



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 107

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 23, 1961

No. 86

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:
Jeremiah 31: 3: *I have loved thee with an everlasting love; therefore with loving kindness have I drawn thee.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, we thank Thee for the tenderness and tenacity of Thy love which we need so supremely and which alone can satisfy us.

We humbly acknowledge that day by day we plan and propose, we counsel and contrive, and often feel very self-confident and self-sufficient.

Help us to understand that our hope for success and security cannot rest upon our own skill and human ingenuity, but upon Thy divine guidance and hold upon us.

May our hearts go out in love and sympathy toward all whose faith is being assailed by doubt and whose whole life seems to be one of conflict and struggle, of labor and sorrow, and of heartache and anguish.

Grant that our love may be a world feeling and may Thy light and truth shine in all the dark and dismal places of the earth, bringing unto mankind the blessings of peace and joy.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 610) entitled "An act to strengthen the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. COTTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

HON. LOUISE G. REECE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee, Mrs. LOUISE G. REECE, be permitted to take the oath of office today. Her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to her election.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. REECE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Member of Congress,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with regret that I submit to you my resignation from the Committee on Public Works.

It was an honor and a privilege to serve on this committee, and I wish to commend the Members with whom I served who worked so hard to produce an outstanding record in the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO A COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 307

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Public Works: JOHN C. KUNKEL, Pennsylvania; LOUISE G. REECE, Tennessee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have asked Subcommittee No. 4, of the House Small Business Committee, to make an investigation of the present import quota program for foreign crude oil. The Honorable TOM SNEED, chairman, has assured me that the subcommittee will make a thorough investigation and appraisal of this program as it affects small business in the oil exploration, production, and refining fields.

Congress has recognized that a vigorous, healthy petroleum industry in the United States is vital both to our domestic economy and our national defense and, in the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1958, gave the administration both the power and the duty to limit foreign oil imports sufficiently to maintain a vigorous and competitive industry in this country.

Recent hearings held by the Department of the Interior suggest, however, that, instead of making full use of the powers which have been granted, the previous administration put into effect a program which may be weakening the domestic oil industry and fostering monopoly control. The program which has been devised is a most unusual kind, to say the least, and may indeed be the only one of its kind. If the testimony given by industry representatives at these hearings is correct, the import program now in effect amounts to a cash dole to independent refiners, by way of compensation for large-scale imports which serve the special advantage of the few big companies that own or control sources of foreign oil, as well as refineries and distribution systems in the United States.

Refineries in all parts of the United States are given quotas of foreign oil—and ration tickets good for the purchase of this cheap oil—though most of these refiners have never used foreign oil and cannot, as a practical matter, use foreign oil because of the freight cost from coastal points inland. It appears that cash markets for these ration tickets are

8005

in operation and inland refiners are selling their quotas to coastal refiners at prices ranging from between \$1 to \$1.25 per barrel. If the effect of this system is as it seems, namely to encourage independent refiners to trade a portion of their markets to the international oil companies in return for cash payments, then certainly the program is neither helping to maintain a vigorous competitive U.S. industry nor encouraging discovery and development of new sources of oil in the United States. Yet the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1958 was intended to serve both purposes.

There is little doubt that the serious plight of the U.S. crude oil industry is a direct result of the big company imports of foreign oil. Since this program was put into effect, the number of oil wells in the United States has declined steadily, and today only one-half of the oil drilling rigs in this country are in operation. In Texas, the country's largest oil producing State, producing wells are operating only 8 days a month. The result has been a loss of tens of thousands of jobs and a serious weakening of an industry in which the United States has previously led the world.

It is a sign of the future that only 14 college freshmen enrolled in petroleum engineering courses this spring, at the University of Texas, a leading center of training in the petroleum sciences. As late as the fall of 1957, the University of Texas was giving training to 134 freshmen in petroleum engineering.

I am confident that the subcommittee, under Chairman STEED, will make a fair and careful study of the present quota system, to make sure that this is the best system that can be reasonably devised in view of both our domestic and foreign obligations, and not just a system which confers undue favoritism on the few great international oil companies.

Cuba CASTRO'S RANSOM DEMAND

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Castro is a gangster of the lowest order. He is now adopting the tactics of the kidnap outlaws of the "Ma" Barker-"Machinegun" Kelly era. If he is successful with his present ransom demand, his success will set a precedent and model for every Communist gangster in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. We do not have enough bulldozers, tractors, or dollars in the United States to buy off every Communist thug and racketeer in the world.

With this ransom, Castro's prestige and military potential will be greatly strengthened. We should face reality and for once be practical and approach this shocking demand with common sense. Castro can sell these tractors or exchange them for jet aircraft, missiles, and artillery. This deal might thus better enable him to bomb Miami, Mobile, and New Orleans. In the long run it could cost us thousands of lives on the beaches of Cuba and the lives of innocent civilians in the United States.

Our Government should forbid any equipment of any nature from leaving

the shores of the United States to strengthen and support an avowed enemy. Our Government should go further and prevent with our Navy and Air Force any material from being shipped into Cuba from Russia, China, their satellites, or from misguided American sympathizers. Any arrangement with Castro will work to his advantage. This despicable Castro proposal could be a scheme to get more of his subversive agents into the United States.

At least I hope our State Department and Government will take no action to encourage and support this type of blackmail which strengthens our Communist enemies and will cost us more lives in the future.

MILLIONS FOR DEFENSE, NOT ONE CENT FOR TRIBUTE

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

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, submission to Fidel Castro's demand for 500 bulldozers in exchange for the Cuban freedom fighters he now is holding in prisons, would constitute an abject surrender to the crudest form of blackmail and an abandonment of principles this Nation has held sacred since its founding.

In Tel Aviv at this moment another mass murderer—Adolf Eichmann—is on trial for the most heinous crime of all time. He, too, offered to free Jews held in the barbarous Nazi prison camps if he were given trucks in exchange. The Allies, acting on principle, refused to bow to Eichmann's blackmail attempt, even though his price was considerably less than that being demanded today by the paranoiac dictator of Cuba.

It long has been an established criminal fact that blackmailers do not abandon their odious demands upon acquiescence to their initial terms. Those who received Eichmann's demands knew this, and the American people and their Government should know it about Castro.

If Castro's ransom demands are met, there will be additional and more costly exactions. That this will be the course of his actions already has been indicated in his statements of yesterday, in which he threatened to cancel the bulldozers-for-prisoners offer if this Nation continues to refer to it as an exchange. Castro prefers to call his blackmail an indemnification and said that if an exchange is called for, it should concern political prisoners.

He is offering, as an alternative to the bulldozer exchange, to free prisoners held in Cuba for such men as Francisco—the Hook—Molina and other of his followers here, in Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Spain.

Molina, whom Castro refers to as a political prisoner and a martyr, it should be remembered, now is awaiting sentencing in New York for the killing of a 9-year-old Venezuelan girl in a restaurant there during a political fight.

If Castro succeeds in getting his demands, Mr. Speaker, we can expect to be subjected to more such blackmail and to further immoral and unjust conditions.

That this Government does not officially endorse the Castro ransom demand or the so-called exchange of political prisoners would in no way lessen American responsibility. We would be in the disgraceful position of passively endorsing an action by private citizens which is contrary to all codes of justice and of giving our tacit blessing to international blackmail.

Further, the meeting of Castro's demands would negate the very purpose of the invasion in which his prisoners were captured—the liberation of the Cuban people. We would be doing so because of the obvious fact that the tractors thus paid in tribute would be used to strengthen the one Communist fortress in this hemisphere and further stifle the hopes for a free and independent Cuba.

Only the naive or the purposely blind could believe that those who now suffer in Cuban prisons because of their efforts to overthrow the tyrannical rule of Fidel Castro were not willing to die, if necessary, to free their native Cuba.

To meet at this time the hysterical demands for the tools this oppressive and rabid dictator requires to further inter-Cuban freedom would be a dishonor to those who already have sacrificed their lives in the cause of freedom 90 miles to the south of us and would make the admittedly awkward and inept invasion attempt sanctioned by the White House even more ridiculous in the eyes of the world.

Although the American people historically have aided the oppressed and sought free captive peoples everywhere, our countenancing of the Castro blackmail would have an opposite effect in that it would prolong the period during which all Cubans must remain the slaves of communism. Such an action also would give even greater credence to communist claims that ours is an opportunistic country completely lacking in principle.

No one, Mr. Speaker, appears to have proposed an exchange of our surplus grain, which is costing American taxpayers millions of dollars annually in storage costs alone, for the Americans who have been held prisoner by the Chinese Reds for 10 years. And most of these prisoners, it should be remembered, are missionaries whose only crime against the government in which they are held seems to have been that they were there when the Communists took over that hapless land.

But wheat can only be used to relieve hunger. It cannot aid tyranny and is not the price Castro demands. He needs weapons of a type he is not receiving from his Communist masters, but which he can use to further fortify Cuba and thus strengthen the bonds with which he now holds the Cuban people.

Those who now would bow to Castro's rabid demands, Mr. Speaker, should keep in mind that many of the men who landed on Cuban beaches in the abortive invasion attempt of last month gave their lives that Cuba might be free. Our surrender now would sully the memory of those whose lives were spent in this vain battle of independence.

In four short months, this Nation's prestige abroad has been lower almost

lated to quicken the spirit of freedom-loving people.

Now we are confronted with the problem in South Vietnam. Another Laos seems to be in the making. We seem to be following the same ill-fated road. Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON made it clear in Saigon last week that he will not recommend to President Kennedy that American combat forces be stationed there.

By announcing to the world that our combat forces will not be stationed in South Vietnam, we invite trouble. South Vietnam forces may be superior, but they cannot head off determined Communist forces indefinitely. Sooner or later, we will be forced to commit our own combat forces or be identified once more with failure.

If we commit our forces in advance of Communist action, the attack will probably never come. If we get into the fight in midstream, we may trigger a big war.

President Kennedy may be concerned lest his party be identified once more as the war party.

If so, he should realize that the uncertainty and weakness of present policy is far more apt to bring war than an open, strong, and consistent policy of containment. No patriotic American will ever criticize President Kennedy for committing combat forces to protect freedom-loving people from aggression. Every patriot has the right and duty to criticize ineptitude and the too-little too-late policies which invite aggression.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit while the House is in session today.

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

There was no objection.

ONE-WAY STREET IN TRADE AND AID PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave from the House, I have been permitted to speak for 30 minutes, and as usual—I am discussing a matter that is paramount in my opinion.

I have tried to call to the attention of the House that we are traveling down the one-way street in trade and aid programs. I have attempted to show that under our reciprocal trades agreements, we have allowed American industry and the American workman to be victimized by foreign producers of consumer goods.

I have tried to explain that many of the items that are sold are not identified to the consumer with their country of origin.

When I made this statement I was challenged by certain authorities who

said that this was a figment of my imagination.

On January 3, I introduced legislation concerning all foreign produced goods to be so advertised and so marketed in these United States.

I have presented today facts and information to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which I will make part of my talk here today showing the brazen, bald-faced attempt by foreign producers through their American mouthpieces to undermine American industry and American production by disguising foreign products in such a manner that their state of origin is not known to the consumer.

I sincerely believe that the time has come for this Congress to stop living in the past—to awaken to the dangers inherent in our present status, and to read behind the headlines in the world's many disorders and disruptions such as Cuba, Laos, Vietnam, Belgian Congo, and the entire African Continent, as well as our neighbors to the south, the Latin American countries.

