

May 22

gation should be released to the press and radio and television.

Now, in light of the recent charges made against the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe the following remark which I made 3 weeks ago is particularly pertinent. At that time I said:

In view of the many conflicting stories already published and yet to come, the public has a right to know the truth. And a calm dispassionate inquiry would be of considerable use to the administration and to the American people.

Mr. President, events and public statements of the past several weeks have borne out my worst fears.

It has been publicly stated that we direly need a new chairman and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It has been publicly implied that the Cuban fiasco was the fault of the military leaders of the Nation, of such distinguished men as General Lemnitzer, my friend Adm. Arleigh Burke, and others.

It has been publicly suggested that our military leaders went into the Cuban invasion without taking cognizance of all the factors. Now, Mr. President, surely a Nation which conducted one of the greatest embibious wars in the history of man has the knowledge, and the military background to conduct a simple landing on an island only a few miles from our shores.

Surely, the men who carried the United States to success in the Second World War were not guilty of overlooking or simplifying the problems of setting ashore a few thousand men.

I say that it is time to stop looking for scapegoats and start seeking the truth. And that truth can only be found in the traditional way of this country—a calm, quiet, deliberate investigation by the Congress. The truth cannot and will never be uncovered by leaked comments or off-the-cuff pronouncements by individuals eager for publicity.

Mr. President, I am not a military expert although I have served my country in time of war, but I associate myself with the military man who declared about the Cuban invasion failure:

No military man in his right mind would have approved the plans that were carried out.

I believe, then, an investigation is imperative, that its need grows more and more obvious daily, and will continue to grow so long as we have statements about dismissing our top-flight military leaders. But this investigation should be conducted by the legislative branch. And this inquiry should be work of a full congressional committee.

Without such an investigation, the public will remain in darkness, unaware of the very real dangers which confront us. Without such an investigation, the reputations of our finest and most honorable military generals and admirals who are under wraps will continue to be besmirched and stained. Without such an investigation, suspicion and the darkest doubts will fill the minds of our people, who in this time of crisis must have the utmost confidence in the men who will lead us into battle should that battle ever become necessary.

With such an investigation, Mr. President, the American people will valiantly respond as they always have and support a program for victory in the cold war. And with such an investigation, the politicians and popoffs will be silenced by the truth. I again urge an investigation of the Cuban invasion and call upon my colleagues to put an end to trial by innuendo, by hearsay and by ignorance.

PRESERVATION OF OUR HISTORIC SITES AND BUILDINGS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, early this year the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and several Members of the House introduced measures designed to halt the headlong destruction of our irreplaceable sites, buildings, and objects of historic and cultural importance.

The Historic Sites Act of 1935 gives the Secretary of the Interior some authority for preserving buildings and sites of national significance. The proposed legislation would strengthen his hand. The Historic Sites Act of 1935 was adopted at a time when the Federal Government played a relatively insignificant role in construction programs. Today the Federal Government is spending great sums of money for federally assisted housing programs, urban renewal, highways, and so forth. In the implementation of these programs very little attention is being given to what they are doing to important historic sites. If the law is not amended to reflect the new situation, in a few years most of the physical evidences of our American heritage will be reduced to rubble.

When the historic American buildings survey ended in 1941, they had recorded more than 7,000 structures of outstanding architectural or historical merit worthy of preservation. Since the reactivation of the survey in 1957 it has been estimated, conservatively, that more than 40 percent of these have been destroyed or so materially altered as not to warrant preservation.

It is ironic that the destruction of the historic sites that tell the story of our country's fight for independence is being done by programs and projects financed either in whole or in part by the Federal Government. The very things that Americans seek out when they go abroad are systematically being destroyed at home. The preservation of our historic sites has more than just sentimental value. In the cold war between free nations and Communist nations it has great practical value. In destroying the visual evidences in which the broad cultural, political, economic, or social history of our Nation is best exemplified, we are blurring the portrait of America—and thus making it easier for our enemies to distort the true meaning of our country.

In recent years, with Federal funds aiding in urban renewal, highway building, and housing construction, the rate of destruction of our historic sites is accelerating to such an alarming degree that only corrective Federal legislation can diminish its impact. A number of

States, with direct encouragement and help from the National Trust for Historic Preservation, have passed legislation enabling communities to adopt ordinances to protect old and historic districts, or specific single sites and buildings.

But this is not enough. There is a pressing need for specific Federal legislation to make sure that funds used in federally assisted programs are well spent in terms of human values. We need legislation along the lines introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and others which provide that the effect on historic sites and buildings of a project involving Federal funds shall be taken into account in the planning of such project; that consideration be given to alternative schemes when such vital factors as scenic, historic, and architectural values may be irretrievably destroyed by such projects.

In the State of California we have a number of examples pointing up the need for this kind of legislation. The lore, legend, and history of Old Sacramento are being threatened by the proposed routing of a freeway. The Old Sacramento district in a blighted area on the river front has been surveyed and analyzed by experts, and plans for its redevelopment as a living, revitalized historic commercial area have been urged as part of the city's redevelopment program. But it may all be lost if plans of the State highway commission go through for locating the north-south freeway immediately in the area. This would prevent redevelopment of the old district as part of today's living city. Under California law, the selection of freeway routes is the sole prerogative of the State highway division. Proponents of the preservation program have urged location of the freeway on the west bank of the river.

If we had on our statute books a provision along the lines of the Humphrey proposal, the State highway commission would be under obligation to give consideration to alternative plans for the freeway—before Federal funds could be spent for this purpose.

I should like to make it perfectly clear that, in expressing my support of this legislation, I am not in any way expressing any reservation about public works programs needed to meet the demands of our times. At the same time, I think we need some mechanism in our law that will make us pause and consider what our extensive construction program might be doing to important evidences of our American heritage. We need, in short, a provision in the law to make sure that in projecting federally assisted programs, due consideration is given to plans that will allow us to have redevelopment, preserved landmarks, and sound traffic planning—and to have all three in harmony without one being sacrificed to achieve the others.

THE FAITH OF THE FATHERS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on March 19, 1961, Hon Edwin Gill, state treasurer of North Carolina, made a speech

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

concerned, it is a Federal aid to education bill, and I hope to see it passed unamended.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I associate myself with all the observations which have been made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]; and in connection with them, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial, published this morning in the Washington Post, in regard to the problems which have arisen in Alabama.

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

ALABAMA OFF DEEP END

Alabama came close to open rebellion against the United States yesterday with Governor Patterson's threat to have State authorities arrest the marshals sent to that State by the Department of Justice to help curb mob violence. It seems improbable that the Governor will carry out this threat, but the fact that he has made it heavily underscores the gravity of the situation. Any such lawless interference on the part of State officials with the right of the United States to protect the movement of interstate commerce would necessarily have to be met by force, with tragic consequences for Governor Patterson, the State of Alabama, and the country as a whole.

The basic cause of the trouble in Alabama lies in the decision of hoodlums to resort to violence to perpetuate racial segregation and in Governor Patterson's failure to maintain order. The Governor looks upon the so-called freedom riders as "rabble rousers" who went to Alabama for the avowed purpose of "creating racial incidents." But they are free citizens of the United States. They have a right to travel in Alabama singly or in an integrated group. This is a basic constitutional right which Alabama is obligated to respect and uphold.

Since the riots of last week, the Department of Justice had repeatedly urged upon Alabama officials its concern for the safety of the bus-riding students. Governor Patterson gave assurance that he had ample men and equipment and that he was determined "to fully protect everyone in Alabama." He declined Federal aid for this purpose. On the basis of this assurance the students boarded a bus in Birmingham for a peaceful trip to Montgomery.

Past experience gave every indication of violence at Montgomery when the bus arrived. Moreover, the FBI notified the Montgomery authorities that the controversial group was coming and asked for its protection. Yet no law-enforcement officials were in evidence when the bus arrived. Hoodlums had ample time to beat the students, white and Negro alike, before the police arrived, and to assault numerous others who merely showed sympathy with the students.

Especially flagrant was the slugging of John Selgenthaler, President Kennedy's representative in seeking a peaceful solution, when he tried to help a girl endangered by the mob. The crass disregard for the safety of individuals was further illustrated when Mr. Selgenthaler was left lying unconscious in the street for about 25 minutes—the only excuse being that all the "white" ambulances in the city were broken down.

In the face of this willful failure of the Alabama authorities to protect interstate travel, the administration was fully justified in taking bold measures to enforce the law. It seeks to enjoin the Ku Klux Klan and other groups from interfering with interstate travel. It has sent marshals to assist State

and local authorities in protecting persons and property against mobs. Governor Patterson's attitude creates a series of unnecessary problems, but the presence of the marshals constitutes a show of force and, presumably, a warning of more drastic action if that should become necessary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I say, in conclusion, that I think the administration is trying to act with calmness and reason. May I say, furthermore, so far as the bill which is presently pending before us is concerned, I would hope we could consider it without reference to race and without reference to religion, but solely on the merits of the bill proposed, which I think is a good measure, and which I hope will be passed practically intact by the Senate later this week.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in inserting the editorial in the RECORD and in associating myself with the position taken by the Senator from Montana, I add only that I am very glad that he stressed the fact that the entire problem of race relations in the South is one of the major foreign-policy problems confronting our country.

As I said at the United Nations last fall, when, as a Senator, I was there as one of the Senate's delegates of the United States, that question arose there time and time again; and we must face it today.

As I said this morning, at a committee hearing, I wish we had some scientific device by means of which we could measure psychological effects. If we could do that, we would have some interesting objective data in connection with what is happening in the world and in our own country in regard to this problem.

We need to keep in mind that millions of colored people in the world have won their political independence from various forms of colonialism—some paternalistic, some more kindly than others, some highly tyrannical that placed them under subjugation and exploitation. I think that fact has had a great psychological effect on the colored people of the United States.

We Americans have to face up to this problem. We cannot sweep it under the rug any longer. We have to recognize now that there are thousands and thousands of colored people in the United States who have developed a sort of Ghandi philosophy. I say, as a Christian, that they also have developed an attitude that, under their Christian principles, they have a moral duty to future generations of colored boys and girls in the United States to make whatever sacrifices are necessary in their generation to bring to an end second-class citizenship for the colored people.

I raise my voice in the Senate pleading for calmness on the part of the people of the South; pleading that they face this problem intellectually; pleading that they recognize that the time has come when they have got to insist that there be substituted for mob law anywhere in the South where it raises its head, as it has in Alabama recently, government by law and order; pleading today that they recognize that the people have the right

to travel in interstate commerce as those persons involved are traveling.

This does not mean that I advocate what they are doing, but it does mean that I recognize their constitutional right to do what they are doing, under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. It is the clear duty of the Federal Government to see to it that their constitutional rights are protected anywhere in the country, including some very troubled spots in the North, and I say that because the question of racial discrimination and denial of first-class citizenship in this country is not limited to the South.

