that it is possible to assemble all of them for our first markup session next Thursday. I thought, therefore, I should make this announcement, so that those who may have wondered when we will proceed with the measure can have the benefit of this official statement of the subcommittee.

THE SITUATION IN CUBA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this time I wish to make a very brief statement.

I desire to say how proud I was of the reply which President Kennedy made to Khrushchev, on the Cuban crisis; how inspired I am and also how proud I am of the very brilliant speech on the Cuban crisis and on a number of facets of U.S. foreign policy which the President of the United States made to the newspaper editors and publishers. I make these comments as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin-American Affairs.

There is not a scintilla of evidence that the U.S. Government has intervened in the sporadic rebellion which has occurred inside Cuba. That rebellion has been aided from the outside by Cuban rebel refugees who have sought to overthrow the Castro regime.

Mr. President, in my judgment, based on such knowledge as I have of the Cuban situation, President Kennedy made a clear statement of fact to the American people and to the world, when he said that this affair is a Cuban affair, and involves a Cuban revolt against tyranny by Cubans.

Having said that, Mr. President, I think we are also aware of the fact that the Cuban situation is going to continue to create a very tense situation which has the potentiality of developing into a much more serious crisis, so far as world peace is concerned.

In recent days, I have said from platforms and over the air, that by all means the American people must remain calm. We must proceed to approach this problem with rationality, not with emotionalism.

Certainly I yield to no one in my very deep feelings of patriotic resentment toward the course of conduct which the Soviet Union and other members of the Communist bloc have been following in respect to Cuba.

It is perfectly obvious that with the complete concurrence of Castro and his associates, the Communists of the world have aided and abetted in setting up a Communist beachhead in Cuba. It is there. It is perfectly clear that the present tyrannical regime in Cuba is putting into practice, in its administrative procedures and policies, a Communist program.

CUBAN PEOPLE DESERVE FREE CHOICE

The people of Cuba have the sovereign right to do that, if that is the form of government they want. It can be asked, "But, Senator, you know, do you not, that undoubtedly the majority of the Cuban people, if they had a free choice in the matter, would not want that form of government?" That is my belief; and that belief is strengthened by the fact that Castro has never been willing to put that to a test, because the test is a very simple, democratic one, and apparently he abhors a democratic test.

The test is the exercise of the voting right that free men ought to be granted if their government really intends to extend freedom to them. All of us know that at the time of the Castro rebellion and revolution against what can properly be described as a form of a Fascist dictatorship in Cuba, under the Batista regime, Castro won a great deal of support and aroused a great deal of hope in the United States, and elsewhere in the free portions of the world, by his promises that elections would be held in Cuba at an early date.

We have all come to recognize that there is the difference of high noon and black midnight between Castro's professions and his procedural governmental practices. Therefore, frankly, Mr. President, I despair of any hope for the immediate future of the establishment of democratic processes in Cuba.

I pray that I may be mistaken. My hope is that reason would come to prevail once again among the leaders of Cuba and that they would test the acceptability of their policies by putting those policies to the decision of the free ballot box. But, Mr. President, such expressions of hope will not solve Cuban problems; and so we have a very difficult problem confronting us, with the apparent hopelessness of any successful revolution in Cuba in the immediate future.

WHAT SHOULD FUTURE POLICY BE?

What shall be the policy, not only on the part of the United States, but of other free nations in this hemisphere, toward Cuba? I am sure that some views held concerning policies which the free world ought to offer to follow in connection with Cuba will not be approved by those who believe that the time has come for direct action by the free nations of the Western Hemisphere against the encroachment of communism upon this hemisphere through what appears to be a Soviet beachhead in Cuba.