Unless we become realistic and practical in the operation of this Government and its economy, I can assure this Congress that the one-way street we are on will lead us into political oblivion.

The following is a true copy of all material and references to the above statements:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1961.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: On January 3, 1961, in the very beginning of this session I introduced H.R. 1149, copy of which is attached hereto.

Like many other American buyers, I was disturbed by the fact that I could purchase consumer goods in any of the public marketplaces not knowing the country of their origin.

Although we do have Federal regulations and some Federal law pertaining to this subject, it appears that in the phase of advertising either at the local point of sale or through the recognized advertising medium newspapers, radio, television, and other media, there is no restrictive covenant to protect an unsuspecting purchaser who does not particularly want to buy a foreign-made product and even if he were inclined to buy same, he would at least like to know where it was made.

I call this to your attention because this day, May 19, I have received a letter that shows this practice of selling unmarked or unidentified foreign-origin products has gone beyond the local housewife consumer stage that invaded the area of primary procurement in the manufacturing process so essential to our well-being.

I quote from a letter without quoting the names of the companies involved for reasons you can understand:

"On another subject, I am attaching to this letter a copy of the most recent glaring example of what we are up against in the tool steel business in regard to imports. This new threat is described in the attached copy of a letter from the ----- Co. to one of our very good customers in the Detroit area. This is an offer from a Japanese firm to send material into this country at substantially lower prices, but I would like to call particular attention to paragraph 3 of page 2 of this letter. I call attention to the portion which reads as follows:

"The high-speed steel bars will not bear any markings except heat numbers, unless you desire your own marks or colors to be

placed on the steel. If, for any reason, it is necessary for us to rebox the material here upon arrival in order to obscure the fact of Japanese origin, this can be arranged at a nominal charge."

"This, John, is a barefaced statement of illegal intent to evade the law requiring marking or to change the marking once the material has arrived here. What other evidence do we need that we are in an all-out war for survival?

"Thanks again for your many courtesies and your helpfulness.

"Sincerely yours,

"JOE,
"President."

Copies of the correspondence between the offering foreign importer and the American buyer are attached for your information.

I would appreciate an opportunity to appear before your committee if, in your wisdom, this legislation merits your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Chairman.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)

no person shall disseminate, or cause to be disseminated, any advertisement—

(1) by the United States mails, or in commerce by any means, for the purpose of inducing, or which is likely to induce, directly or indirectly, the purchase of any article manufactured or otherwise produced in any foreign country, or

(2) by any means, for the purpose of inducing, or which is likely to induce, directly or indirectly, the purchase of any article manufactured or otherwise produced in any foreign country,

unless such advertisement contains words stated or printed in such manner to as give actual notice to prospective purchasers, of the country of origin of such article.

(b) Whoever violates subsection (a) of this section shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for a term of not more than one year, or both.

MAY 5, 1961.

DEAR Mr. -----: It was a pleasure to talk with you again on Thursday after a lapse of several years. This letter will attempt to acquaint you with our company and some of its objectives in the field of imported specialty steels.

Our company has been formed very recently and is supported by responsible people who are interested in building a sound organization for the attainment of long-range objectives in the specialty steel markets. While it is possible for us to obtain European specialty steels, we are placing our emphasis upon five excellent Japanese sources, with whom we have exclusive long-term contracts executed in Japan. The quality of their products is fully equal, and in some respects superior, to the domestic or European product. This is so primarily because their mills and equipment are much more modern, their laboratories are ultra-modern, even to the extent of being equipped with electron-beam microscopes, X-ray, reflectoscope, and spectrographic equipment.

The tool steel plant has the reputation for being the leader in its field in Japan. It is fully equipped with melting flexibility consisting of various sizes of electric arc furnaces; electric induction furnaces, and vacuum furnaces for the production of the higher alloys. Your orders will be produced to AISI standards for chemistry, tolerances in inches, finish, etc., or to your own proprietary specifications. You can incur no risks on quality. If the steel, when inspected by your personnel upon arrival at your plant, proves to contain any defective material, we will accept it for our account,

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8007

to the vanishing point. It is to be hoped that we will not further assail our national image by kowtowing to a pint-sized dictator.

In 1797, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, who was our minister to the French Republic, made a statement which is familiar to all Americans. It was, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

Actually, Mr. Pinckney's words were a bit stronger and were toned down because they were to be inscribed on his cenotaph in St. Michael's churchyard in Charleston, S.C. He said, "not one damned penny for tribute."

As strong as that was for the day and time, Mr. Speaker, I believe this Nation should be even stronger and more outspoken in its dealings with this, the most deranged criminal we have had to deal with in many years.

Cuba
CASTRO THE BLACKMAILER

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

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will America, lulled in the sweet dream of peace, slumber too long, unaware of the true nature of the Communist conspiracy, until we awake to find our cause has been lost? The astounding news stories of this past weekend make me fearful that our desire to be humane, to be good, has blinded us to the real purpose of the Communists, destruction of the United States and domination of the world. How often must we recall this Red purpose, stressed by every Communist leader since Lenin, before our people recognize that they mean it? Yet, in the face of recent Communist aggression, in spite of the demonstration of Red beastiality as exemplified in Hungary, Tibet, and Cuba, we now have a national movement underway, approved, according to press statements, by the State Department, to submit to blackmail by Castro in order to help him build up his military and economic strength and further insure the success of a Communist satellite 90 miles from our coast.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to no man in caring for my fellowman. I, too, am imbued with humanitarian instincts, and I grieve deeply for those unfortunates now held prisoner by Castro. But, Mr. Speaker, we are at war—at war with a ruthless enemy who will show no mercy, will stop at nothing to accomplish the complete destruction of our country and its guarantees of freedom and individual liberty. These prisoners are the unfortunate victims of that war, just as millions of Jews were the victims of Hitler, and thousands of American boys were victims of the Nazi campaign to rule the world. We grieve for the prisoners of Castro, yes. We salute their bravery in their fight for freedom. But we betray them and ourselves if we now submit to coercion, to blackmail, in bringing about their release.

What effect will such a trade as proposed by Castro have on the peoples of other Latin-American countries? He will become a hero all over again to the

misguided who refuse to recognize his real purpose and know only that he has been able to humble and humiliate this great Nation.

We cannot afford to give further aid and comfort to the enemy by helping to build up Castro. We dare not be blackmailed into bringing about a trade of heavy construction equipment for prisoners of war. Such a barter is morally wrong—trading human lives for pieces of machinery. Should we be so foolish as to enter into such a trade, it will not be many days until other twobit bandits and potential dictators will be seizing American tourists and holding them for ransom. Americans, who once were secure in the knowledge that wherever they traveled they were safe because of the strength of the United States and the guarantee that we would protect them, will become fair targets to a worldwide kidnaping ring.

Mr. Speaker, on October 20, 1960, the United States took action to prohibit shipment to Cuba "of all goods except certain nonsubsidized foodstuffs, medicine, and medical supplies which are permitted for humanitarian reasons." There has been no change in our relationship with Cuba to alter this decision made 7 months ago. The need for a complete embargo of shipments to Cuba is greater now than it was then because since that time, Castro has hurled defiance at the Western Hemisphere and has openly and completely set up a Communist state. To now give him, for whatever reason, the heavy construction equipment he so badly needs, will enable him to strengthen his position in Cuba. It will not lead to peace, nor guarantee freedom for those it is intended to help. It will make more certain further demands by Castro, will endanger the lives and safety of all Americans traveling outside the borders of this country, could lead to the loss to communism of other Latin-American countries, and could well pave the way to war once this Communist stooge is able to complete the construction of jet airbases and missile sites for the convenience of Soviet-based military strength.

Hard as it will be for Americans to do, we must steel ourselves against the action now being proposed by some well-meaning citizens to raise by public subscription some \$20 million ransom to pay to Castro. The Government must forbid the exportation of the heavy construction equipment Castro demands. We must serve notice that we do not deal with international gangsters on their terms and that we are ready, willing, and able to use the might of this Nation, if need be, to bring about the freedom of political prisoners held in defiance of international law and to protect our own citizens wherever they may be. If we can show unity of purpose in protecting ourselves and those who believe in freedom, we will be much more successful in dealing with Castro, the Soviet dictators, and any others who threaten the peace of the world and the liberty of mankind. To do less is to admit weakness and invite further aggression and the war we all hope may be avoided.

The President only recently stated that we will free Cuba. It may well be that in the end we will have to take such action through the sacrifice of American lives. If this be the case, how can we justify giving Castro the equipment he needs to strengthen his military might?

SOUTH VIETNAM AND LAOS

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

Mr. FENDLEY. Mr. Speaker, there is an ominous parallel between a recent statement made by Vice President Johnson and the speech of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State shortly before the Communist invasion of South Korea.

In this speech Acheson placed Korea beyond America's defensive perimeter. It was an invitation to trouble, and trouble came.

In Saigon the Vice President said he would not recommend that U.S. combat forces be stationed in South Vietnam. This, too, is an invitation to trouble.

Today nobody knows how far the United States will go, and the Vice President has added to the uncertainty.

U.S. combat forces are the most effective deterrent to aggression, and we should publicly offer such forces to South Vietnam without delay.

Another Laos is in the making. Supplies and training are not enough. Sooner or later, we will be forced to send combat forces to a war already in progress, or once more be identified with failure.

In South Vietnam and other similar trouble spots, we should first determine whether the local population really wishes to resist Communist takeover. If not, forget them. Do not waste resources on them.

If the will to resist does exist, we should offer to station U.S. combat forces.

It is a fact of history that no country where the U.S. Army has been stationed has ever been attacked.

If we had kept forces in Korea, that debacle might have been avoided. Marines effectively stabilized the situation in Lebanon. West Berlin would not be free today except for the presence of American troops.

The presence of U.S. forces under U.S. command has always proved to be the most effective deterrent to aggression.

We should adopt a firm policy, announce it to the world and stick by it. Today nobody knows how far we will go. This uncertainty has led to trouble in the past and will do so again.

Perhaps the people of Laos had no desire to resist the Communist takeover. In any case, we spent a lot of money there, we are identified in the eyes of the world with the resistance which failed, and Communist takeover of a large portion of that country has already been accomplished.

In Cuba, we used no combat forces, but we are identified with the invasion failure nonetheless. All this delights the Communists and disturbs the rest of the world. Our role in the Cuban invasion was incredibly inept and hardly calcu-

This committee has developed that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has thousands of dollars in finances in deposits, and withdrawals of large amounts have been made subject only to the control of this witness and Mr. Taber; that American citizens, including college youth, are being asked to contribute to this organization.

It is a perfectly proper legislative purpose for the committee to consider whether there is a situation here which could be met by recommendations for legislation to govern such organizations so as to give assurance of a sounder or at least a tighter financial control in cases where the public is involved.

The founder of the committee, Robert Taber, is now in Cuba. He was sentenced in Ohio in 1939 to serve up to 30 years in jail for armed robbery, auto theft, and kidnaping.

He was a newswriter for the Columbia Broadcasting System. An article by him in Nation magazine in January of 1960 was the instrument which brought the Cuba committee into existence. Needless to say, it was a whitewash of Fidel Castro. It extolled the alleged social gains of the Cuba revolution and it pooch-pooched the clear facts about Moscow's dominating influence in Havana.