My plea to all Americans this morning, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, is to recognize now that this has become a foreign policy issue. The time has come for us all to recognize now that the Constitution has to have uniform application throughout the length and breadth of this country.

I congratulate the President and the Attorney General of the United States, no matter how sad the experience, no matter how they wish it could have been avoided, for their courage, for their dedication to their oaths, to see to it that the Constitution is for the protection of people all over the country.

If there is the Governor of any State in this country who wants to seek to place himself above the Constitution of the United States, the Federal Government must deal with him in accordance with the clear application of the constitutional rights of the Federal Government.

I hope we will at least learn, out of the lessons being taught in connection with those very unhappy incidents which have occurred recently, that there never was a time in the last 100 years when it was more important that all sections of the country join and bind themselves together in a united determination to see to it that mob law is put down and that constitutional law prevails in this land.

CUBAN INVASION FAILURE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for not more than 4 minutes. I am to speak on a very important subject, and I should like to complete my statement without being interrupted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I have been allowed to take more than 3 minutes, I shall not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on April 30, I proposed a congressional investigation of the Cuban invasion failure similar to that conducted last year on the U-2 incident. At that time, I suggested that the inquiry should be closed, but that a daily transcript of the investi-

moral responsibility to help obtain the release of brave men who have been captured.

Second. It would not be confined to an exchange of men for bulldozers. The Cuban people need many things in their efforts to build a better life for themselves and their children. Among the items which we could offer them are milk for their children, school lunch programs as well as a variety of health and technical assistance programs.

Third. It is not confined to prisoners captured in the invasion. Reports from Cuba indicate there are many thousands of political prisoners held by the Castro government. If they wish to leave the country, my resolution would authorize negotiations for their release.

The text of my resolution follows:

Whereas the United States and Cuba have committed themselves under the Charter of the Organization of American States to settle their disputes by peaceful procedures, such as "direct negotiation, good offices, mediation, investigation and conciliation, judicial settlement and arbitration"; and

Whereas the expansion of Communist influence within Cuba has contributed to greatly increased tensions between Cuba and the United States and has resulted in an armed invasion of Cuba by Cuban refugees which has failed, with an unfortunate loss of life and the capture of more than 1,000 invaders by the Cuban Government, which is now threatening to sentence them to hard labor for an indeterminate period of time; and

Whereas Premier Fidel Castro on May 17 is reported to have offered to exchange most of these prisoners for 500 bulldozers; and

Whereas the United States in the past has participated in arrangements whereby prisoners were exchanged for prisoners; and

Whereas it is reported that many thousands of men and women in Cuba have been arrested and are being held as political prisoners; and

Whereas the United States has a moral responsibility to aid these military and political prisoners: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should offer to explore the possibilities for some exchange, through the United Nations or the Organization of American States or otherwise, which would result in the freeing of the captives and political prisoners, and at the same time show the Cuban people in Cuba that the United States is willing to supply them with nonmilitary equipment, health or technical assistance programs, school lunches or milk for children, or other programs which will contribute to the well being of the Cuban people as a whole.

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. GREEN of Oregon's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

SUMMIT MEETINGS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, many Congressmen on both sides of the aisle have noted with dismay and misgivings the news that once again an American president is "going

to the summit" to meet Mr. Khrushchev, of Russia.

Many of us have sat in this Chamber and heard similar announcements about the late Mr. Roosevelt, and about Mr. Truman and Mr. Eisenhower.

We had our misgivings then and they proved well founded. Down through the years we have seen time and again that it does not pay to deal in "summitry" with the Russians. For some reason, though, our Presidents seem obsessed with the idea. None have been able to resist its siren call.

Summitry will never replace a strong and nationalistic foreign policy, nor should it be used to divert the attention of the American people from what seems to me to be the No. 1 foreign problem of today. That problem is Cuba.

While the President prepares to go to the summit at Vienna with the same man whose character, as he rightly said, was stamped forever on the bloody streets of Budapest, Fidel Castro is preparing himself to become the Lenin of the Western Hemisphere.

Our previous experiences at the summit have proven the truth of an old midwestern saying—man is the only animal that can be skinned more than once. We have been skinned at Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Geneva, Camp David, and other places; yet it seems that every time Russia beckons, our chief executive is ready to run to a meeting.

Nothing is really gained. Much has been lost. You would think that by this time President Kennedy would profit from the mistakes of the late Mr. Roosevelt, and from the errors of Mr. Truman and Mr. Eisenhower.

It is apparent that is not the case. It is also apparent that this latest summit is a diversionary tactic to take the minds of the American people off the problem that sits 90 miles off our shores—the problem of Cuba.

Cuba is going to continue to be our No. 1 problem until this administration stops vacillating and adopts a firm policy designed to bring down Castro and his henchmen.

It is my opinion and the opinion of many military and foreign policy experts that this administration should at once clamp a tight air and sea blockade on Cuba. This blockade should be designed to prevent any military goods from Iron Curtain countries from reaching Cuba.

Many gentlemen on this side of the aisle have withheld criticism and advice in a true attempt to create a bipartisan air about our policy concerning Cuba. Since it is now apparent we have no true policy on Cuba, then perhaps it is our job, as the opposition, to suggest one.

We must start now, and we must bring down Castro now; otherwise, his military position may, in the future, be demolished at a cost dear to this Nation. Otherwise, we may see a Soviet missile base 90 miles offshore.

This blockade does not require any great change in foreign policy. It merely calls for implementation of the basic principles of the Monroe Doctrine and other past foreign policy edicts.

This House has already recognized the threat of Cuba to this hemisphere's peace

and well being. Only last week, we passed a resolution that demanded collective action against the clear and present danger of Cuba and communism in our midst.

Unless we insist that the sense of this resolution be followed up, unless we insist on adoption of a hard and firm policy in regard to Cuba, we are setting the stage for Fidel Castro to build up an island bastion of power. We are also allowing the stage to be set for a Communist springboard to Latin America.

We can expect Castro-agitated uprisings in other South American countries and we will some day find our weak-kneed policies in regard to Cuba have cost us nation after nation in Latin America.

Now, what are we actually doing?

Instead of concentrating on this hemisphere's "Communist cancer in Cuba" we see an attempt to divert the attention of the American people to another summit—which will see little or nothing accomplished and which will see Russia concede nothing and demand all.

When are we going to wake up to our peril? When will we realize that this Nation needs a positive, energetic, nationalistic foreign policy?

This, Mr. Speaker, is now the duty and responsibility of this administration, which, in just 4 short months, has plunged our prestige to its lowest ebb in history. I say it is the responsibility of this administration—it promised sweeping changes in our national prestige, but it certainly missed the call on the direction.

Since it has plunged us into the depths, it now becomes its responsibility to get us out. I want to state here and now that I will join in any attempt to get that job done and will back any strong stand on Cuba.

I will support any policy formed to get rid of communism in Cuba in particular and thwart the spread of communism in general.

I cannot support our present policy. It is, at its best, poorly conceived, poorly thought out, poorly administered, and its returns have been anything but encouraging.

Many of my constituents believe we are seeing an administration that is weak-kneed on foreign policy and civil rights legislation, and that really has only two accomplishments about which to talk.

These are the rough, tough political pressures on the home front and the diarrhea of words later weakened by utter inactivity.

This administration is willing to act tough and be tough with Congressmen. The President recognized that last week when he penned a short note on a photograph attesting to the ability of the administration to have its way in this House.

Yes, the administration is willing to get tough to get its deficit spending, welfare state schemes through the Congress.

Why doesn't it shift this toughness to the foreign scene, where it is really needed? And why does it not back up all those words with action?

Those of us who have served in Congress through World War II, the Korean

pact the proposed merger will have on the railroad workers and their welfare must be kept in mind when consideration is given to the possibility of a merger. If the merger is not realized, what security can the financially weak B. & O. offer its employees, if any at all? If the C. & O. and the B. & O. do merge and the B. & O. is thereby strengthened, will this stronger financial position offer more job security to the railroad workers?

It must be borne in mind, also, that the railroad plant is too essential to this Nation for mergers on a hit-and-miss or piecemeal basis. They should be planned carefully so that the result will not be to have all the strong roads merged on one side, with the weak roads left out in the cold, so to speak. This would do irreparable damage to the communities served by the latter roads.

I would hope that the appropriate Federal regulatory and policy officials will, therefore, consider this merger within the context of the overriding public interest.

SPACE CONQUEST

(Mr. DEROUNIAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, now that our Nation has successfully demonstrated the ability to put a man into outer space and return him safely, we can begin to think constructively about the next stages of such exploration.

Recently I attended the formal dedication of a space-orientated facility which increases my optimism that we have the resources and ability to translate tomorrow into today. Republic Aviation Corp., which for three decades has produced fighter aircraft which have been a backbone of our defense, publicly opened its new Paul Moore Research and Development Center. This \$14 million facility has since been described by reporters as "the most diversified privately owned facility of its type in existence." The work to be carried on within its walls is best reflected by the names of the seven research laboratories around which it is built. They are: Space Environment and Life Sciences, Re-Entry Simulation; Electronics, Materials Development; Fluids, Guidance and Control Systems, and Nuclear Radiation. In addition it is supported by three wind tunnels which, coupled with other units, gives the company the unique capability of testing spacecraft models at speeds ranging from 400 miles per hour to over 19,500 miles per hour, which is orbital velocity.

Mundy I. Peale, president of Republic, and my constituent, pointed out that the technical transformation of the company from its original role as an airplane company had been going on for several years. Since 1958 alone, he said, the company had ventured into 29 new technological areas and had enlarged its research and scientific staff three times.

I would like now to quote some excerpts from the remarks of Mr. Peale during the luncheon address at the ceremonies because I feel they are especially

timely and reflect the kind of clear thinking which will stand this Nation in good stead during the days ahead.

Mr. Peale said, in part:

The laboratories you will see in this Center have been bought and paid for by the past work of scientists, engineers, production workers, and office employees. They have been paid for, also, by the men and women who invested their earnings and their savings in this country. Looking back on my own 23 years with Republic, it sometimes seems that our stockholders were the bravest of us all.

A Russian major has orbited the earth and returned. It is a fine achievement. But even if we try to apply the traditional and sincere philosophy of American sportsmanship and say "Well done, Russia," the rest of the world will no longer let us get by with it. Laotians and Cubans and Congolese, and undoubtedly many others, accept the feat as proof of Soviet superiority in all things—diplomatic, scientific, military, mental and muscular.

Congressman WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, expressed his doubts over the profitability of negotiating with the Communists on disarmament by making this point: "The difference between us is that we simply want to end the struggle—the Soviets want to win it."

In his inaugural address President Kennedy reminded us that we should not "ask what our country can do for us, but what we can do for our country."