When we called him to the witness stand last year, Taber denied that the committee used funds supplied by Castro representatives. When we later developed proof that there was Castro money in this alleged fair play operation, he was gone.

But he can still draw checks against the committee's account made up of funds contributed at least in part by gullible youngsters on America's campuses.

Our hearing developed the fact that he had taken at least \$19,000 from the committee's account in one single withdrawal.

There is also more to be said about the man he left behind him, Richard Gibson.

For many years, Mr. President, we have heard a good deal about athletic bums, who hop from campus to campus, season after season. It is time we began hearing about Communist front bums, who do the same kind of hoping.

Richard Gibson is a Communist front bum. Our record shows that he was a freshman at Kenyon College 12 years ago. He vanished just before the end of the spring term, leaving behind him a tuition bill of \$579, which has never been paid. Regardless of this, he got a John Hay Whitney fellowship a year later to study in Rome.

Five years later, a GI grant sent him to the University of Paris, the Sorbonne. Today, he is a graduate student at Columbia University, at the expense of his former employer, CBS.

Columbia is the operating base, from which he operates the fair play racket. He went to Canada, in his role of Fidel's Typhoid Mary, to solidify a fraternal connection with Canadian undergraduates. He helped start the committee chapter on the Columbia campus and is president of the New York chapter. He has thrown the weight of his organization behind what he describes as a "very brilliant book by a Columbia University professor, C. Wright Mills." The book is entitled "Listen Yankee."

It excoriates the American position in Cuba and glorifies Moscow's Fidel. Needless to say, the Communist press is equally overjoyed at this "very brilliant book by a Columbia University professor."

Our hearing also developed that the Cuba committee has refused to register under the Alien Registration Act. The committee, in its own publications, has boasted about mass demonstrations it organized outside the United Nations and in Union Square.

How was it possible for this group of Red racketeers to solicit funds and to organize demonstrations after the initial facts about Taber's concealment of Castro's hand in his committee appeared in some newspapers?

I believe this can be laid at the door of the liberal publications that spent so much time furiously assaulting the Subcommittee on Internal Security that they overlooked the truth about this specious Fair Play for Cuba outfit.

There are many of these, Mr. President. The most flagrant of all is the eminently respectable Harper's magazine, for the falsehoods it circulated in collaboration with a certain Kenneth Tynan.

Tynan, dramatic critic for the London Observer and guest critic for the New Yorker magazine, another eminently respectable publication, signed the New York Times advertisement which was the kickoff for the Cuba committee's activity.

He was called into executive session by the subcommittee when he began looking into the shenanigans of this Fidel-financed group. Tynan wrote an article for the October 1960 issue of Harper's, which purported to tell what happened in this executive session.

His account of what happened in the session may be accurately described as a double-barreled lie. Harper's lent the full weight of its prestige to this lie. According to him, here is what took place:

Had I received money for signing the [Fair Play for Cuba] ad?

No.

Was it paid for by Cuban gold?

No.

The record of the hearing shows that Kenneth Tynan was not asked either of these questions and consequently he gave neither of the answers. Obviously the Fair Play for Cuba Committee needed to have something like this said about it under respectable auspices, so Mr. Tynan took care of its needs. It was unfortunate for him that the committee ran across another witness, who swore that the ad was paid for with Cuban money.

But it is even more unfortunate, Mr. President, for the gulls who fell in behind Harper's, the Nation, and a whole string of liberal newspapers across the Nation. These were so determined to give the Subcommittee on Internal Security a black eye, that they gave the Fair Play for Cuba Committee a clean bill of health.

More than all others, Mr. President, they have an obligation to begin to tell the truth about what this Red shake-down racket really is.

LAWLESSNESS IN ALABAMA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the ugly passions which have distorted reason and law in some cities in Alabama have given birth to a violence resulting in most serious damage to our great Nation—not only here at home but throughout the world.

I call particular attention to the brutal attack upon John Seigenthaler, a fellow Tennessean and outstanding former newspaperman, who was sent by the President and the Attorney General to the area to seek facts about the protection of citizens who were exercising their constitutional rights in a peaceful manner.

Caught up suddenly in the violence, Mr. Seigenthaler courageously sought, as any honorable citizen would, to protect a young woman from attack and was struck down from behind by a coward's blow. Fortunately, Mr. Seigenthaler is recovering from his injuries and will be able to continue contributing his valuable talents to the important post that he holds as special assistant to the Attorney General.

I call attention to the tragic case of Mr. Seigenthaler because it represents all that is reprehensible about the unchecked lawlessness which has led to senseless injury of many other citizens who deserved protection from violence, regardless of issues argued by either side in the situation.

Mr. President, I suggest that some of the local officials of Alabama have been negligent of their obligations to control brutality brought about by hotheaded lawlessness. I submit that these officials also by their failure to move quickly and effectively with the local enforcement facilities at their disposal, have turned their backs on their responsibilities.

Mr. President, much as we regret the need for using U.S. marshals to protect the rights of people and to prevent violence, it seems to me that the Attorney General had no alternative in this instance. He is to be commended for taking this necessary step.

Our Nation and our people will not be able to count, today, the depth of the damage that has been done the cause of freedom throughout the world by these days of shame that have occurred in Alabama.

I pray that those who have inflicted this damage, those who have condoned it, and those who have turned their backs upon it will seek forgiveness in their souls. I hope sincerely that strength and steadfastness will continue to support those who have deplored this tragedy and who have sought and are still seeking to establish law and order where a mob has run rampant and struck bloody blows at individual freedom.

TRIBUTE TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the strength and vigor with which Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall is attacking his job as Secretary of the Interior is well characterized in the article which appeared recently in the Deseret News

STATE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAWS
 Maximum weekly benefit for single employee
 for temporary total disability by States

State	Rate	Date of available information
Alabama ¹	\$31.00	1957
Alaska ¹	100.00	1959
Arizona	(2)	
Arkansas ¹	35.00	1959
California ¹	65.00	1959
Colorado	40.25	1959
Connecticut ¹	(2)	
Delaware ¹	60.00	1959
Florida ¹	42.00	1959
Georgia ¹	30.00	1959
Hawaii ¹	75.00	1959
Idaho	28.00	1959
Illinois ¹	45.00	1959
Indiana ¹	65.00	1959
Iowa	32.00	1959
Kansas ¹	38.00	1959
Kentucky ¹	36.00	1960
Louisiana ¹	35.00	1958
Maine ¹	39.00	1961
Maryland ¹	40.00	1959
Massachusetts ¹	60.00	1961
Michigan ¹	33.00	1960
Minnesota ¹	45.00	1959
Mississippi ¹	35.00	1960
Missouri ¹	45.00	1959
Montana	28.00	1959
Nebraska	37.00	1959
Nevada	(2)	
New Hampshire ¹	40.00	1959
New Jersey ¹	40.00	1960
New Mexico ¹	38.00	1959
New York ¹	50.00	1960
North Carolina	35.00	1959
North Dakota	38.00	1960
Ohio ¹	49.00	1961
Oklahoma	35.00	1959
Oregon ¹	(2)	
Pennsylvania ¹	42.50	1960
Rhode Island ¹	36.00	1960
South Carolina ¹	35.00	1956
South Dakota	30.00	1957
Tennessee ¹	34.00	1959
Texas ¹	35.00	1959
Utah	37.00	1959
Vermont ¹	36.00	1959
Virginia ¹	35.00	1960
Washington ¹	(2)	
West Virginia	(2)	
Wisconsin	(2)	
Wyoming	(2)	
Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.	54.00	1961

¹ Maritime.
² Not applicable.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a study of this listing discloses that the \$70 a week maximum proposed by S. 733 will be practically 40 percent, and in many instances 100 percent, more than the amounts paid in the individual States.

I cannot see anything else but a chain reaction throughout the country demanding that the increase granted by the Congress shall likewise be granted by the States.

Perhaps the increase ought to be granted, but before it is, we ought to make certain what are the actual facts. Prior to the amendments of 1948, maximum weekly benefits for workers covered by the Longshoremen and Harbor Workers Act was \$25 a week. In 1948, it was raised to \$35. In 1956, it was raised from \$35 to \$54, an increase of approximately 50 percent.

Now, 5 years later, it is sought to be raised from \$54 to \$70, an increase of 30 percent.

It is my understanding that only perfunctory hearings are contemplated on this bill. It seems to be accepted that the grants ought to be made. I hope that, before we act upon this bill, it will be studied adequately, not only from the standpoint of the Federal Govern-

ment, but from the standpoint of the effect it will have on the various States in the Union.

Cuba file

THE FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the facts I am about to present to the Senate today are of particular concern to students in America's institutions of higher learning, for reasons which will quickly become apparent. They are of particular concern to the parents of these students, and to faculty members in these institutions. They are of particular concern to Senators from California, Colorado, my own State of Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Minnesota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Vermont, Washington.

I believe they are also of general concern to the people of the United States. Fitted together, they provide a priceless example of how gullible persons can be misled into serving as victims for a cheap Communist shakedown. I believe part of the responsibility for this situation lies with certain self-misguided liberal editors, who, in their blind fury, rush to the defense of anyone and everyone who receives a subpoena from the Subcommittee on Internal Security. The victims in this case are 7,000 students who have given their support to something that calls itself the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Months ago, the subcommittee published testimony making clear that the so-called Fair Play for Cuba Committee was a fraud set up under the auspices of a concealed agent of Fidel Castro. Nevertheless, according to testimony of Richard Gibson, the acting executive secretary, before the subcommittee last Tuesday, May 16, the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has chapters located at Antioch, University of California, City College of New York, Stanford, Columbia, University of Colorado, Brooklyn, Queens, Cornell, UCLA, Fisk, Los Angeles City College, University of Minnesota, Carleton College, University of Indiana, Yale, University of Virginia, Oberlin, Brandeis, Harvard, University of Washington, University of Michigan, Wayne, Brown, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, St. John's, Boston University, University of Ohio, Grinnell, Tufts, Bennington, Goddard, University of Kansas, Reed College. The committee also has what it calls adult chapters in Los Angeles, Calif.; San Francisco, Calif.; Tampa, Fla.; Detroit, Mich.; Chicago, Ill.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Baltimore, Md.; Palo Alto, Calif.; and New York City.

Other chapters are located in Washington, D.C., Newark, Boston, New Haven, Denver, Cleveland, Seattle, San Diego, Hartford, Lynn, Mass., Santa Clara, Calif., Brooklyn, Queens, Bergen County, N.J.

On Thursday, May 18, an excellent editorial entitled "For Exposure's Sake" appeared in the Washington Evening Star. I will read it to Senators:

It is said that a congressional investigating committee "has no right to expose for exposure's sake." Generally, this makes sense. For an investigating committee is supposed to be seeking facts for purposes of possible legislation. It is not supposed to use its authority to embarrass and humiliate an unoffending citizen.

There are exceptions, however, to all generalities. And this week's quizzing by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee of a representative of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee is one of them.

The Senate group had before it one Richard Gibson, acting executive secretary of the committee. He told a remarkable story.

This Fair Play Committee claims to represent 7,000 people in the United States and Canada. It has 23 chapters and 37 student councils in the United States. Mr. Gibson, one of two people authorized to write checks on the committee's bank account, testified that he had never asked where the money came from. Why? So he couldn't be forced to reveal the names of contributors. His committee, he said, kept no membership list, using, instead, a general mailing list. Again, we suppose, to avoid having to disclose the names of members. Finally, Mr. Gibson said he didn't know that his committee's executive secretary, who is now in Cuba, was sentenced in Ohio in 1939 to serve up to 30 years in jail for armed robbery, auto theft, and kidnaping.

We assume that the Senate subcommittee, in eliciting this testimony, had some legislative purpose in mind. But it doesn't matter very much. The point is that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, on the basis of Mr. Gibson's testimony, ought to be exposed for what it is. The dupes who belong to it and who contribute to it, assuming that they are dupes, ought to know what they have been conned into. And if this comes within the sweep of "exposure for exposure's sake," we are all for it.

To begin with, the Star correctly assumes that we had a legislative purpose in mind when we sought facts about the Cuba Committee. On this floor, I have kept Senators continuously informed about the committee. Our legislative purpose was stated three times at the hearing last Tuesday. At page 211 of the hearing transcript, I am quoted as follows:

There has been evidence before this committee, sworn testimony, that advertisements were placed in the newspapers with funds supplied by Castro.

If your agency is not registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, this committee is interested, and we shall suggest to the Attorney General that he may be interested.

The following appears on page 225 of the transcript, quoting Subcommittee Counsel Sourwine:

There is evidence before this committee that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee is a foreign-sponsored propaganda organization. There is also evidence that it is supported and encouraged by the Communist Party, USA. We want to know as much as we can about its activities for the purpose of determining the extent that it threatens the security of this country and what, if any, legislative action can be taken to meet that threat.

Mr. Sourwine commented further at page 241:

May 23

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance; and also to exclude representatives of the Government of Cuba from attendance at meetings of the Inter-American Defense Board.

SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, on April 12 of this year, I introduced for myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], S. 1567, a bill to amend section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946.

I said at that time that large sums of the American people's money are being spent by Government agencies. Such a trust should be open to constant access for review by the taxpayers and their elected representatives in the executive and legislative branches.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] is the author of an article on this subject which was published in This Week magazine of the Washington Sunday Star on May 14, 1961.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LET'S STOP SILLY SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT (By Senator WILLIAM PROXMIER, of Wisconsin)

WASHINGTON.—A few years ago a Federal agency decided to classify as secret the amount of peanut butter used by our Armed Forces. It was thought that an alert enemy might be able to determine the size of our forces from the amount of peanut butter consumed.

This was a fuzzy-headed try at censorship. Unfortunately, another Government agency in Washington was at the same time publishing reports which gave down to the last man the size of our Armed Forces. These reports weren't classified. Anyone could buy them.

The peanut butter situation was one of the more comic aspects in the continuing battle between the dictates of secrecy and the people's right to know. In recent years the balance in this tug of war has swung drastically to the side of secrecy.

We must reverse this situation before it is too late. For Government is everybody's business, and what you don't know about it will hurt you.

Today thousands of Government decisions are made in secret. You as a private citizen cannot find out what is going on. Time and time again we, your lawmakers, have also been denied access to important information which is essential in representing you responsibly and intelligently.

I have made a list of some of the more fantastic examples of needless secrecy. The list could run on for pages, but I've tried to condense it for brevity's sake:

A group of college students prepared a scrapbook of newspaper clippings, scientific magazine articles, and articles from foreign publications about atomic energy. The Pentagon got wind of this, and classified the whole scrapbook as top secret.

The secrecy stamp was placed on a report describing shark attacks on shipwrecked

sailors, even though the shipwrecks occurred more than 20 years ago.

A scientific study on a modern adaptation of the bow and arrow was classified secret.

After congressional pressure, the Immigration and Naturalization Service declassified a report in the use of public funds to send border inspectors to rifle and pistol matches.

At one time, the State Department stored gifts received by Federal officials from foreign nations in a classified building. Under fire for this action, the State Department finally and reluctantly let reporters enter the building.

One result of this secrecy-happy approach has been the creation of a giant mountain of classified documents. Each week our Government now classifies a stack of documents higher than the Empire State Building.

In the past 14 years we have accumulated more than three times as much secret material as was classified in the entire history of our Government from the Civil War to 1946, and this includes all of World War II and the Manhattan Project, which built the first atomic bomb.

What is being done to end this stifling growth of secrecy? For one thing, we in Congress are trying to limit the number of agencies with the right to classify papers.

As you might imagine, once a Federal official is given the right to wield a secrecy stamp, he doesn't like giving it up. But recently the authority to classify documents was withdrawn from some 30 Government agencies which included the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, and the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission.

Why do Government agencies desire to cloak their activities in secrecy, for reasons other than national defense, or to prevent invasion of personal privacy? Nearly always the cause stems from a desire to avoid public criticism of inefficiency and waste. Decisions considered and adopted without public scrutiny are much less subject to public criticism, even though they affect many citizens. But with a Federal budget topping \$80 billion, every citizen has the right to know how his money is being spent.

With a very few limited exceptions your Government has no more right to deny you access to all the facts than a hired bookkeeper has to deny the owner of a business the right to see his books. This is your Government. You own it, you pay for it. You have a right to know about it. And, yes, you have a duty to find out about it.

THE FIGHT IN CONGRESS

Not all government secrecy conceals wasteful spending or graft. But the snap reflex of any official on the verge of exposure is to shroud his error by claiming a secrecy privilege. Time and time again investigators have pruned the screen aside and uncovered influence-peddling, embezzlement, and other violations of the public trust.

We in Congress have begun to meet the problem of unnecessary secrecy.

In the House of Representatives the Government Information Subcommittee, brilliantly led by Representative JOHN E. MOSS, of California, has handled nearly 200 cases of Federal abridgement of freedom of information. In over half the cases the subcommittee succeeded in freeing the information from the censors. The House committee has been at work 6 years. The Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights also has been working on the problem. The vigilance of the two committees has prevented much unnecessary secrecy.

Two other nongovernment groups—the American Society of Newspaper Editors and Sigma Delta Chi, the national journalism fraternity—have waged long and courageous battles against unnecessary government secrecy.

But I fear that the cases of unwarranted secrecy which come to light are only the top of the iceberg. Beneath the surface, a vast amount of information continues to be withheld.

Perhaps the worst offender in silly secrecy is the Department of Defense. A classic example took place when the first Atlas communications satellite was launched. For some reason only 88 of the many hundreds of men working on the project were told its real purpose: to place in orbit a communications package which would broadcast a taped message from the President. Of course, all of the employees had been cleared for top-secret work.

To keep the secret from the others, the 88 men had to sneak around the missile site at night altering circuits and rebuilding parts of the missile, changing what had been done during the day by the people who didn't know what the real purpose of the missile was. You can guess at the confusion this caused, and how much money was wasted.

THE PENTAGON'S SECRET PHOTO

On another occasion the Defense Department refused to declassify photographs of the Titan missile for months after it had been stored outside a factory near Denver, viewed by local residents, seen on television and photographed from a helicopter. Finally—2 weeks before the 1958 congressional elections, pictures of the President viewing the missile appeared. The Pentagon claimed it had wanted to avoid premature "ballyhoo." Or, putting it another way, they wanted the ballyhoo, but at a time of their own choosing.

Let me underline one point: In the interests of national defense, it is absolutely necessary to classify information about weapons, codes, strategies, and a number of other subjects. But I think that many of our military men are infected with "secretitis." Their secrecy policies and procedures must be reexamined.

There is no simple way to lift the giant lid of secrecy over Washington. It is a constant struggle in which we all must fight. One thing that will help is new legislation. I am a sponsor, with Senator CARROLL, of Colorado, of S. 1567, which provides:

1. All Government records, rulings, reports and all other papers not specifically excluded for reasons of national defense or personal privacy be made public.

2. Except as justified by reasons of national defense, no order or rule of a Government agency shall be valid unless made public.

3. Any citizen may bring a suit in any Federal district court to compel such public inspection.

Enactment of such a law would go a long way toward ending the more flagrant examples of secrecy.

But it will take more than a new law to end foolish secrecy. More and more citizens must become increasingly aware of the dangers. You, the voter, should realize that every time a Federal official wields that secrecy stamp unnecessarily you and the people of your country are losing another bit of freedom.

Laws will help end the secrecy mumbo-jumbo. But in the long run the key figure in the fight for the right to know is the citizen who keeps a vigilant and inquiring eye on his Government.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, is it my understanding that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has the floor and that he has yielded to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

1961

installations the services are operating and where they are located.

I am glad, too, to know that six of these installations are being closed, and that further study as to the need for the others is continuing.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1961.

Hon. ALBERT GORE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GORE: This is first to report that, on the basis of the facts we have now accumulated from the various oversea commands of the military departments, as to the hotels and hotel-type accommodations in foreign areas, we have directed, as an initial action measure, the orderly closing of the following hotels:

1. The Palast Hotel, Wiesbaden, Germany.
2. Hotel Powers, Paris, France.
3. Columbia House, Tempelhof Central Airport, Berlin, Germany.
4. Newhaven Court Hotel, United Kingdom.
5. The Hotel de Paris, Paris, France.
6. General John K. Cannon Hotel, Ramstein Air Base, Germany.

In addition, we are directing the military departments to adjust the rates charged personnel occupying hotel space on a leave basis, in order to provide the Government a more favorable return. Travelers on official business are subject to a flat 40-percent reduction of the per diem allowance established for the locality under the joint travel regulations, and, in addition, pay a \$1 to \$1.50 daily service charge when they occupy Government quarters. This service charge is apparently the rate to which you referred in your letter of February 4. I might point out that in a number of localities, official per diem rates are substantially higher for travelers who cannot be accommodated in Government quarters.

The survey to which I referred in my letter of February 27 has disclosed the existence of a total of 100 hotels, as against the 57 identified in the teletype survey reported in my first letter. In addition, we have been informed by the military departments that during the period 1949 to the present, they have closed a total of 499 hotels or hotel-type accommodations in foreign countries throughout the world. For all of the facilities now in operation we have collected information on occupancy rates, charges, per diem allowances, operating income and expenses, the extent to which the activities are financed from moneys generated by non-appropriated fund activities, and the purposes served by their operations.

A preliminary analysis has been made of the information reported on the particular facilities to which you referred in your letters. This analysis indicates that the Torrejon Guesthouse (BOQ), near Madrid, is not adequate to satisfy the demand for accommodations during 7 months of the year. In fact, that demand exceeds the combined capacity of the guesthouse and the Torrejon housing annex (Balboa Hotel), which you suggested closing. We propose to investigate the possibility of making the annex available for civilian occupancy during this slack period. The facilities in Nurnberg, as I reported in my letter of February 27, show a net profit to the Government, and are used primarily by enlisted military personnel and their dependents on leave and change-of-station travel. As to the Sanno Hotel in Tokyo, we have been requested informally by the Department of State to maintain this triservice facility, and we are inquiring

about the basis of this request. The Garmisch-Berchtesgaden area, which contains several facilities for rest and recreation of service personnel, supported completely by nonappropriated funds, was covered by our survey. We have not yet reached a decision on the future of these facilities.

We intend to pursue vigorously further analysis of the factual information now accumulated, and we expect to have a further report by June 30. In the meantime, this material is available for inspection or study by you or your staff.