This was intended and, I'm sure, accepted as an exhortation to the individual American. I would like to remind you all that this also applies to the American corporation which, under our laws, is a citizen of the United States.

There is no mystery as to what the corporation can be for our country. Its greatest contribution can be the utilization of capital to make possible the doing of worthwhile work, to provide employment, to increase our standard of living, and to give something to the enlargement of human values.

We are inclined to forget that progress is no longer measured in what we can do with our hands alone. It is also measured by what we can create in capital facilities that make human labor easier and vastly more productive.

Only 20 years ago the theme of the Temporary National Economic Committee hearings was that America's frontiers had closed and that this was what had caused the stagnation of the thirties. A famous survey made at the University of Notre Dame concluded that during the 1930's not \$1 had been added to the capital equipment of the United States.

Now, with a suddenness that we still can hardly grasp, the frontiers have opened in a way that no frontier ever opened before: to include the space and the universe.

This is the most dramatic aspect. Probably the more practical one is the flowering of dozens of sciences that make accomplishment possible in a hundred directions—not merely in outer space, but in the molecules of metals and the composition of the human body, to mention just a few.

It is important we see this revolution in accurate perspective:

Space, after all, is only a new and unexplored part of that universe we have been studying since Copernicus. The achievements of only the last 7 years impress upon us that the pace of discovery is more breathtaking than anyone would have dared prophesy. But still, what we are doing is simply wrenching truths about matter from the unknown and finding applications for this new knowledge.

Unless we convert this knowledge into progress for people it isn't worth anything.

Our greatest need and our greatest opportunity is to interpret the new momentum of science so as to make it directly important and valuable to millions of Americans.

This can be done. Our facilities for communicating knowledge and ideas are highly developed. How long ago was it that, supposedly, only 10 people in the world understood the theory of Einstein? Today a scientist must not only know it, he must have 20 different ways of applying it, to get a job.

From there we must be careful to remind ourselves that there is no assurance of success in any single line of discovery. We must pursue broad parallel lines of development. Our assurance then is this: That the support of scientific thinking with physical facilities administered by dynamic and creative industrial management will increase the opportunities where people can be put to work gainfully in large numbers to create new wealth.

Science affects people through people—the concern for humanity is the endless responsibility of living men and women. This responsibility can never be delegated to the machine. Some might assume that the keynote of this dedication is a sense of awe at the rapidly expanding scientific world and the new tools it requires.

But that is not the keynote. The keynote is our renewal of the solemn pledge to make human life here—and everywhere—more meaningful. This requires a mighty effort at communication, keeping the family circle unbroken, with scientist linked to assembly line worker, executive to farmer, educator to investor, and clerical worker to minister.

Finally, we must use our best talents in the greater enterprise of discovery—seeking and making truly understood the elements of human progress that are embedded in this onrush of technical accomplishment.

This is the challenge to all of us—resolutely to give and to receive clear and helpful interpretations of all that we are doing, so that we strengthen our faith and inspire the hope and courage of all mankind.

EXCHANGE OF CUBAN PRISONERS

(Mr. KOWALSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to urge the U.S. Government to explore an exchange of Cuban military and political prisoners for U.S. nonmilitary assistance to the Cuban people, including milk for Cuban children or school lunch programs.

It is unfortunate that Premier Fidel Castro should take the cynical and materialistic view that human lives can be traded for 500 bulldozers. But his offer of May 17 now opens up the possibility for releasing the Cubans who participated in the abortive invasion effort in April.

I feel sure all Americans welcome the formation of a group, organized to seek the release of the captives by private subscription.

My resolution goes beyond that worthy effort in three important respects—

First, it would establish the principle that the U.S. Government as well as private citizens should share in the cost. Our Government shared some responsibility for that invasion and now shares a

tion, the Legislature of Hawaii appropriated an additional \$50,000. This leaves \$200,000 still needed.

Recently, the Legislature of Wisconsin adopted a joint resolution urging the appropriation of the remaining \$200,000 for completion of the memorial.

In recognition of the sacrifices of the men of the U.S.S. *Arizona*—of the tremendous efforts already made for this shrine—and the deep concern of the State legislature and of patriots everywhere for its completion, I bring this resolution to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JOINT RESOLUTION 49

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress to appropriate the necessary funds so that the memorial over the U.S.S. *Arizona* may be completed as a national shrine for the men killed at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941

Whereas the project to build a permanent memorial over the hull of the U.S.S. *Arizona*, sunk in the December 7, 1941, attack on Pearl Harbor and still containing the bodies of 1,102 servicemen entombed within it, is slowing because of lack of funds although the project is nearing completion; and

Whereas the Navy Club of the United States of America, one of the originators of the plan to enshrine the *Arizona* and its gallant dead as a memorial to all who died at Pearl Harbor on the "day of infamy" in 1941, has been responsible together with the Pacific War Memorial Commission for raising \$250,000 privately toward the \$500,000 needed; and

Whereas the Hawaii Legislature has appropriated an additional \$50,000 toward the memorial leaving an additional \$200,000 still needed; and

Whereas the completion of this memorial is in the interest of the Nation as a whole as a shrine to the men who gave their lives and as a symbol for future eternal vigilance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, the assembly concurring, That the Congress is memorialized by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin to appropriate the necessary \$200,000 in additional funds so that the memorial over the U.S.S. *Arizona* may be completed at an early date as a national shrine for the men killed at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and that suitable copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and the Members of Congress from this State.

W. P. KNOWLES,
President of the Senate.
LAURENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
DAVID J. BLANCHARD,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ROBERT G. MAROTZ,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

NEEDED: A GREATER SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY BY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES AND "FREEDOM RIDERS" IN RIOTS IN ALABAMA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a U.S. Senator, as a citizen, and as a human being, I, along with my fellow Americans deplore, and am saddened by, the race riots in Alabama.

As Americans, we believe in perpetuation of a climate in which the rights

and privileges of all citizens—regardless of race, creed, or national origin—can be fully exercised and protected.

We recognize, of course, that racial interrelationships have a long, turbulent history.

In our efforts to resolve the inherent problems, there is always the need for the exercise, by all sides, of human understanding and good judgment.

Fundamentally, there is a need to preserve the legal rights of all citizens. This includes the right to travel, to be protected from mob violence, and the full exercise of other legitimate privileges.

To assure a climate in which this can be accomplished, our law enforcement agencies—local, State and Federal—have a basic responsibility. If violations occur, then whatever force is necessary should be deployed to guard against such violations.

However, our citizens—individually, and by association—also have a great responsibility for the exercise of good judgment in such circumstances.

Today, our free system is engaged—militarily, sociologically, economically, politically, ideologically—in a life-and-death struggle with totalitarian communism.

Previously, the riots in Little Rock gave our Nation a "black eye"—a blow to our national prestige.

Undoubtedly the tragic events in Alabama also will be "ballooned" globally, to distort the image of the United States.

In the larger world—as well as the legal, social, interracial—view, then, there is a need to ask: Are the law enforcement agencies, as well as the so-called "Freedom Riders" exercising the kind of judgment that will, first, further, not retard, their separate causes; and second, reflect favorably, not unfavorably, upon the Nation of which they—regardless of this specific cause—are, and should be, responsible citizens.

There is, then, a national call to rise above the prejudices, hates, blind action—whatever motivations are the underlying factors in these tragic events—and to remember that we serve ourselves best if we, first, best serve our country.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION TO CREATE A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to announce to the Senate that hearings have been scheduled on the legislation which provides for the creation of a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. These bills include S. 289, S. 375, S. 609 and S. 1633. The latter bill was submitted to the Congress by the President as a part of the administration's program. These hearings will be held before the Reorganization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations in room 3302, New Senate Office Building, on Wednesday and Thursday, June 21 and 22.

A number of Senators have expressed interest in this proposed legislation, and I am making this announcement well in advance of the hearing dates so that

those Senators wishing to appear before our subcommittee can arrange to do so.

Also, there are many private groups and individuals who have indicated a desire to testify on this bill.

I would suggest that anyone wishing to appear as a witness or who wishes to file a statement on the bill to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, should communicate with the Government Operations Committee, room 3304, New Senate Office Building. Telephone CA 4-3121, or Government code 180, extension 4753 at the Capitol. We wish to give the opportunity to testify to all who are interested in this important legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FUNERAL OF SENATOR GEORGE W. MALONE, OF NEVADA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as all Senators know, today we are sad because of the death of our former colleague, Senator Malone of Nevada. Many in the Senate wish to pay their tributes to his memory by attending his funeral at 1 o'clock. Therefore, I shall request that the Senate stand in recess until 1 o'clock. Let me say that I have cleared this matter with the majority leader.

So, Mr. President, in order to enable the Senate to proceed at 1 o'clock with debate on the Bush amendment, and also in order to allow ample time for Senators to attend the funeral of the late Senator Malone, of Nevada, and thereafter to return to the Senate in time to vote on the Bush amendment, I shall either move or shall ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess until 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I may not object, let me say that Senators have come to the Chamber to transact morning business. Therefore, will the Senator from Oregon modify his request, so as to make it possible for Senators to transact morning business and for the reassembly, following the recess, to occur 1 hour after the conclusion of the transaction of morning business?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. Mr. President, I modify my request accordingly, with the understanding that the 1-hour recess will begin at the conclusion of the transaction of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modified request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

Morning business is now in order.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON VET-
ERANS' AFFAIRS—ADDITIONAL
COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. CANNON, Mr. President, on May 3, on behalf of myself and 32 other Senators, I submitted a resolution (S. Res. 134) to amend the standing rules of the Senate to create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] has since requested that his name be added as a cosponsor. I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the resolution the name of the Senator from Iowa be added.

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

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed; and, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now stand in recess for 1 hour.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

At the conclusion of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. METCALF in the chair).

THE ATTEMPTED INVASION OF
CUBA

During consideration of H.R. 1021, Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The other day the distinguished Senator from Oregon held some hearings before a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee in his capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. He invited other Senators to be present. I was one of the Senators who was present part of the time. I should like, with the Senator's indulgence, to take a moment or two to clarify some interpretation placed on the remarks attributed to me following the hearing.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. President, may we have the understanding that this interruption will appear either previous to or following discussion of the education bill?

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The other day, during the hearings being conducted by the Senator from Oregon with respect to the Cuban matter, one of the Senators leaving the room made a statement which implied some criticism of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Later on, at the conclusion of that hearing, I left the room and was asked by some reporters by the door what I thought. I said, "Well, I thought there were certain aspects of it that should be reviewed by the Armed Services Committee," of which I am a member. Another reporter made some further interrogatory. He said, "Well, how do you personally

feel about it?" I said, "I was flabbergasted," and started to say why I was flabbergasted.

Just then General Lemnitzer came out of the door, and the reporter turned to find out what General Lemnitzer had to say in comment on an earlier statement by another Senator that he thought there should be a shakeup.

Subsequently, or as soon as I could, I turned to see if there was any reporter interested in having me finish the sentence. They were interested in what General Lemnitzer was saying. Later, reporters from the Associated Press and CBS asked me, and I finished the sentence for them. Apparently the completion of the sentence never reached the editor of the Washington Star or the Washington Daily News. The Washington Daily News, in its editorial of today says:

All the public knows is that one Senator, having heard the testimony, thinks a shake-up is essential. Another Senator—CASE of South Dakota—says he was "flabbergasted" by what he heard.

In yesterday's Washington Sunday Star, an editorial reads:

It is true that Senator GORE, except possibly for some implied support from Senator CASE of South Dakota, stands alone. Senator MORSE, chairman of the investigating subcommittee, has expressed his confidence in the Joint Chiefs.

What I started to say, and what I did say to those who listened to the completion of the sentence, was that I was flabbergasted that the military reputation of the United States could be laid on the line by persons who are not in the Military Establishment or under their control—which puts a different meaning on it. I started to say I thought there were aspects of the matter that ought to be reviewed by the Armed Services Committee. I was a member of that committee. We had in the hearings testimony by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and some of their associates. It was only natural that I should say certain aspects of the matter should be reviewed by the Armed Services Committee.

I was flabbergasted—I am still flabbergasted—that the military reputation of the United States could be laid on the line by persons who are not under the control of the Military Establishment of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from South Dakota for coming to the hearing of the committee the other day. The questions he asked and the contributions he made by way of his suggestions and statements were very helpful to the record we are making. I did not hear what transpired outside the committee room, but I am sure no confidence is violated when I say that the Senator from South Dakota did say in the committee room, practically verbatim, just what he said on the floor of the Senate. In fairness to the Senator from South Dakota, the public record should show that. Beyond that, I do not intend to involve myself in any controversy which the Senator from South Dakota may be involved in with anybody else; but I do want to say that what he has said on the floor of the Sen-

ate he said, in meaning, in the committee itself.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in response to what the Senator from Oregon, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has said, I should also like to say, if I may, and I hope I am not violating any confidence of the subcommittee, that a question was asked, and I think some emphasis was placed on it by the distinguished Senator from Oregon which would have shed some light on the whole situation, and which would have been helpful to members of the committee who were obliged to leave before the hearing was concluded. I think the Senator from Oregon recalls the question which he asked, or the matter to which he directed attention, and said that was a very significant comment; that if that had been brought to the attention to the Senators present, there would perhaps have been a different feeling about some of the issues involved.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator knows, I propose to make the recommendation to the full Foreign Relations Committee, if the subcommittee approves, the full Foreign Relations Committee give approval to the subcommittee to advise the President that we think the contents of the transcript should be made known to the President, and particularly the piece of information that the Senator alludes to, which bore upon the question I asked.

The press representatives asked me afterward, "Do you mean to imply, Senator, that the President does not know all these things?" My reply was, "I simply want to make sure he knows. I think we owe it to him to give him the opportunity to make absolutely certain he knows the condition of the transcript and also, if it meets with his pleasure, that he have whatever benefit, if any would come from a brief consultation with the members of the committee in respect to some of our observations and interpretations as to the significance of what the transcript indicates."

He might obtain benefit from reviewing some of the problems which I think confront the President of the United States in respect to the whole matter of our procedures and our policies in the field of Latin American affairs.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair now lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Connecticut wishes to modify his amendment, and that is perfectly acceptable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The author of the amendment has that right.

**PURR WORDS AND SLUR WORDS:
HURDLES IN THOUGHT TRANS-
MISSION**

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, much of our time on the floor of the Senate is spent in dissecting the meaning of words. Indeed, the bulk of material in the RECORD in which this appears deals in some degree with this process because the same word evokes different responses in different individuals. At the same time our language offers a broad spectrum for description of abstract ideas. For instance, "chronic complainer" and "perfectionist" are terms that might be used to describe the same individual, but the meanings are poles apart.

Mr. Stuart Chase, a word craftsman of some precision, has delved into the language barrier between reasonable men in an article which appears in the spring 1961, issue of the Lamp. A little reflection on the article, entitled "What Are We Talking About?" makes me wonder whether work of the Congress would be facilitated by creating a Joint Committee on Definitions, thus providing more definite boundaries within which we could pursue our discussions. It might be advantageous to set forth the meaning of such phrases as "the public interest," a condition frequently alluded to here.

But the task of defining is not without peril. How would members of the Joint Committee on Definitions react when dealing with words such as "Democrat" and "Republican"?

I ask consent to include with my remarks portions of an article by Stuart Chase from the attractive and enlightened house organ of one of the Nation's largest corporations, the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

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

EXCERPTS FROM ARTICLE ENTITLED "WHAT ARE WE TALKING ABOUT"
(By Stuart Chase)

What is free enterprise? In a recent survey of public opinion, a scientific sample of adult Americans were asked to define this familiar phrase. Only 30 percent of them had a passable answer; many thought it meant something given away free at a sale. Surveys conducted by Opinion Research Corp. show that most Americans have only the foggiest notion of such terms as "capitalism," "socialism," "communism," "productivity," "depletion." Even the word "dividends" baffles some citizens.

Fogginess about economic terms is not confined to the rank and file. Discussion and dispute rage in academic, congressional, journalistic, and executive circles about the political, economic, and social issues of the day, in words that shed little light, although they often generate heat.

Beware, the semanticists say, of "slur" words and "purr" words, terms which have a built-in emotional bias. They raise the blood pressure and fog the vision. They can transform reasonable men into unreasonable table pounders. "Profiteer" is a slur word, and so is "spender," while "budget balancer" is a purr term, along with "home" and "mother." Campaign oratory normally contains a generous larding of slurs and purrs; indeed it is

often intended to stir the emotions and confuse.

Let us compare briefly our present economy with the language currently used to describe it. The United States has developed a series of economic habits and arrangements which produce a fantastic output of goods, together with a somewhat uneven balance between private and public expenditures. Automobiles are in oversupply and places to park them in undersupply. A television set is in nearly every home, while the country is gravely short of school classrooms. Average family income—more than \$7,000—is the highest ever known on earth; the poor are getting richer, and the rich disgorge in income taxes up to 91 percent of their annual take. Hours of labor have declined so dramatically over the years that the use of leisure has become a serious problem. The stockholders of large corporations, in many cases and for various reasons, no longer exert management control; control is in the hands of a continuing group of professional managers who may hold only a minority stock interest. The Federal Government administers a social security system with more than 100 million Americans on its rolls. Farmers now constitute less than 10 percent of the gainfully employed, with the ratio shrinking year by year, yet they still produce tremendous surpluses. Factory workers are declining relative to white collar workers, automation speeding the process.

OLD WORDS FOR NEW REALITIES

The Washington Post in a recent editorial summed up the current economic pattern:

We live in a mixed economy, with tariffs, subsidies, tax privileges, credit arrangements, and direct and indirect governmental regulation. In total this is neither socialism nor capitalism, but a composite adjustment of a practical people to the realities of day-to-day affairs. We live in private houses which we can afford because of governmental control of the mortgage market.

One might go on to give unlimited examples of the way private affairs are entangled with those of government on its three levels. They are interwoven too with nonprofit institutions like universities and foundations, and with cooperative enterprises. The reality just will not fit into neat, exclusive categories. This mixed economic pattern is spreading throughout the so-called free world.

Here then is the objective reality, the mixed economy which is steadily raising living standards but at the same time creating new problems of imbalance, some badly in need of correction. Responsible citizens are concerned with these problems; they are also concerned with the rapidly expanding Russian economy and the competition it offers to our system.

"Socialism" has long been explicitly defined by scholars as the public ownership and operation of the principal means of production. Webster will corroborate this one. It follows that there is very little socialism in the United States. Public utilities are the only important exception, and these in many cases have been operated by the community ever since the first water and sewage works, a century and more ago. Regulation, to be sure, is gaining. Federal, State, and local governments are moving in to regulate motor traffic, the airwaves, water and air pollution; they are stepping up social security laws. This is welfare legislation, but it is not socialism or communism.

"Capitalism" can be defined as a system where the private owners of capital decide and direct the flow of investment, and so control the nation's economy, within certain overall rules laid down by the Constitution and the state. Capitalists freely vie in

choosing what resources shall be developed next and what goods placed upon the market. They must abjure monopoly and keep the market free. They hire and fire at their discretion, unimpeded by social legislation and trade union rules. There is reason to believe that Britain in the 1840's and America in the 1870's were not too far from such performance.

A hard look at the American economy today reveals that it corresponds about as little to "capitalism," as defined above, as it does to the accredited definition of "socialism." Discussion based on these terms is likely to be stale and unprofitable, as well as overemotional. Remedial action based on these terms is likely to be confused. There is simply no such animal out there in the real world.

Take "free enterprise" and its sister terms, "free competition" and "the free market." Plenty of lively competition goes on in Main Street, but over the years the free market, as the Washington Post points out, has been drastically modified. Protective tariffs; subsidies of many kinds; "fair trade" laws, where manufacturers set the price at which retailers can resell; "oligopoly," where a handful of firms more or less control a market; Government regulation of utilities and the airwaves—all these practices modify, if they do not contradict, free competition. In brief, "our free enterprise system" is a wild misnomer for what is actually going on. But "our monopolistic system" is almost equally wild. The system varies from the airtight monopoly of the Atomic Energy Commission to the unhampered competition of roadside vegetable vendors.

Take the national debt, which looms in many minds as an arching tidal wave, about to engulf us all. A neighbor told me recently that he was more afraid of this "crushing burden" than he was of nuclear war. Most of us think of the national debt as similar to a mortgage on one's house. Speaking as a CPA, I know that the analogy is weirdly inaccurate.

The Federal debt is little greater now than it was in 1946—about \$290 billion as against \$279 billion—while the gross national product has almost doubled and population has soared. The "crushing burden" thus grows relatively less. The debt furthermore is practically all internal, and interest received by citizens is subject to taxation; we are on both sides of the equation. It is utterly impossible for the United States to "go bankrupt" under these conditions. The real difficulty with the debt is its unequal distribution among groups inside the country—banks, trustees, insurance companies, corporations, individuals, and other bondholders. The debt could be better managed, doubtless, but such action will be difficult as long as the words are so far from the facts.

Take "balanced budget," a term closely allied in our minds to the debt. It is a purr term, while "unbalance" is a slur. Practically every candidate for President in my memory has promised to balance the budget. It is a battle of words, not of facts. Fiscal prudence over the years is certainly mandatory, but there is no occasion for a scrupulous balance every year. A deficit is sound procedure in a recession year, and in prosperous years a surplus should be planned for, to retire some of the debt. Few citizens, furthermore, ever stop to define "the budget." Shall it be on a cash basis or on an accrued basis? Shall social security fund transactions be included or excluded? Shall earning assets, like the TVA, be capitalized as in a business balance sheet, or treated as running expenses?