We have also requested the military departments to study the use of full-time military personnel engaged in the management and administration of all hotel-type accommodations for the purpose of either reducing the numbers required, or, where feasible, considering their replacement by nonmilitary personnel.

I am sure you appreciate the problems involved in balancing the need for adequate official travel and recreation facilities for military personnel in foreign countries, and for facilities that will minimize adverse effects on our balance of payments position, against the necessity for the lean and fit Defense Establishment that President Kennedy has called for.

I am sending copies of this letter to the chairmen of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees.

Sincerely,
ROSWELL GILPATRICK,
Deputy.

Mr. GORE. It is my hope that the Defense Department will pursue this matter further, and close or consolidate such activities, including hotels, as their study indicates to be in the public interest.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I offer my amendment identified as "5-18-61-D" and ask that it be stated; and that I may then be permitted to yield to several Senators, including the Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from Florida, without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4 line 25, after "American Samoa," insert "the District of Columbia."

On page 5, line 4, after "and (iii)" insert "the allotment ratio for the District of Columbia shall be .50, and (iv)".

On page 5, line 24, after "American Samoa," insert "the District of Columbia."

On page 6, line 11, after "American Samoa," insert "the District of Columbia."

ACTION IN THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES TO REEVALUATE THE ROLE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA IN INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the House of Representatives has approved a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 226) expressing the sense of the Congress

that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.

This resolution lays the facts on the line with regard to Cuba, and expresses the sense of Congress that the present Government of Cuba constitutes a clear and present danger to the United States and to all the free nations of Latin America.

The concurrent resolution, Mr. President, specifically recites that "Cuba today has become a base and staging area for Communist subversive activities throughout the hemisphere" and that "the present Government of Cuba has signified its unquestioning acceptance of the Soviet line on international affairs."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of House Concurrent Resolution 226 may be printed in the RECORD at this point at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I want to express my own very strong conviction that House Concurrent Resolution 226 should be brought to the floor of the Senate as quickly as possible so that my colleagues may have the same chance that was afforded Members of the other body to express their views with respect to the Cuban situation.

I am confident that an overwhelming majority of Senators will favor this resolution if they get a chance to vote on it; and I shall do everything I can to see that the resolution is speedily considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that it is reported favorably to the Senate.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 226) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Caracas Declaration of Solidarity of March 28, 1954, declares that the domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties; and

Whereas Cuba today has become a base and staging area for Communist subversive activity throughout the hemisphere; and

Whereas the present Government of Cuba offers a clear and present danger to the spread of political liberty, economic development, and social progress through all the Republics of the hemisphere; and

Whereas the Declaration of Havana of September 2, 1960, was an open attack on the Organization of American States clearly showing that the present Government of Cuba stands in defiance of every proclaimed principle of the inter-American system; and

Whereas the present Government of Cuba has signified its unquestioning acceptance of the Soviet line on international affairs; and

Whereas representatives of the present Government of Cuba continue to participate in the councils of the Organization of American States: Now, therefore, be it

Sure, the Commissioner may ask for advice, but he is not supposed to make a ruling based upon pressure from the executive branch or from anyone else. If he did, Congress might as well stop passing laws.

Ordinarily, it takes months to get such a ruling. Most certainly one cannot get a ruling as quickly in bureaucratic Washington as apparently the organization in question secured its ruling. The bureaus simply do not rule that fast, and if they do then something is wrong.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that the purchase of machinery, no matter for how humane a purpose, cannot be regarded as a charitable undertaking under any circumstance?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly. By no line of reasoning can it be said that what is proposed to be given to Mr. Castro is charity. Certainly it cannot be ruled that blackmail payments to his regime are charity. I repeat the language of the law: tax exemptions are for gifts made:

Exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals.

How can Mr. Castro qualify under any of those definitions?

Under the regulation which has been issued under section 501(c), it is provided that a charitable organization, for tax deduction purposes, includes organizations which have been formed "to combat community deterioration and juvenile delinquency."

The closest Castro might come to qualifying under that language would be in the category of juvenile delinquency, and I doubt their application will be based upon helping Mr. Castro as a "juvenile delinquent."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the able Senator from Pennsylvania yield me 1 minute, so that I may address a question to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as I understand, the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, has stated that it is his understanding that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], will ask representatives of the State Department to appear before the committee tomorrow. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. MORSE. In a conversation with the chairman of the committee, he said he planned to ask representatives of the State Department to appear before the committee tomorrow afternoon. However, I cannot speak definitely for him.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not wish to leave the impression that the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations or the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs were not in any way cooperating in this matter.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is fair to say—and I believe the chairman of the

committee would say so, were he on the floor—that he is concerned about the situation, and desires that there be consultation.

Mr. CAPEHART. The point is that both the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Oregon are cooperating to have these questions answered.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment be printed at this point in the Record instead of at a point some minutes earlier, before the colloquy which has just been concluded developed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

On page 4, line 25, after "American Samoa," insert "the District of Columbia."

On page 5, line 4, after "and (iii)" insert "the allotment ratio for the District of Columbia shall be .50, and (iv)".

On page 5, line 24, after "American Samoa," insert "the District of Columbia."

On page 6, line 11, after "American Samoa," insert "the District of Columbia."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to increase the allotment to the District of Columbia for public school education purposes.

The formula provided in the bill for apportioning the funds divided among the States, the District of Columbia and U.S. possessions, is unfair to the District of Columbia for a reason readily apparent on examination of the bill.

One of the factors on which the apportionment formula is based is income per public school pupil, which is determined by dividing the number of school age children 5 to 17 inclusive by the total income of individuals in the State or district.

There is, of course, a highly artificial element in the income of the District of Columbia because there are many residents here with substantial income who contribute little to the District of Columbia government because of exemptions in the District's tax laws for Members of Congress and certain other Government officials. Naturally this inflates the District of Columbia income figure considerably with the result that the District's allotment ratio is the minimum permissible figure of 0.25 and under the committee bill \$9.26 share per school age child provided the District is the lowest share for any State, district, or possession.

Mr. President, having served on the Committee on the District of Columbia with the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is in charge of the bill, during the first 2 years of my membership in the Senate, I had occasion to learn at first hand the almost pitiable condition of the schools of the District of Columbia, schools which should be really the showcase of our

public school system but which unfortunately are far from that.

I have asked Mr. Charles Lee, a member of the staff of the Subcommittee on Education, to prepare a memorandum concerning the educational needs of the public school system of the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

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

MAY 11, 1961.

Memorandum to: Mr. John S. Forsythe.

From: Charles Lee, professional staff member, Education Subcommittee.

In response to your request the following information concerning educational needs in the public school system in the District of Columbia is respectfully submitted:

1. Total enrollment.....	121,448
Elementary	80,805
Junior high school.....	24,419
Senior high school.....	12,696
Vocational high school.....	2,274
Americanization School.....	674
Veterans High School Center.....	551
Capitol Page School.....	29
2. Teachers	4,500
Fully accredited.....	3,200
Uncertified	1,300

29.4 percent of teachers lack full accreditation.

3. School buildings:

According to a recent survey conducted by the Office of Education there are 49 school buildings definitely substandard which should be replaced out of a total of 165 buildings currently being used for schools. An example of the type of school building for which replacement is being sought is Hines Junior High School. This structure was built in 1894. In part it was condemned in 1923. It has been used consistently since that date although the auditorium is boarded up and one-half of the top floor is cut off. The situation has been repeatedly brought to the attention of the District officials by the Members of the Senate District Committee. Senator MORSE in the 86th Congress warned the District in a statement on the floor of the Senate that the building was a potential fire hazard. Some 3 months later a fire occurred. Fortunately, at the time there was no injury or loss of life because the pupils under excellent discipline were quickly evacuated.

4. Fiscal situation in the District of Columbia:

For fiscal year 1962 a total budget of \$291,400,000 has been requested. This amount includes \$54,500,000 for operations and maintenance, including salaries, of the school system. Capital outlay for the school system is \$9,200,000. A revenue deficit is forecast for the general fund (on the assumption that Federal payment will be as in the past \$25 million annually) in the amount of \$32 million.

Revenue possibilities being explored include a legislative program to increase District sales taxes, increase taxes on liquors, additional taxes on cigarettes, and a change in the method of computing the corporation income tax, all of which, if enacted, would yield \$14 million. In this connection, it might be noted that the Senate and the House in the 86th Congress could not agree upon requested tax increases.

Real estate is taxed in the District currently at \$2.30 per \$100 of assessed valuation (assessed value is computed at 55 percent of full value). For fiscal year 1963, District Commissioners had indicated that they

Today, 186 years later, during which time we have grown from an infant Nation of unlimited courage to a mighty Nation which appears suddenly to have lost her national conscience, we might ask whether life is so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of blatant blackmail? We think not.

Shades of George Washington, shades of Patrick Henry, shades of Thomas Jefferson, shades of Capt. John Paul Jones, shades of Admiral Farragut, shades of Abraham Lincoln, shades of Teddy Roosevelt, shades of Iwo Jima and Anzio.

What in heaven's name goes on here in the home of the free and the land of the brave?

That should be the philosophy of every Senator.

I said yesterday, and I repeat, How silly and ridiculous can we get? According to a ticker tape report, the President of the United States has told the majority leader today that the Government is going to have nothing to do with this matter. So I ask again, Who is running the State Department? Who is running the Government? Is it Mrs. Roosevelt or Mr. Reuther or Dr. Milton Eisenhower? Or is it the President of the United States? The Senate should find out. Certainly the American people are interested in knowing. What right do we have to deal with a blackmailer like Castro? What right do we have even to be considering making \$15 million or \$20 million tax deductible? That would mean that the American taxpayers would contribute 80 percent in taxes. I repeat, How silly and how cowardly can we in the United States become?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware without my losing the floor.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Indiana in denouncing the so-called tractor deal with Castro. I call particular attention to an article published in the New York Times of today. I will quote from it, as follows:

The Tractors for Freedom Committee was organized this morning to provide a formal group for the collection of contributions.

The article is dated today. It states that the group was organized this morning. I continue to read from the article:

In discussions over the last 3 days, the Government had ruled that contributions to the committee would be tax exempt, given assurances that export licenses would be granted for a shipment of the tractors, and told committee officials they would not be considered to be violating the Logan Act forbidding private citizens from negotiating with foreign governments.

I raise the question of the propriety of a tax exemption. However, first I ask how can the Treasury rule on an application for a tax exemption for an organization prior to the time that it has even been organized, or prior to the time that it could possibly have filed an application?

At this point I would like to read the law on the establishment of tax-exempt organizations. I quote section 170(c) of the 1954 Tax Code:

Section 170(c) of the 1954 code defines the term "charitable contribution" for pur-

poses of the deduction to include any contribution to an entity organized in the United States " * * * exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals * * *" providing "no substantial part of the activities is attempting to influence legislation." The word "charitable" is not defined or explained in the statute.

The word "charitable" is not defined or explained in the statute, but the regulations under section 501(c)(3) more fully defines what the term includes. I quote that regulation:

Relief of the poor and distressed or of the underprivileged; advancement of religion; advancement of education or science; erection or maintenance of public buildings, monuments, or works; lessening of the burdens of Government; and promotion of social welfare by organizations designed to accomplish any of the above purposes, or (i) to lessen neighborhood tensions; (ii) to eliminate prejudice and discrimination; (iii) to defend human and civil rights secured by law; or (iv) to combat community deterioration and juvenile delinquency.

By no stretch of the imagination can the Department refer to Mr. Castro's regime as a religious organization. Certainly his regime is not a charitable organization. It is not a scientific organization. There is nothing about Mr. Castro which would contribute to literary or educational purposes. Under the act those are the only reasons on the basis of which a ruling can be made that such contributions can be said to be tax exempt.

Certainly this is not charity; it is nothing short of international blackmail.

I hope the Committee on Finance will give this question attention the first time the Secretary of the Treasury is before us. Certainly we should get the answers to these questions: First, did the committee to aid the Cubans get a ruling as reported in the New York Times? If so, how could the Internal Revenue Service have made such a ruling for a group before it was organized? How could this ruling have been made before the Internal Revenue Service had received the application? A committee cannot file an application until after it has been organized. How could the Internal Revenue Service review and evaluate what was an application filed by a group which had not yet been organized?

As the Senator from Indiana said, I think it is time we found out who is managing this fast action, who is giving assurance to this committee that tax exemptions will be granted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

First can there be a ruling by the Internal Revenue Service without a policy being established by the administration?

Second, is it not true that the legal interpretation of "charitable organization" is based upon charities located within the United States and not charities located outside the United States?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The answer to the Senator's second question is as he has stated. The law relates to contributions made to organizations in the United States, not to those located outside the United States.

Will the Senator please repeat his first question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My first question was, How can a ruling be made by the Internal Revenue Service concerning a problem of this kind without a policy having been established by the State Department or the administration as to whether what is proposed in an organized effort and a proper effort by U.S. citizens.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Treasury Department, in making its ruling, could properly consult the State Department and ascertain some of the background of the committee. However, final rulings are supposed to be based upon the merits of the case as applied to interpretations of the law, not upon special appeal made by the State Department or anyone else in the executive branch.

The rulings are supposed to be based upon law. I have read the law. The Treasury Department has no right to issue an arbitrary ruling merely to comply with the wishes of anyone in any agency of the Government, whether he be in the legislative branch or the executive branch.

We have had similar trouble along that line before. Several years ago, the executive branch insisted upon the issuance of a ruling by the Treasury Department which permitted certain large contributors to the Democratic Party to be written off as charitable deductions. There were over half a million dollars worth of such contributions. Under that ruling the Democratic National Committee was in effect classified as a charitable organization for tax deductible purposes. When discovered though, they hastily reversed this ruling.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Is not the Democratic National Committee a charitable organization? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The rulings of the Internal Revenue Service are supposed to be based upon strict interpretation of the law, after the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has had the application of the organization submitted to him and after he has evaluated all the points raised in the application. If the executive branch can get these rulings merely upon request without regard as to merits, then why have a Commissioner?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I would be happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana, but I had promised that I would yield to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] first for not in excess of 5 minutes, after which I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is willing to yield to me now.

Mr. CLARK. Then I am happy to yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, yesterday I took the floor to inquire whether or not the Tractors for Freedom Committee has been officially recognized by our Government. While some of that committee claim that they are operating officially, we have not had any word of this.

Today I am asking the President of the United States, or the Secretary of State, or any other responsible official, whether or not these people are acting with the advice and consent of our Government, or whether or not they are in violation of the Logan Act of 1799.

The spirit of the Logan Act is that there will be only one voice speaking for our Government, and that private individuals cannot take it upon themselves to speak for our Government.

Chairman Fulbright of the Foreign Relations Committee aptly summed this up last year in discussing the role of some of the Israelis in the Suez Canal dispute. I am enclosing a copy of his statement on April 25, 1960, made on the floor of the Senate.

I am also asking Chairman Fulbright to call the responsible Government officials before the Foreign Relations Committee immediately in an effort to ascertain once and for all who is running this country and by whose authority are we going to be blackmailed.

I wish to read what the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] stated on April 25, 1960:

Mr. Fulbright. Mr. President, for some years I have become increasingly concerned at the development in the United States of special pressure groups for purposes of pushing U.S. foreign policies in special-interest directions.

We must, of course, accept the concept that in a democracy such as ours shipping interests will pressure Congress and the Executive to adapt foreign policies so they may serve collaterally, at least, the shipping interests; citizens will organize to promote foreign aid, or to oppose foreign aid; exporters will seek foreign policies to develop new markets and importers will seek policies that may hurt domestic manufacturers; religious groups will seek to promote some policies and oppose others.

Our representative Government is designed to deal with these special interests, to balance them, and ultimately to develop policies which will skillfully blend conflicting interests in such a way that the total national interest will be served.

There are limits, however, beyond which special interests cannot go without undermining the conduct of our foreign policies.

Many years ago, Congress enacted the so-called Logan Act. It reads as follows:

"Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the

United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both. This section shall not abridge the right of a citizen to apply, himself or his agent, to any foreign government or the agents thereof for redress of any injury which he may have sustained from such government or any of its agents or subjects (title 18, sec. 953 U.S.C.A.)."

The basic theory behind the Logan Act is that this Nation should speak with only one voice when it deals with other nations. No one save the President, or, with his approval, some specified individual, may presume to speak for the United States.

This basic rule is as good today as it was when enacted in the early days of the Republic.

But, Mr. President, there is a shadowland between the legitimate activity involved in the organization of special interest groups to influence foreign policy and the illegitimate activity proscribed by the Logan Act.

The questionable operation of individuals and groups in this area of foreign relations is illustrated by a recent dispatch in the New York Times. On April 15 the Times reported the activities of two maritime unions which picketed and thus prevented the unloading of the Egyptian passenger and cargo ship, the *Cleopatra*. The ostensible reason for this activity was that the unions by this demonstration protest the action of the United Arab Republic in boycotting ships that have traded with Israel or called at Israeli ports.

I hold no brief for UAR interference with international traffic passing through the Suez Canal. The point is, however, that the U.S. Government is proceeding through diplomatic channels to promote free passage through the canal. The Israeli Government, which complains that the UAR stops its ships, has available to it the procedures of the United Nations as well as other diplomatic devices for urging its views on the Government of the UAR. Yet, despite the official actions of the United States, we find private groups proceeding by coercive devices of their own to interfere with the official activities of our Government in the field of foreign policy.

These maritime unions do not seek an economic result related to wages or working conditions. Rather, they seek to force political action in an area of most delicate international negotiation.

I am not privy to any international secrets involving efforts to reopen the canal to Israeli shipping. But let us suppose that the work of U.N. Secretary General Hammarskjöld, aided by the good offices of the United States and other governments, nearing a conclusion. Were this the case, I can imagine few interventions by private groups—such as these unions—which might be more clearly calculated to thwart the objectives of our Government's foreign policy; in this case, peace, and stability in the Middle East.

Subsequent to drafting these remarks, my attention has been called to the fact that the State Department has informed the picketing unions that their conduct is embarrassing this Nation in the conduct of its foreign policy.

My objection to this kind of activity is an objection of principle, not of specifics.

I understand that the Internal Revenue Service at this very moment is meeting, and may be deciding that they will make the \$15 or \$20 million involved

a tax deductible item. I have also heard the rumor today that there is talk about people trying to figure out a way of perhaps shipping the tractors to Canada and then reshipping them to Cuba, and that they are trying to figure out some way of going behind the law requiring the obtaining of an export license before these tractors can be shipped to Cuba.

This leads me to an editorial which appeared in the Indianapolis News of yesterday, from which I should like to read:

WHAT GOES ON HERE?

As of this writing, self-appointed private citizens' groups—the most notable headed by Eleanor Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Milton Eisenhower—are raising money for the release of some 1,200 Cuban rebels, captured during the recent unsuccessful attempt to rescue their homeland from Communist rule. The money, \$20 million, will be used to purchase tractors or bulldozers for Fidel Castro's Red regime.

One newspaper, supporting the idea of a trade with Castro, declared in a front page editorial that it believes "a human life is worth more than a machine," and so do we. But, if, for the purpose of preserving human lives, we submit to Castro's brazen blackmail attempt, we will be opening the door to every future tyrant and bully boy, large or small, who decides to make a laughing stock out of the United States. Also, there is the little matter of the law, conveniently overlooked by the State Department, prohibiting private citizens from negotiating with foreign governments. The activities of these self-appointed committees, unofficially supported by our Government, are unprecedented in our own history or in the history of international diplomacy.

Castro is not offering this deal because he especially needs 500 tractors, although he certainly could put them to good use in helping to solve his dire farm problem. He offered the deal precisely because he and his Communist bosses want to see exactly how far they can push the United States before it stops acting like a sniveling coward and once again flexes its national muscles. Why else did Havana radio gloatingly announce that Castro would deal only with the United States—and remember, the 1,200 prisoners are Cubans, not U.S. citizens—and not with a neutral country.

What happened to that national pride we displayed in 1797, when after the unsavory French foreign minister Talleyrand demanded a bribe as the price of negotiating with the United States, our envoy Charles C. Pinckney replied with his memorable, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." What happened to the courage displayed by our Nation in 1853, when, after Austria kidnapped a former citizen who had since taken out his first U.S. citizenship papers, an American war sloop pulled into the harbor of Smyrna (where the prisoner was being held) and its commander ordered the Austrian commander to return the man or face immediate consequences? (Naturally, the man was returned.)

How different today. It's bad enough we supplied the push to the rebel invasion of Cuba, and then lacked the courage to see it through to victory. It's bad enough that we allow Castro to insult our Nation, and publicly declare his island a part of the Soviet bloc. But to pay blackmail to his Communist government, just days after both our President and our House of Representatives agree that it constitutes "a clear and present danger" to our sovereignty, is nothing short of fantastic.

Patrick Henry once asked his fellow men, "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?"

1961

8063

**TRIBUTE TO SENATORS STYLES
BRIDGES AND NORRIS COTTON**

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I happened to read an editorial recently concerning two of my Republican colleagues, which I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate.

The editorial, which appeared in the May 19 edition of the Nashua, N.H., Telegraph, pays tribute to Senators STYLES BRIDGES and NORRIS COTTON for their interest in the welfare of that community of some 40,000 persons.

Having served in the Senate for some time with these two able gentlemen, I have long been aware of their substantial contributions to the welfare of the country, as well as to the State of New Hampshire. However, it is gratifying to note that their service to the city of Nashua has received editorial recognition.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial from the Nashua Telegraph entitled "Kudoes," be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

KUDOES

Several important Federal projects will provide jobs for Nashuans and add considerably to our economy during the next few years, thanks to the vigilance and support of our New Hampshire Senators STYLES BRIDGES and NORRIS COTTON.

Ground-breaking ceremonies will take place early next month for the new \$5 million air safety control center which will rise in the south end of the city and which will be in operation late in 1962. That figure is for the cost of the building alone. When it is completely equipped the Federal Government will have invested more than \$15 million in the project.

Within 90 days the Government will ask for bids on a new post office, which will be leased from the builder for a long term. This building will arise on a site other than the present post office property, which has outlived its usefulness in this growing community.

Here again the interest and enthusiasm of Senators BRIDGES and COTTON is evident. Both have been working on the needed new post office building for many months and their efforts have been successful. Without their help and aid the project might well have been delayed many months, regardless of the need.

Both projects will offer a number of jobs to local citizens during their construction stage, thus adding to our payrolls which feed the economy of our retail business.