This brings us to the powerful slur word "spending." Spending for what? Is it better for the community to have money spent

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7937

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE WEST CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF THE AUGUSTANA EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH APRIL 22, 1961

Whereas the National Lutheran Council has made a statement in regard to the issue of governmental aid to nonpublic elementary and secondary schools, as follows:

"The National Lutheran Council views with concern the proposal made in connection with legislation currently before Congress which would authorize loans to nonpublic elementary and secondary schools for the construction of school buildings, on the bases that:

"(a) Such Government aid previously given to colleges and universities operated by religious groups has been considered by many a borderline practice in proper relation between church and state, but Government aid for the construction of church-operated schools at the elementary and secondary level is clearly a form of tax support for sectarian instruction; and,

"(b) The availability of such aid to nonpublic schools would facilitate with public funds the establishment of racially segregated private schools as an alternative to integration in the public schools"; Therefore be it

Resolved, That—

1. The West Central Conference of the Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church record its opposition to the granting of governmental aid to nonpublic elementary and secondary schools;

2. We urge members of Conference congregations to write their congressional representatives giving expression of their convictions on the subject of governmental aid to nonpublic elementary and secondary schools; and,

3. The Secretary of the Conference be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the Members of the congressional delegation from each of the States represented in our Conference.

Cuba file
CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several weeks ago in the Committee on Foreign Relations I stated that practically nothing that is discussed in the committee, regardless of how highly sensitive it may be from a classified information standpoint, remains within the walls of the committee rooms. The experience of every day fortifies me in that conviction. There is no information divulged in that committee room sensitive and dangerous to the country, and hence classified through it may be, that does not ultimately, by direct or indirect expression, become knowledge for the world.

From my own standpoint I have become deeply apprehensive that, while trying to abide by that understanding about confidential, sensitive, and classified information, I have subsequently found that by direct quotation or indirect statements everything that occurs becomes public information.

I cannot associate myself with the efforts to condemn the Central Intelligence Agency or the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the basis of what happened in Cuba. The failure to keep classified information inviolate is one of the reasons

why we are in the rather delicate position we occupy today.

Whatever happened in Cuba was wrong, in my opinion, because the invasion, or whatever it may be called, was tolerated and then allowed to become a failure after it had started. If invasion was the decision, nothing should have been left undone to make it a success. I think that it was a debacle, of course.

We have suffered unduly in the world on account of that event, and the suffering has not yet come to an end. We do not know what will happen in Laos, South Vietnam, Thailand, Cambodia, and other places.

My principal reason for addressing the Senate today is to state that I do not condone the statement condemning our Chiefs of Staff that was made following last Friday morning's meeting of the committee. I have implicit confidence in the Chiefs of Staff. They have done great work, and the interest of our country is not served by these "interhouse accusations." It would be far better if we would point out the weaknesses of the Soviet and their deprivations. Not one word is spoken about them. But in the Chamber today I have heard nothing but criticism of my Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for additional time so that I may be allowed to ask a question of the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUTLER. Does not the Senator believe that this question, which I am sure is not clear to the public or, indeed to the Senators, should be reserved until such time as an impartial investigation, such as was made of the U-2 incident, is made of the invasion and a full report is made by the committee entrusted to make the investigation?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I opposed the U-2 inquiry. No good purpose that would benefit our country could be served through such an investigation. Nothing of a constructive nature could follow.

Mr. BUTLER. At least, did not the people learn the truth concerning the U-2 incident? Does not the Senator from Ohio believe that the people of America are entitled to know who made the decisions and why they were made?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur in the appraisal of the Senator from Maryland with respect to the subject, but I do not concur in the idea that we should conduct an investigation. The investigation of the U-2 incident served the Communists and not our country. I cannot see what good would be served our country by a general open and public discussion.

Mr. BUTLER. Then I believe it behooves Senators to remain silent about the whole matter and make accusations against innocent people who have served their country well and who are unable to make answer.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If I were to express myself, I would suggest that we do not become slaves of the microphone and the television lens when it is in the corridor outside the room of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Let us not run up to it with great avidity to tell the world what happened in the Committee on Foreign Relations, which has been discussing sensitive and classified material.

Mr. BUTLER. Such information does nothing but degrade the Military Establishment of this great country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator from Maryland for making that statement.

VIOLENCE IN ALABAMA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is a sad day for American when a group of young white and Negro citizens cannot safely travel through any of our States. The Communists already are making the most of this incident in the world press.

Firm action is needed to restore law and order and constitutional protection to the victims of the mob in Alabama. It must be made clear that such deprivations do not go unremedied in our great democracy.

Our integrity as a nation of law is at stake as well as our standing in the international community. We cannot permit the proud inheritance of freedom which we all enjoy as Americans to be besmirched and stained by hoodlums, racists, and demagogues.

I commend Attorney General Kennedy for his bold response to this ugly situation. No other course was open to him but to invoke whatever Federal authority existed to cope with this situation. This is not an invasion of States' rights. There is a national responsibility to uphold the Constitution and to safeguard travel by interstate facilities. We would be a Union of States in name only if the Federal Government had no authority to restore law and order under circumstances such as exist in Alabama.

It must be assumed that the Attorney General is acting with the approval and encouragement of the President. However, it would be very desirable for the President to give the full legal and moral support of his office to the Attorney General's efforts. A strong public statement by the President would prevent any misconceptions as to where the overwhelming majority of Americans stand on this issue.

Mr. President, I believe strongly in the need for new civil rights legislation and this incident in Alabama emphasizes the great gap which still exists between our constitutional principles and their enjoyment by all Americans. But certainly no new laws are needed for the Federal Government to deal with such conditions as exist in Alabama. The present laws are fully adequate to enable the Department of Justice to take action in this situation. Obviously we need not and should not wait for additional legislation to meet the clear responsibilities of the Federal Government to protect the freedom riders.

Miami County townships plays a major role in keeping top teachers in these areas.

Charles L. Stalcup, president of the Bloomfield school board said that— it would mean that our local property taxes would have to be raised 20 cents [per \$100] to get the amount now contributed by the Federal Government.

2. Was the Federal grant contributed to the general fund of the school district or was it allocated for specific expenses?

Most of the school districts replied that the Federal grants are used for general school expenses and particularly for teachers' salaries. Use of the money to meet capital expenses or to retire capital debt is, of course, prohibited by the law.

3. Did the acceptance of the Federal grant result in any Federal regulation, specific or implied, with regard to school curriculum, personnel, or administration?

Response to this important question has been a consistent and emphatic "no." Not a single instance of Federal control or regulation was reported. Typical of the comments on this question was the statement of Leo J. Costello, superintendent of the Loogootee public schools, who said:

I hope that you will do all in your power to get us more Federal help because the fear, that so many have, of Federal control has not materialized.

4. Is the administration of the program satisfactory?

The comments generally indicated that the program was being administered satisfactorily, although some criticized the amount of paperwork involved and the timing of the grants.

5. Do you favor continuation of this Federal aid program?

Without dissent, every one of the respondents voiced their anxious hope that the program would be continued. Glenn D. Barkes, superintendent of the New Albany-Floyd County Consolidated School Corporation said:

Since our experience has been exceptionally good, we favor this program without reservation.

6. Further comments—

Most of the comments offered reemphasized the general acceptability of the program and favored further Federal assistance. Not uncommon was this comment by Vance B. Collins, superintendent of the Clarksville School Town: "I would like to urge that very serious consideration be given to the education bills of the present administration. I feel that Federal funds can be utilized efficiently in the field of education. It seems to me that is the only source of funds left open to take care of increased enrollment, increased and intensified curriculum and increased demands being made by the public in general."

From the replies, I have concluded:

First. That the programs of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 are vital to many communities and should be continued.

Second. That Federal aid to education can be free of Federal control and regulation and still be effective, if we in Congress insist that local school autonomy be preserved.

I hope that those who seriously questioned the practicality of Federal aid to education without imposed Federal regulation will be enlightened by the results of this survey. I hope that the fears of Federal controls resulting from Federal assistance will be quieted.

NATIONAL FREEDOMS FOUNDATION CLASSROOM TEACHER MEDAL AND CITATION TO DONALD R. TERRY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the many friends and associates of Mr. Donald R. Terry, director of the Speech Department of Louisville High School, Louisville, Ohio, in congratulating him upon the occasion of having been chosen to receive a National Freedoms Foundation Classroom Teacher Medal and citation, in recognition of his outstanding contributions.

This will be the third time that Mr. Terry has been so highly honored by this Foundation.

First in 1951, he received a George Washington Medal in recognition for his literary contributions.

In 1956, the school newspaper in Warsaw, Indiana, the Hi-Times, which Mr. Terry sponsored, won the editorial award and in 1961 the Classroom Teacher Award, for significant contributions to the American Way of Life in teaching America's youth our American heritage. This most recent award will be presented by Mr. Russell A. Strausser, Executive Head of Louisville High School at the commencement program to be held May 23, 1961. Mr. Strausser will be acting in behalf of Dr. Wells, president of the Foundation.

Ohio is proud that one of its citizens in the teaching profession is again to be so highly honored.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Association of School Boards has just conducted a poll of the school board members in our State concerning Federal aid to education. This questionnaire was sent to 1,200 members of the Kansas Association of School Boards and replies were received from 328.

In response to this questionnaire, it was interesting to note that 58 percent favored Federal aid to education in any form and 40 percent were opposed. Of those replying 58 percent wanted help with both salaries and construction, while 35 percent felt it should go for construction only.

The response to this questionnaire is most interesting, in view of the present debate in the Senate and I ask unanimous consent that a news release analyzing the replies be printed as part of my remarks.

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

KANSAS AND FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

School board members who fight the battle of budget and pressures to improve public schools favor Federal aid to education in some form. A recent study conducted by the Kansas Association of School Boards among

school board members whose districts' belong to the association revealed that board members want Federal aid and are not particular whether it comes for teachers salaries or for school construction.

A short questionnaire was sent to members of boards with membership in the association. Replies were received from 328 people.¹ Some replies did not answer all of the five questions but the answers indicated the following:

1. Fifty-eight percent favored Federal aid to education in any form. Only 40 percent were opposed to Federal aid in any form.

2. Preference as to type of aid showed 58 percent wanted help with both salaries and construction, 35 percent felt it should go for construction only, while 5 percent wanted it for salaries only.

3. Fifty-one percent thought that Federal money should be distributed and administered through the State department of public instruction while 39 percent felt it should be allocated directly to the local district. Ten percent did not react to this question.

4. A majority, 51 percent of those responding felt that, if available, Federal aid money should be distributed in relation to a district's overall need. Forty percent preferred distribution on a student population basis while 8 percent did not respond to the query.

5. Among the group responding 63 percent said they would work to qualify for Federal funds, if and when enacted. Only 5 percent would not work to qualify for such help, however, 32 percent did not react to this question.

Comments registered with question responses could be summarized as follows:

(1) Some are violently opposed to and some are wholeheartedly in favor of Federal help for public education.

(2) Federal help should come only after a State has established its ability to support and support should be based on ability.

(3) Kansas can do a better job at the State level with better organization.

(4) Kansas, accepts Federal aid now and additional aid would help.

(5) Available Federal moneys should be handled through the State department, and districts should qualify for such help.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at a meeting of the 91st annual convention of the West Central Conference of the Augustana Lutheran Church, held in Denver, Colo., April 19-23, 1961, a resolution was adopted opposing the proposed legislation of financial aid to the nonpublic schools of the elementary and secondary levels.

The Augustana Lutheran Church, of which the West Central Conference is a part, is a Minnesota corporation, with congregations in 34 States and the District of Columbia. The church consists of 1,242 congregations and numbers 592,000 members. Its president is the Reverend Dr. Malvin H. Lundeed, whose office is at 2445 Park Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.

The West Central Conference is a Kansas corporation, with congregations in Colorado, Kansas, Missouri and Wyoming. The Conference consists of 63 congregations and numbers 23,592 members. Its president is the Reverend Dr. N. Everett Hedeem, whose office is at Salina, Kans.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed as a part of these remarks.

¹All percents were calculated using the total response of 328.

Chiefs of Staff and in the interest of the millions of Americans who want to know and who are entitled to know what happened, I must ask that the full role of the Joint Chiefs of Staff be made available to this body. Did they participate or did they not? If they did, to what extent? Were there some who were not consulted while others were; and, if so, who were they, and why were the others excluded?

The President is to be commended for his willingness to assume full responsibility in this matter, and I know the American people are proud of him for that assumption. They are not looking for scapegoats. They are only asking why, and I am sure that when they know the whys they will stand behind the President in his actions in this matter, but they will not condone accusations against General Lemnitzer, an American of unquestionable loyalty proven time and again in the service of his country, which cannot be backed up by proof.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have heard with a great deal of mutual concern the feeling expressed this morning about what has been taking place in Alabama. I heard the majority leader justly ask, "What must other people be thinking of us?"

I wonder at the same time, Mr. President, while we are worrying about what the world thinks of us in relation to the South, what the world and our own people are thinking of us in relation to Cuba. Mr. President, what should we do when Castro attempts to blackmail us by offering 1,000 lives for 500 tractors and by throwing in what he calls "the Fascist priests" for free? What is the answer when we ask what will happen if we do not succumb to this blackmail? I think these are questions we should be meditating this morning, instead of asking the people of America to put up with blackmail from a Communist country 90 miles off our shores.

I think the people of the world will judge us as strongly by what we do or do not do in the case of Castro as they will judge us by what we do or do not do in relation to what is happening in the South.

I do not think we can abandon our moral responsibility to the Cubans we placed on the shores of Cuba in the hope that they would help get rid of communism there. We have a deep moral responsibility—I think a deeper moral responsibility to those people than we have ever had in the history of this country. If we ignore this and succumb to the Communist blackmail with which Castro is threatening us today, I think we will slide down further in the opinion of the people of the world.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators who may have had neither the opportunity to hear the testimony nor the opportunity to read the transcript of the investigation which the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, as chairman of the subcommittee, has been conducting, I advise that the clerk of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has informed me six transcripts of the verbatim record have been made and are available to any

Member of the Senate who will make the effort to walk down one flight of steps to the Foreign Relations Committee room, No. F53, to read them.

It is true that President Kennedy has assumed and accepted full responsibility for the Cuban affair. Like the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona, I applaud him for doing so.

Other participants, others charged with official responsibility, should be held responsible for the part they played, for the recommendations submitted, for the advice given. Ours is a Government of responsibility.

Answers to the questions raised this morning—to many of them, at least—are available already in the RECORD, if Senators will take the time to read the RECORD, which is very nearby.

DR. JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Friday, May 19, 1961, Dr. John Temple Graves—a great American patriot, an outstanding newspaperman, and one of the South's most eloquent spokesmen—passed away while making an address before the Mobile (Ala.) Bar Association. Long a spokesman for States rights, Dr. Graves was calling for observance of the Constitution when he was apparently stricken by a heart attack.

Dr. Graves rendered valuable service to the cause of constitutional government over his long and brilliant newspaper career, which began on the New York Journal and ended on the Birmingham Post-Herald. On the Post-Herald he wrote a news column which was published in 24 other newspapers across the Southland, which he loved so dearly.

In addition to the laurels and respect he earned as a newspaperman, Dr. Graves was the author of three books—"The Shaft in the Sky," "The Book of Alabama," and "The Fighting South"—and he was a much sought-after public speaker not only in the South but throughout the country.

I knew Dr. Graves very well as a good friend and a noble gentleman of sterling character. He will be missed by many friends and in many ways, but he has left a great mark—in his writings, his speeches, his courage, and his personal integrity—and he made many valuable contributions toward making this country and the world a better place in which to live.

In tribute to this great newsman, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, an editorial written to his memory in the May 21, 1961, issue of the Charleston News and Courier, one of the newspapers which used his column for so many years.

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

JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES

The South lost one of its ablest spokesmen when John Temple Graves died in Alabama. A faithful trouper, he was in action till the end. A fatal heart attack struck him on a lecture platform at Mobile.

His eloquence had brought speaking invitations from every State. His fame went far beyond the circulation areas of the news-

papers for which he wrote, among them The News and Courier. We counted him not only as a respected member of our editorial staff, but as a warm personal friend.

John Graves was a gentleman by birth and upbringing. He was also a gentle man in the best sense of both words. His instincts were noble. He had a keen respect for the feelings of others. By no means did these sensitive qualities detract from the courage or the frankness of his journalistic approach.

In his writings he was a staunch defender of States rights and Southern philosophies. Through his college years at Princeton, his service with The New York Journal and his journeys up and down the land, he had a thorough understanding of other parts of the United States. But he never lost his southern accent.

FEDERAL CONTROLS OVER SCHOOL CURRICULUM, PERSONNEL, OR ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, many people have written me concerning Federal controls or regulations over school curriculum, personnel, or administration which might follow Federal financial assistance to elementary and secondary schools.

We have had Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools for many years under the provisions of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. These programs offer financial assistance directly to school districts affected by unusual Federal governmental activity in the district, such as the location of military bases or other Federal installations within or near the school district boundaries.

Under these laws the Federal aid is directly given to the local school authority. In this sense, the danger of Federal control or Federal regulation would seem more real to those who conscientiously fear control than in the Federal aid to education bill we are now considering, which, of course, allocates funds to the States for distribution to local school districts.

To find out whether any Federal control over local school autonomy over its school curriculum, personnel or administration, either specific or implied, might have resulted from the administration of these programs, I recently wrote to the executives of all of the school districts in Indiana which had received such assistance in recent years.

To date, I have received replies from nearly half of those contacted. I would like to report the response to the inquiries I made of them:

1. What percentage of the total school district budget was derived from Federal assistance under Public Law 874?

Respondents indicated that the Federal assistance was generally constituted a small percentage of their total budget, but they emphasized its importance in no uncertain terms.

Ray Geyer, superintendent of Miami County public school wrote that in one township where nearly three-fourths of the pupils are children of airmen stationed at Bunker Hill Air Force Base, the Federal assistance is of major importance to the education of the pupil in this area. He further states that Public Law 874 assistance to four other

entitled "The Faith of the Fathers," at the North Carolina State Service, Washington Memorial Chapel, Valley Forge, Pa. This speech contains some sound advice for all of us, and it ought to be made available to all Members of the Congress. For this reason I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE FAITH OF THE FATHERS

(Address by Edwin Gill, state Treasurer, at the North Carolina State Service, Washington Memorial Chapel, Valley Forge, Pa.)

I count it a great privilege to speak to you today in this beautiful chapel erected by patriotic citizens and dedicated to the worship of God. Near this sacred spot, the men of Valley Forge suffered great hardships. Under the leadership of the great Washington, they carried on a valiant fight for all the rights and privileges that we hold dear. As we sit here together in this spiritual retreat, our minds naturally turn to that portion of the Bill of Rights that guarantees to all of us the right to worship God as we please. All of us owe a debt of gratitude to the Founding Fathers who had the foresight to declare in our fundamental law for religious as well as political liberty.

The Founding Fathers had a highly developed sense of history. They were aware of the long struggle of mankind for freedom. They knew of the trials and errors of the past. They were well informed as to the rise and fall of republics, and they knew of the first stirrings of self-government—faint and feeble though they had been—both on the European continent and in England. And they were determined, as far as possible, not to repeat the mistakes and errors of the past.

In their minds, one of the greatest blunders of history was the centuries-old alliance between church and state. For a thousand years, this mixture of politics and religion had bred intolerance as dogmas were enforced through the rack, the wheel, the faggot, the hangman's noose and the block. They knew from experience that it was unwise to trust any church with political power. Although Washington and his associates were deeply religious men and believed that civil society could best endure if undergirded by religion and morality, they were determined that here in America the state would protect all religions but prefer none. This policy they fervently believed would prevent the intolerance and fanaticism that had scarred and defaced the story of civilization.

It has been said that it was fortunate for the United States of America that it came into being in the 18th century; that the Founding Fathers, breathing the tolerant air of the age of enlightenment, were prepared to conduct a successful experiment in human freedom that would have been difficult, if not impossible, to accomplish at an earlier time. For instance, it is extremely doubtful that our Nation could have been conceived in freedom during the 16th century, which was generally a period dark with intolerance, during which mankind was afflicted with the cruel blight of religious wars.

During this century mankind was divided more by religion than by either race or politics. During a civil war that ravaged France, a well informed observer¹ declared:

"It was folly to hope for peace between persons of different religions. A Frenchman and an Englishman who are of the same religion have more affection for one another

¹ Michel L'Hopital, French jurist and statesman (1507-73).

than citizens of the same city, or vassals of the same lord, who hold to different creeds."

In all this dark era of intolerance and persecution, there were, of course, bright spots such as the tolerance of William the Silent who led the Low Countries in their war for independence against Spain, and the expedient moderation of King Henry of Navarre, who sought without much success to establish a truce between Catholics and Huguenots.

Yes, it was fortunate that the Founding Fathers were permitted to work in the more tolerant atmosphere of the 18th century, but it was also fortunate that they had fresh in their memories the appalling record of intolerance, fanaticism, and persecution that had desecrated the centuries that preceded it.