When the air safety center is completed it will mean the eventual moving to Nashua of about 200 experienced personnel needed to man this station. This, again, will be a tremendous boost to our community, along with some obligations, too.

A vote of thanks should be given the two New Hampshire Senators for their continued interests in the welfare of Nashua.

**ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL
9 A.M. TOMORROW**

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today, it stand in ad-

journalment until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for not more than 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] who has some remarks he desires to address to the Senate.

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

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I rise in my individual capacity, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to express an opinion on the proposal made by Castro that he will release the 1,200 Cuban prisoners captured by him in the recent invasion in exchange for 500 tractors from the United States.

I do not feel that I can be simply an auditor and spectator with regard to this grave problem confronting our country. My sympathies and compassion naturally are for those 1,200 men. I would like to urge that the proposal be accepted but I can not do so. Castro is demanding ransom. He is blackmailing not only the Government of the United States but also its citizens. He anticipates that we will yield. He views us as a rag without character. As a consequence of what happened in Cuba, we have lost our prestige in the world to a degree that is beyond calculation at the present time. If we yield to Castro in his demand for tribute, such action will only constitute a message to our friends throughout the world who wonder why we yield to every demand made by Khrushchev, Castro, and their cohorts.

The demand is one for tribute and requires that we abjectly surrender. In my judgment, we cannot do so and preserve our honor. We could not do so and still declare to the world that we will not become the victims of blackmail and the demands for ransom and the trembling slaves of Communist threats.

Moreover, I think that under no circumstances should our Government permit private citizens to become negotiators in our international relations, and that point applies regardless of the dignity and the worth of the citizens who are attempting to act as such negotiators. Whatever is done should be done through the proper representatives of our Government. When we allow individuals to become the negotiators, we are abandoning the very principles upon which our Government is built.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish the RECORD to show that I completely share the point of view that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has expressed. I happen to believe that the foreign policy of this country should be run by the

White House and the State Department and not by volunteer committees. I do not know where the end of the rope will be.

May I have the attention of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], when I make the following comment. I also believe that the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate is entitled to know from one Mr. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, as to whether or not the State Department in any way, manner, shape or form gave clearance to the program of this committee before it announced its program to the American people.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I can see that the affairs of the District of Columbia, so far as education is concerned, will have to take a back seat. Knowing the mood and temper of the Senate, I am perfectly willing to continue to yield, if my friend will remember that sometime before we go home tonight I should like to have my amendment considered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I congratulate my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, and commend him for the magnificent statement he has made today concerning what proper American policy should be. "One hundred and sixty-four years ago a great American, Charles C. Pinckney said, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

I fully agree with my colleague that, as far as the Government of the United States is concerned and as far as individual Americans are concerned, that statement should be the sentiment followed by Americans now. If we pay this ransom, our national conscience will have fallen to a new low. We must not yield to this flagrant attempt at extortion by Castro.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I express gratitude to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], who was a prosecutor for many, many years, and I believe he knows clearly the meaning of blackmail.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield further?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In my opinion, the Treasury Department should be cautious in the manner in which it approaches this problem. It is rather distressing to observe newspaper reports indicating that the Treasury Department has approved this proposal even before it has ripened into a state where it has assumed its proper form. The question of giving tax exemption to donors of funds for this purpose under no circumstances should be determined in any manner except under the law. I doubt very much that the question has been considered in that manner.

May 23

industrial development here. More on the humanitarian side is the institute's extensive cancer program. This is a laborious effort that may eventually yield important results for the human race.

Dr. Kimball, now in his 11th year as Midwest president, must receive much of the credit for the institute's swift development. A sincere and energetic group of trustees—from all over the Nation—also deserves praise. But, basically, the day-to-day contributions of the staff of 300 technical people must rank at the front. These chemists, physicists, engineers and mathematicians produce the results that have meant success.

Research in the United States is changing rapidly. The decades ahead will present new problems to the staff at the institute and elsewhere. Research costs are rising swiftly. More expensive equipment must be bought. Skilled people demand higher salaries. In certain fields, shortages of some qualified people create difficulties. But industry and Government recognize the importance of research. Kimball predicts that national expenditures for research will exceed \$20 billion within 9 years.

Kansas City, largely through Midwest Research, is sure to have an important role in these developments. This is a community facility that has admirably fulfilled the vision of its founders. It serves the Nation's heartland—and the Nation.

Civil War Centennial Conceived in an Absent-Minded Moment: 1954 Court Decision Celebration More Appropriate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 21, 1961. Justice Hofstadter, one of America's most distinguished jurists, makes a point which we should all think about with reference to the centennial of the Civil War:

FORGET THE CIVIL WAR, HAIL THE COURT DECISION

To the New York Herald Tribune:

It would seem sensible quietly to abandon the celebration of the centennial of the Civil War, which was conceived in an absent-minded moment, and to memorialize, instead, the 17th day of May, which would fittingly exemplify its spirit. On that day in 1954, a unanimous Supreme Court rendered the fateful decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* effecting school desegregation.

The complex of civil liberties decisions beginning with the Brown case at long last have honored, in truly implementing, the promise of the 14th Amendment. That enactment had formalized and broadened the Proclamation—and the proposition that all men were born free and equal. The 14th Amendment articulated a grand promise which apparently the Nation was unprepared to fulfill at once. Even three decades later the Nation would not fulfill its covenant of equality, a covenant which really went back to the Declaration of Independence.

Faced with the problem of equal protec-

tion as to public passenger transportation, the court enunciated the compromise doctrine of "separate but equal" in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, in 1896, notwithstanding the sublime fact as the first Justice Harlan put in dissent: "The Constitution is colorblind." The Court was uneasy with its principle of compromise. Thus, it retraced its steps from time to time, in a series of cases which eroded the Plessy formulation.

In *Buchanan v. Warley*, it voided a city ordinance requiring Negroes to live in one part of town and whites in another. And in *McCabe v. Atchison, T. & S. F. Railway*, a law permitting a carrier to provide sleeping and dining cars only for whites was invalidated. *State of Missouri ex rel. Gaines v. Canada* held that a State which established a law school within its borders for whites must do likewise for Negroes.

Sweatt v. Painter held that legal education in a separate law school was not equal, and *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents* held that enforced segregation of a Negro student admitted to the graduate school was invalid, as it handicapped him in the pursuit of graduate studies. Finally, in inevitable sequence, *Brown v. Board of Education* in a historic opinion by Chief Justice Warren held in 1954 that segregation of public schoolchildren solely on the basis of race, even though physical facilities and other tangible factors may be equal, deprives the children of minority groups of equal opportunities, and is therefore unconstitutional.

The court quoted from Gunnar Myrdal's great sociological treatise on the Negro, "The American Dilemma," as well as from certain works in the field of psychology. Treatises do not make the law but analyze conditions out of which law grows. The law has been frequently influenced by nonlegal sources: socioeconomics, science and literature. Such examples come to mind as the influence of Dickens on England's child labor laws and of Charles Reade on laws relating to mental institutions and penology. Forty years ago Cardozo had already noted that the "force which is becoming the greatest of them all is social justice which finds its outlet in the methods of sociology."

Though the segregation cases may have strained State-Federal relations for the time being, in an ultimate view they make for increased national well-being and strength—in harmony at home and influence abroad. They may have a significant impact on our country's leadership of a free world which includes Asia and Africa. They will continue to have political and social implications of the greatest import for us and the world at large.

Some historians and legal scholars recognize that the Brown decision was a heroic step forward and a necessary one, and that consummate leadership went into securing the necessary unanimous ruling. But they suggest that it could have been a much more cogently written and thought-out opinion, and it would have been a more lawyer-like one. The writer dissents from this view. It is not inartistic to paint with a broad brush when the subject matter is sufficiently broad to require it. The Brown case was the grand climax of the complex of cases which turned away from Plessy. A compelling pronouncement of judicial statesmanship was greatly to be preferred to a professional dissertation, however well documented.

Plessy was the polity formulation of compromise—and expedient of its time. Brown is also polity formulation in the perspective of the changing climate of opinion—a triumph of the American ideal of freedom and equality under law.

SAMUEL H. HOFSTADER,
Justice, Supreme Court of the State
of New York.

Returning Fiscal Control to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on May 22, 1961, the Christian Science Monitor carried a thought-provoking editorial which pointed up certain facts and gave its conclusions on the subject of backdoor spending.

One aspect of the practical legislative procedure regarding this debated method of financing programs was not mentioned by this worthy newspaper; namely, that if the Rules of the House of Representatives gave one committee exclusive jurisdiction over spending bills, the emergency or special case could always be allowed by the Rules Committee. All it would have to do is report a rule on a bill which waived all points of order. Otherwise, all regular appropriation legislation would have to come from one committee which would evaluate the need of programs as against the available revenue.

However, until mere editorials like this stimulate public opinion, I suppose the Congress will continue to forego its constitutional responsibility to scrutinize all Federal expenditures.

Under leave to do so, I include the editorial in question:

BACKDOOR SPENDING; FRONT-DOOR AID

The fight made by financial conservatives in Congress against one feature of the area redevelopment bill appears due to be repeated on a possibly intensified scale against President Kennedy's expected plans for aid to underdeveloped countries.

The feature most in issue is a mode of financing which bypasses the congressional appropriations committees and authorizes governmental units to borrow from the Treasury for their expenditures. This in turn forces the Treasury to borrow and the debt may or may not be paid off. Critics call it back-door spending.

The record of such operations is partly good, partly bad. It began with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation during the depression 1930's. After that came the Commodity Credit Corporation, Export-Import Bank, Home Owners Loan Corporation, and many other agencies. Of such lendings, totaling some \$108 billion, about half have been repaid, nearly one-fourth have had to be canceled or made up by appropriations, and more than a fourth are still owed.

The area redevelopment bill added \$300 million to the lending authorization. This was stubbornly resisted in the House of Representatives, but the House authorized more than 10 times that much for veterans' housing loans and farm surplus disposal without serious objection.

As to the foreign aid program, the administration, it is understood, will ask authority to borrow \$7.3 billion from the Treasury over a period of 5 years. This in turn will be loaned for long terms and at low interest rates to countries presenting acceptable development programs.

If the recent "soft-term" credit to Honduras, the first announced by the new International Development Association, is a criterion, even full repayment after 50 years

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

Castro is not offering this deal because he especially needs 500 tractors, although he certainly could put them to good use in helping to solve his dire farm problem. He offered the deal precisely because he and his Communist bosses want to see exactly how far they can push the United States before it stops acting like a sniveling coward and once again flexes its national muscles. Why else did Havana radio gloatingly announce that Castro would deal only with the United States—and remember, the 1,200 prisoners are Cubans, not United States citizens—and not with a neutral country.

What happened to the national pride we displayed in 1797, when after the unsavory French Foreign Minister Talleyrand demanded a bribe as the price of negotiating with the United States, our envoy Charles C. Pinckney replied with his memorable, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." What happened to the courage displayed by our Nation in 1853, when, after Austria kidnaped a former citizen who had since taken out his first U.S. citizenship papers, an American war sloop pulled into the harbor of Smyrna (where the prisoner was being held) and its commander ordered the Austrian commander to return the man or face immediate consequences? (Naturally, the man was returned.)