Sir Edward Newenham wrote to George Washington in 1792 telling him of the deplorable condition of affairs in Ireland due to religious conflicts and received in reply from Washington a letter, from which I quote the following excerpt:

"Of all the animosities which have existed among mankind, those which are caused by a difference of sentiments in religion appear to be the most inveterate and distressing, and ought most to be deprecated. I was in hopes that the enlightened and liberal policy, which has marked the present age, would at least have reconciled Christians of every denomination so far that we should never again see their religious disputes carried to such a pitch as to endanger the peace of society."

As an example of the consciousness of the Founding Fathers of the tragedy of mixing politics and religion, we find James Madison writing to Robert Walsh on March 2, 1819:

"It was the universal opinion of the century preceding the last, that civil government could not stand without the prop of a religious establishment, and that the Christian religion itself, would perish if not supported by a legal provision for its clergy. The experience of Virginia conspicuously corroborates the disproof of both opinions. The civil government, though bereft of everything like an associated hierarchy, possesses the requisite stability and performs its functions with complete success; whilst the number, the industry, and the morality of the priesthood, and the devotion of the people have been manifestly increased by the total separation of the church from the state."

There are, of course, some who contend that the Founding Fathers were against the recognition of any church in our Constitution for the simple reason that they were indifferent to religion itself; that most of them were formal Christians who merely gave lip-service to the church.

Now, there is no denying the fact that during the 18th century there was a great deal of skepticism and indifference to religion, and that many intellectuals favored an approach which ignored the individual creeds of all churches and that in the process the Christian faith, whether Protestant or Catholic, was diluted by a sort of pagan viewpoint. Typical of this attitude is a verse from the universal prayer written in 1738 by Alexander Pope, which said:

Father of all! In every age,
In every clime adored;
By saint, by savage, and by sage,
Jehovah, Jove, or Lord!

However, I do not agree with those who think that the religion of the Founding Fathers was cold and formal, and that they worshiped only with lip service. No one can read the letters and papers and the contemporary testimony without feeling that Washington and his associates gave serious and solemn allegiance to God, and that they were unanimous in contending that His worship should include working for the welfare of all men.

As Norman Cousins points out in his excellent book, "In God We Trust,"² the founders' "view of man had a deeply religious foundation: rights were 'God-given'; man was endowed by his 'Creator'; there were 'natural laws'; and 'natural rights'; freedom was related to the 'sacredness' of man; * * *"

On the other hand, I think the Founding Fathers, although men of faith and of deep religious conviction, did take advantage, if you please, of the latitudinarian atmosphere of the 18th century, as expressed by Pope, which was congenial to widely divergent opinions in matters of religion, to imbed in our Constitution the fundamental rights of man, which, of course, included freedom of religion.

It is true that Washington never spoke or wrote with particularity about his creed. In fact, he was extremely reticent not only about his individual religious faith, but also about his theories of government. It was a part of the nature of the man to say little, to refrain as far as possible from useless controversy, and to make deep and abiding commitments only when great issues were at stake. More than any of the Founding Fathers, Washington reserved the intimate details of his faith for the inner recesses of his own heart. And yet it is clear not only that he believed in a benign providence, but that he felt the need of the comfort and powerful support of the Christian religion for himself, for his soldiers, and for his country. You are familiar, of course, with his celebrated statement to his soldiers here at Valley Forge in which he said:

"While we are zealously performing the duties of good citizens and soldiers, we certainly ought not to be inattentive to the higher duties of religion. To the distinguished character of patriot it should be our highest glory to add the more distinguished character of Christian."

It is true that John Jay, the first chief justice of the United States, opposed the selection of a chaplain for the national House of Representatives (because he feared it would be in conflict with the principle of separation of church and state), and yet Jay was a fervent and devout Christian, serving as president of the American Bible Society.

If you will read the papers of Jefferson, you will find that he was deeply absorbed in the philosophy of Jesus, and went to the trouble to prepare, as he called it, his own bible, including in it quotations from the lips of the Master. Certainly few men in America believed more in the good life as advocated and as practiced by Jesus. Speaking of this book in which he had collected the sayings of Jesus, Jefferson said: "It (the book) is a document in proof that I am a real Christian."

And we cannot summarize the religious convictions of Alexander Hamilton better than to quote words that he sent in a message to his wife upon the eve of his duel with Aaron Burr, which was to end in Hamilton's untimely death. Speaking from his heart and with the realization that he might soon face his Maker, Hamilton said:

"The consolations of religion, my beloved, can alone support you; and these you have a right to enjoy. Fly to the bosom of your God and be comforted. With my last idea I shall cherish the sweet hope of meeting you in a better world. Adieu, best of wives—best of women. Embrace all my darling children for me."

And the brusque and crusty master of Braintree, John Adams, who was perhaps more conservative in his views than most of the Founding Fathers, summarized his religion neatly by saying it was embraced in the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount.

² In God We Trust, by Norman Cousins, Harper & Bros., 1958.

Benjamin Franklin, associate of intellectuals both in Europe and America and undoubtedly a man of unconventional beliefs, sought to state his faith in language broad enough to constitute a common denominator for all men of good will and of spiritual conviction. Here is Franklin's credo. He believed:

"That there is one God, who made all things.

"That He governs the world by his providence.

"That he ought to be worshiped by adoration, prayer, and thanksgiving.

"But that the most acceptable service of God is doing good to man.

"That the soul is immortal.

"And that God will certainly reward virtue and punish vice, either here or hereafter."

Of course, there are those who would deny to Thomas Paine a place among the Founding Fathers. However, Washington and the other Founding Fathers valued Paine's service to the revolution, particularly his pamphlet called "Common Sense," which was used to stimulate the morale of our soldiers during the War of the Revolution. There are many who are willing to accord Paine a high place in the struggle for freedom, but who are disturbed by his attitude toward religion, which was highly irregular and something of a scandal following the publication of his book—"The Age of Reason." In this connection, it is interesting to quote from Paine's own statement as to his beliefs. Here it is:

"I believe in one God, and no more; and I hope for happiness beyond this life.

"I believe in the equality of man; and I believe that religious duties consist in doing justice, loving mercy, and endeavoring to make our fellow creatures happy."

So, I submit that generally speaking the Founding Fathers were men of faith. Although they differed individually in matters of creed and in degrees of conformity, there is no doubt that they believed firmly in a Divine Creator and were convinced that in worshipping Him they must work for the welfare of mankind, and with the exception of Paine, who in his language was often intemperate and incendiary, the Founding Fathers approached the issues of the day with amazing moderation and restraint. I have the feeling that they frequently leaned over backwards declining to engage in theological discussion not because of any lack of interest in religion, but because of their deep conviction that religion could flourish best where each individual was free to approach the throne of grace along the path that seemed best to him.

Typical of the Founding Fathers' attitude in the following excerpt from a letter written in 1814 by Jefferson to Miles King, from which I quote in part:

"Our particular principles of religion are a subject of accountability to our God alone. I inquire after no man's, and trouble none with mine; nor is it given to us in this life to know whether yours or mine, our friends or our foes, are exactly the right. Nay, we have heard it said that there is not a Quaker or a Baptist, a Presbyterian or an Episcopalian, a Catholic or a Protestant in heaven; that on entering the gate, we leave those badges of schism behind, and find ourselves united in those principles only in which God has united us all. Let us not be uneasy then about the different roads we may pursue, as believing them the shortest, to that our last abode; but, following the guidance of a good conscience, let us be happy in the hope that by these different paths we shall all meet in the end. And that you and I may there meet and embrace, is my earnest prayer. And with this assurance I salute you with brotherly esteem and respect."

Just because the Founding Fathers did not talk, as a rule, in terms of dogmas and creeds does not mean that they were indif-

ferent to religion, or that they were not men of spiritual conviction. They did not think any nation could prosper or long endure whose people were not deeply religious and moral. They insisted, however, that religion was a matter of individual experience, and that the specific creed involved was of no concern to the State. The truth of the matter is that the Founding Fathers sought to emphasize the ideas that united all men of faith, thus they hoped that religion would cease to be a matter of discord and that the worship of God would have a unifying effect, bringing all men together as spiritual brothers. This view coincided not only with their religious beliefs, but was also in harmony with the overriding concern of the Founding Fathers for the unity of the new Nation.

Jews, Protestants, and Catholics today have complete freedom of conscience, and are able to worship God as they please because these great men had the courage and the wisdom to eliminate creed from the domain of government.

Of course, the adoption of our Bill of Rights did not overnight remove from the constitutions of the States all remnants of religious intolerance that had been brought to our shores by our forefathers. Progress in purging such provisions from the fundamental law of the States was to take time. If you will pardon me, I would like to give you an incident from the history of my own State.

In 1833, our legislature prevailed on William Gaston, a Roman Catholic, to accept election to our State supreme court. The action of the legislature in offering this position to Gaston was taken in spite of article 32 of our constitution which provided, among other things, that no person should be capable of holding any office or place of trust or profit who denied "the truth of the Protestant religion." After much soul searching and after conferring with some of the foremost legal authorities of the day, Gaston came to the opinion that this provision did not bar him and consequently accepted election to the supreme court. Later, in a constitutional convention held at Raleigh in 1835, this provision, which cast doubt on the right of Catholics to hold office, was removed from the constitution after an eloquent plea by Gaston, who was a member of the convention. Thus the cause of religious freedom was advanced in North Carolina because of the growing spirit of tolerance among our people and because of the outstanding character and ability of William Gaston.

I wish to observe that the recent election of John F. Kennedy, a Roman Catholic, to the Presidency of the United States symbolizes the fact that our people have reached a very high plane in this matter of religious tolerance. It is true that we had had judges and Governors and Senators who were of the Catholic faith, but not until Mr. Kennedy was elected had the people demonstrated that adherence to the Catholic faith was not of itself a bar to holding the highest office within the gift of the people.

In this connection I wish to echo the plea of President Kennedy in the current debate about Federal aid for education, which has involved parochial schools, that our people speak with moderation and restraint, keeping in mind at all times that we who engage in this discussion are, after all, Americans and that we are the heirs of the Founding Fathers who found a way in a great crisis to settle their sharp differences wisely in a spirit of moderation and with mutual respect for each other.

We are all aware of the fact that the debates of 1787 and 1791 were often sharp, threatening again and again to disrupt the plans of those who desired a Constitution with a Bill of Rights, and yet somehow

the Founding Fathers, regardless of their differences, managed to preserve a broad, basic understanding that gave room for co-operation. It is to be hoped that the current debate about Federal aid to our schools can reflect this spirit of harmony that pervaded the minds of the Founding Fathers.

Is it too much to hope that this important discussion can be carried on with the dignity of Washington, the candor of John Adams, the broad philosophic approach of Jefferson, the courage and sound judgment of Hamilton, and last but not least, the homespun wit and wisdom of Franklin? This question probes deeply into the minds and hearts of all of us and is one of the challenges of our day.

Let me say by way of summary, that the faith of the Fathers was an affirmative force in the building of this Nation. Their faith in God was associated with their faith in man. After all, in their opinion, man was created by God and was endowed with certain inalienable rights and abilities. So, in their judgment, man had the right, the duty and the potential to govern himself. It was upon this grand assumption that our Republic was founded, and which encouraged Washington and his associates to believe that it had a chance to endure. So here is one Nation that refused to recognize any particular religion as being superior to another, and which in fact took a neutral position toward all creeds, and yet owes its existence and its hope of survival to a deeply held religious conviction that all men are brothers subject to the governance of Divine Providence. So it is entirely in keeping with our concept of religious freedom to continue to say: "In God We Trust."

Subscribed
THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the attack made upon a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff by one of our colleagues is a serious affair which cannot be lightly brushed aside. Public conference in the State Department and in the CIA has been severely shaken by the events in Cuba, and I might add justifiably so because of their close connection with the episode. But to add the Joint Chiefs of Staff, upon only the word of one Senator, has implications which need explaining. The entire Congress has, I believe, acted with propriety in this matter, refraining from accusations of a partisan nature. We have been waiting for the story to unfold, as unfold it must, but now it seems that one in this body has information the rest of us do not have, and questions arise which must in fairness to a group of dedicated Americans, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, be answered.

For example, my understanding at the time of the invasion was to the effect that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had been consulted. Since that time I have wondered at the lack of mention of the presence at any such meeting or meetings of the Chief of the Air Force or of the Marines. I have, in addition, heard statements to the effect that none of the Joint Chiefs of Staff had been consulted immediately prior to the attempted invasion. I have withheld questions on both of these points, feeling that after due investigation a report would be made to the President and subsequently to the Congress, but after reading the accusations made by our colleague last weekend, I feel that, in defense of the good names of those who constitute our Joint

extortion, and intimidation throughout the world?

How, by all this, do we strengthen the hand and the position of the President of the United States in his impending conversations with Soviet Premier Khrushchev?

I earnestly hope that we will recover from our current emotional binge, and that our national leadership will regain its voice, before we are too badly burned.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TOLL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) for today, on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WILSON of Indiana for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. JONAS for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. GOODELL), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. GOODELL), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. STEED), for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. STEED), for 30 minutes on Wednesday next.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER, for 20 minutes on Thursday, May 25.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ASPINALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SKES in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANKFORD in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MASON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DEROUNIAN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of California in two instances, in one to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$216.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURRAY and to include an article.

Mr. GIAMBO.

Mr. STEED to revise and extend his remarks on the bill H.R. 7208, and to include certain tabular material.

Mr. HARRIS and to include a speech by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare at the James E. West Boy Scouts annual meeting.

Mr. MACK and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MADDEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. STEED) and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$351.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts and to include an editorial.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOODELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio.

Mr. CEDERBERG.

Mr. WHARTON.

Mr. HOEVEN.

Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. SHORT.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE.

Mr. DEVINE.

Mr. ELLSWORTH in three instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. HOSMER in five instances.

Mr. BECKER.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. AVERY in two instances.

Mr. MACGREGOR in three instances.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

Mr. ALGER in five instances.

Mr. SCHWENDEL in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STEED) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

Mr. COOK in two instances.

Mr. McDOWELL in two instances.

Mr. RABAUT in six instances.

Mr. FLOOD in two instances.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. JENSEN.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5571. An act to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Effigy Mounds National Monument in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6100. An act to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the payment of operating-differential subsidy for cruises.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act to provide an interim increase in the authorization for insurance of mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 18, 1961, pre-

sent to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7030. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 23, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

930. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Crowabout Creek-Powell Creek, Ala., Grady-Gould, Ark., Napa River, Calif., Hog River-Pig Creek, Ill., Beasha Creek, Miss., Panther Creek, Mo., Halkey Creek, Okla., Cane Creek, Tenn., Blue Creek-Howell, Utah, and Polk Creek-Saltlick Creek, W. Va., pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

931. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Magma, Ariz., Muddy Fork of Illinois River, Ark., Bull Creek, Ga., Seven Mile Creek, Ill., Fall River, Kans., Bayou Rapides, La., and Camp Rice Arroyo Lower Plum Creek, Tex., pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

932. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purpose"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

933. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of March 31, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

934. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of an overobligation which occurred early in calendar year 1960 under the appropriation "Construction, public buildings projects," pursuant to title 31, United States Code, section 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

935. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the 40th report on property acquisitions for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization for the period ending March 31, 1961, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

936. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain laws enacted by the Fifth Guam Legislature, 1960, pursuant to the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

937. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of Sen-

1961

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, recently, a major British steel producing company announced that it had requested permission from the Board of Trade to import U.S. coal.

Despite the fact that the steel company is located in the heart of the Welsh coalfields—among the largest in Britain—it told the Government it can buy coal from the United States at about \$2.24 a ton less than it can from domestic nationalized mines.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that U.S. coal can be produced in our mines by men enjoying one of the highest wage scales in industry, moved by rail to the Atlantic coast and then shipped to Europe and be sold for less than British produced coal will come as a surprise to many people. But to persons familiar with the technological revolution which has occurred in the American coal industry in the past 10 years the fact that American coal is competitive with foreign produced coal in just about every coal market of the world is one more bit of proof of the efficiency and productivity of our coal industry.

The U.S. coal industry is without a doubt the most productive and efficient in the world. Today, the average production of all coal mines is more than 13 tons per man per day—more than double the 1947 production rate and about 10 times greater than individual production in most Western European mines.

In a period of strong inflationary pressures, the average mine price of commercial coal has actually declined during the past 12 years. As newer and more modern machines are put into use, there is every reason to believe that the price line can be held, regardless of what happened in other domestic fuels industries.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the coal industry has not been able to use its great efficiency and productivity to win new export markets for American coal. The truth of the matter is that because our coal mines are so efficient and productive foreign government has resorted to tariffs, quotas, and a variety of other trade barriers to keep out American coal.

If American coal was a high priced product, produced in an old, deteriorating plant, and unable to compete abroad without an export subsidy or some other form of government assistance, the decline in coal exports would be understandable. But the truth is that American coal is being frozen out of many markets through Government edict. American coal is the victim of the rankest kind of trade discrimination in many world markets, particularly in Western Europe.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government has an obligation to the American coal industry to do everything it possibly can, through negotiations and other means at its disposal, to open once more European markets to American coal. In 1957, we exported 76 million tons of coal. At the present exports are running at the rate of about

37 million tons a year—a decline of almost 40 million tons.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the decision to bar or limit imports of coal from the United States was largely a matter of policy in each of the nations involved. But I am sure our Government can take steps to ease the situation for American coal without infringing upon the sovereignty of our allies or interfering in their internal affairs.

Mr. Speaker, an increase of 40 million tons a year in coal exports would go a long way toward alleviating conditions of significant and persistent unemployment which exists in almost all of the great coal producing regions of the Nation. Men would be put back to work in the mines, the coal carrying railroads would undoubtedly have to put on more men to handle the increased coal traffic and business generally throughout the coal areas of the Nation would receive a shot in the arm.

The Government is now pursuing policies which are detrimental to the coal industry. For example, the Government is permitting an increasing amount of foreign residual fuel oil, which can be priced to undersell coal along the east coast, to be imported and it also is doing nothing to discourage the sale of natural gas at dump prices in coal markets.

Imported residual fuel oil and dump gas are seriously affecting efforts of the coal industry to put the domestic coal industry on a sound and expanding basis. If these domestic policies are continued and nothing is done to reopen world markets to American coal—if this combination of adverse marketing conditions continue, then I say, Mr. Speaker, that the coal industry faces an impossible task and all of the modernization and improvements in efficiency and productivity will be for naught.

The American coal industry and the American coal miner has given ample evidence that it can produce coal more efficiently and cheaper than any other coal industry in the world. I trust the Government will do everything it can to see that the coal industry has the opportunity, both at home and abroad, to put this efficiency and productivity to work in free, competitive markets.

GIFT ENTERPRISE LAW

(Mr. MATHIAS (at the request of Mr. GOODELL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia has been at a disadvantage in recent years because of its antiquated "gift enterprise" law. This law—title 22-3401, District of Columbia Code 1951—was passed in 1871 by the then legislative assembly of the District as a tax revenue law. Proprietors of gift enterprises were required to pay a \$1,000 annual license fee. After 2 years, Congress, on February 17, 1873, repealed the license clause of the enactment, and prohibited gift enterprises under a penalty.

The historical purpose underlying the District's gift enterprise law was the pre-

vention of lotteries or similar schemes. These were a common problem throughout the United States in the 1870's. For example, in *Comm. v. Emerson*, 165 Mass. 146, 42 N.E. 559, the purpose of a similar law in one of the States was stated as being "to prevent offers of bargains which appeal to the gambling instinct, and induce people to buy what they do not want by the promise of a gift or a prize, the precise nature of which is not known at the moment of making the purchase." The gambling problem today is under control, but the District's out-of-date law remains on the books.

Although there has never been a judicial decision construing the District's "gift enterprise" law as preventing the usual and normal sort of premium or gift-with-purchase merchandising carried on throughout the 50 States, the District's Corporation Counsel has so interpreted the law because of its rather broad and specific language.

As a result, residents of the District are being deprived of the opportunity to make bargain purchases, and the District is losing tax revenue, at a time when it is badly needed. Legitimate business is being unnecessarily interfered with under the present law.

The Federal Trade Commission reviewed this matter carefully in 1953 and issued a trade practice rule on the use of the word "free" in advertising and other commercial offers. I believe it will be in the public interest, in the interest of residents of the District, and in the interest of business in the District to amend the present law and incorporate the substance of the Federal Trade Commission rule. This will permit the same pattern of merchandising in the District of Columbia as prevails in the other States and territories. I am introducing such an amendment today.

Cuba file
AND NOW EXTORTION

(Mr. JOHANSEN (at the request of Mr. GOODELL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, at the moment, do-it-yourself diplomacy and do-gooder sentimentality threaten to compound and complete the disaster of the Cuban invasion fiasco.

I am appalled at the apparent eagerness of many Americans to accept the principle of extortion and comply with the ransom terms laid down by Communist stooge Fidel Castro.

By what standards of responsible governmental leadership is the authority to negotiate with a ruthless foreign regime transferred to, or assumed by, Solidarity House and a private citizens committee?

By what standards of common humanity do we deliberately hand Castro an enormous propaganda victory, tighten the grip of a ruthless, dictatorial, Krenlin-dominated regime over millions of Cuban people and give incalculable aid to the Soviet campaign of subversion in this hemisphere?

By what standards of elemental prudence do we forge and sharpen the tools and weapons of Communist blackmail,