How different today. It's bad enough we supplied the push to the rebel invasion of Cuba, and then lacked the courage to see it through to victory. It's bad enough that we allow Castro to insult our Nation, and publicly declare his island a part of the Soviet bloc. But to pay blackmail to his Communist government, just days after both our President and our House of Representatives agree that it constitutes a clear and present danger to our sovereignty, is nothing short of fantastic.

Patrick Henry once asked his fellow men, "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?" Today, 186 years later, during which time we have grown from an infant nation of unlimited courage to a mighty nation which appears suddenly to have lost her national conscience, we might ask whether life is so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of blatant blackmail? We think not.

Shades of George Washington, shades of Patrick Henry, shades of Thomas Jefferson, shades of Capt John Paul Jones, shades of Admiral Farragut, shades of Abraham Lincoln, shades of Teddy Roosevelt, shades of Iwo Jima and Anzlo.

What in heaven's name goes on here in the home of the free and the land of the brave?

Food Stamp Whisky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following is an example of what can happen when the Federal Government gives the people something for nothing. This philosophy destroyed the Roman Empire and if continued will destroy the United States:

U.S. SURPLUS CORN USED TO MAKE LIQUOR

GASTONIA, N.C.—A 500-gallon moonshine still raided by Federal agents and police near here Saturday was being fed by a mash

made from cornmeal distributed under the Federal surplus foods program.

The ground around the still in a wooded section of the Union Church community was littered with empty paper bags bearing this label:

"U.S. Department of Agriculture. Surplus commodities program—5 pounds yellow cornmeal."

The defendants, Noah T. Thomas, 60, of Gastonia and Dorus W. Sisk, 50, of Route 1, Clover, S.C., were ordered bound over to the October term of U.S. district court in Charlotte by U.S. Commissioner B. W. Craig.

Midwest Research Has Only Begun To Grow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article and editorial from the Kansas City Star.

Scientific research is one of America's main businesses—and it is just beginning to grow. The University of Kansas at Lawrence, the Linda Hall Library in Kansas City, the University of Kansas Medical School in Kansas City, and Midwest Research Institute—these are just a few of the outstanding organizations, situated in my area, that make mid-continent America a vital center for development of the thrust into the future. With this in mind, I invite my colleagues attention to the news report of a speech by Dr. Charles N. Kimball, president of Midwest Research Institute, and the editorial comment about Midwest Research Institute.

[From the Kansas City Star, May 1, 1961]

POINTS TO NEW ERA IN SCIENCE GROWTH—
PRESIDENT OF MIDWEST RESEARCH INSTITUTE
IN REPORT TO TRUSTEES—IN SECOND GENERATION—ROLE OF KNOWLEDGE SEEKERS
CHANGING RAPIDLY, DR. KIMBALL SAYS

Scientific research is one of America's main businesses—and the curve for its requirements, in brains and dollars, is going upward steadily.

That outlook was painted by Dr. Charles N. Kimball, president of the Midwest Research Institute, in giving the president's 16th annual report to the institute's trustees today at the Hotel Muehlebach.

IN GREAT EXPANSION

Dr. Kimball pointed out that research in the United States expanded from \$800 million in 1940 to \$13 billion last year and will probably hit \$14 billion this year—making research as large as the automobile business.

Developments now occurring in research, he predicted, will have a profound effect on the future of the Nation.

"Large scale research is entering its second generation in this country," Dr. Kimball said. "Some revolutionary changes are occurring that are altering the traditional role of scientists and science."

The speaker listed six major changes. Foremost, he said, is the tremendous accumulation of scientific knowledge.

"Each day throughout the world," he said, "scientific papers are now written in such numbers to fill seven complete sets of the Encyclopedia Britannica. One day's output."

Scientists face a mountainous problem of making the most practical use of all such knowledge, he said. New projects to study scientific literature, now being carried on jointly by Midwest and the Linda Hall Library, may provide helpful answers.

A second great scientific change, Dr. Kimball said, relates to the growing need for "interdisciplinary skills"—that many complex modern research problems cannot be solved by a chemist, or an engineer working alone. "The interchange of skills among all scientific fields becomes more important."

A third major factor relates to the rising cost of research. The expensive equipment and increasing salaries of topnotch professional workers affects not only Midwest Research, but all similar labs across the Nation. More efficient use of scientific equipment and manpower is an aim of research executives and administrators.

NEED NEW CONCEPTS

Other important changes in research, Dr. Kimball said, relate to needs for more accurate measurement systems, and improved ways of evaluating results of research. Of particularly basic importance, he said, was a final major challenge—the need for new ideas and new concepts affecting the entire research field.

Dr. Kimball stressed the tremendous future that still lies ahead in science.

"Recognized research experts claim that national expenditures for research and development will exceed \$20 billion by 1970. I don't know where the limit lies," he said. "It may exist only in the lack of availability of capital with which manufacturing plants can be erected to manufacture the products of research."

Dr. Kimball pointed out also that Midwest Research had a highly productive year in 1960, with a total research volume of \$3,248,000, and currently is working for about 100 sponsors.

He revealed also that W. N. Deramus recently had made an additional gift of 10 acres to the Deramus Feld Station near Grandview.

[From the Kansas City Star, May 2, 1961]
AT 16, MIDWEST RESEARCH HAS ONLY BEGUN
TO GROW

In the 16 years since it began operations in a rented room of a bakery, the development of Midwest Research Institute has been impressive. It made possible the splendid reports at yesterday's annual meeting. The more than \$3¼ million in research volume last year alone exceeded the total for the institute's first 7 years. The institute is expanding in new fields and with new facilities. The addition of 10 acres to the area of the already busy Deramus field station is an example. Altogether, the institute added roughly \$200,000 in new equipment last year.

There is no doubt that the Kansas City institute has established an excellent national reputation. Scientists, educators and industrialists look to Midwest for results on tough technical problems.

Obviously, the institute is a tremendous local asset, as well. It puts Kansas City on the scientific map of the Nation.

In his annual report, Dr. Charles N. Kimball, president, told the story of a great variety of scientific projects that indicate the range of scientific talent at Midwest. The diversity includes several projects in space travel. There are "farm belt" surveys, such as an inquiry into calf ailments, and a study of agricultural surpluses. Economic studies seek information on prospects for

several thousand new jobs in many fields and skills for our people.

The economic expansion fostered by the modernization of the Warrior-Tombigbee is not concentrated in one area. Rather, it is occurring throughout the valley, and is being carried on by a variety of industries. During the past few years, we have seen new coal mines opened along the Upper Waterway; we have seen the establishment and growth of paper-producing plants at Tuscaloosa, Naheola, Demopolis, and Mobile; we have seen more than \$150 million invested in chemical plants in the Washington County area; we have seen a major steam electric generating plant built at Barry; we have seen the lumber, shipbuilding, textile, and metal fabricating industries increase their productive capacities.

Yet, even with these gratifying developments, we have hardly scratched the surface. Other areas of the Nation are growing at an even faster rate—as evidenced by the fact that we shall lose one of our Congressmen on the basis of the 1960 census.

Yes, we still have a lot of catching up to do. And if we are to move ahead, one of the things we must do is press for the wise conservation, development, and use of the water resources Nature has so abundantly bestowed on Alabama.

Our State is practically framed by rivers. To the north is the Tennessee, which carries more than 12 million tons of commerce annually. To the east is the Chattahoochee, a part of the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint system which is now under development. To the west are the Mobile and Tombigbee Rivers, and to the south is the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway which, while not a river, is an improved navigation channel. And running diagonally across the State is the Alabama-Coosa system.

In all, Alabama has 1,500 miles of authorized waterways with depths of nine feet or more. Of this total, approximately 750 miles have been completed.

We must press forward with all our energy to ensure that the remaining mileage is improved as rapidly as practicable. We cannot afford to do otherwise.

This is not a matter of concern for the few. It is a matter of concern for every man and woman who lives and works in Alabama. All of us must remain keenly alert to the progress being made in the conservation, development, and use of our water resources. We must all give these programs our active support, for only this way can we hope to accomplish our objective.

As General Barney has indicated, considerable progress has been made in recent years in carrying out the modernization of the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway. Demopolis lock and dam was completed in 1955 to eliminate four obsolete navigation projects; the Warrior lock and dam between Eutaw and Greensboro was finished 2 years later to remove two deteriorated, inadequate structures, and today we dedicate still another new facility.

In the headwaters of the Warrior River, the Alabama Power Co., always in step with the needs and ambitions of the State, has built with private capital the Lewis Smith Dam on the Sipsey Fork, thereby becoming an active partner in carrying forward the waterway's improvement. The Alabama power project, representing one of the three headwater dams urged several years ago by the Corps of Engineers, was designed and built so as to fit into the comprehensive program for the Warrior-Tombigbee.

Our next step in modernizing the waterway is construction of Holt lock and dam in the district of my colleague, Armistead Selden. By replacing four old locks and

dams, it will extend above Tuscaloosa the modern waterway dimensions which the Warrior, Demopolis, and Jackson projects provide between that city and Mobile.

The Corps of Engineers will be in a position to use initial construction money for Holt lock and dam in fiscal 1962, which begins July 1. We are encouraged by the fact that the budget now being considered by Congress recommends \$750,000 for that purpose. But let us remember that it's a long way between a budget recommendation and an appropriation. And even then, we will have money only for the first year's construction. It will be necessary for us to fight year by year for subsequent appropriations to complete the project in an orderly manner.

The urgent need for Holt lock and dam is demonstrated by the Warrior-Tombigbee's steady growth in commerce, which has more than doubled during the past decade, reaching 5,756,227 tons in 1959 to set a record high for the 7th consecutive year.

Accompanying the continued rapid growth in movements has been a change in the pattern of traffic that makes early completion of the Holt project even more vital. In 1949, only a little more than 800,000 tons or 38 percent of the Warrior-Tombigbee's total commerce moved in that reach to be improved by Holt lock and dam. In 1959, however, this portion of the river carried almost 2,900,000 tons or 50 percent of the total.

Major difficulty encountered by navigation above Tuscaloosa is caused by the small size of the existing locks, built between 1905 and 1915. These structures are only 52 feet wide and about 285 feet long, as compared with lengths of 600 feet and widths of 110 feet at the new locks.

Only four 500-ton barges can transit these four locks at one time, and as a consequence multiple barge tows must break their formations and transit the structures in two or three operations. A double lockage tow spends about 1½ hours in passing each of the structures or a total of 6 hours. A triple lockage spends a total of more than 9 hours in lockages alone.

The Holt lock and dam with its single large chamber will accommodate all size tows in one operation of about half an hour.

Overall, it is estimated that the new project will save an average tow more than 21 hours per voyage. Such economies will make the waterway still more advantageous for the transportation of bulk commodities and heavy finished and semifinished goods, and thereby greatly improve our position in attracting industry.

Construction of Holt lock and dam is the next logical step in the waterway's modernization and unless we obtain an initial construction appropriation for the coming fiscal year a serious interruption will occur in our timetable. The Corps of Engineers has carefully studied the need for the project and has solid proof of its economic merit. We have made and shall continue making every effort to see that it is undertaken without delay.

I assure you that the Alabama congressional delegation is unanimously behind the plan to improve the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway. I can say without fear of contradiction that no other State in the Union has a congressional delegation that is more dedicated to the development of our natural resources. And I can say that we in the delegation will work for every meritorious program to make all of Alabama's rivers fully useful and productive.

But to do this, we need your help. With your assistance and your interest, we shall surely succeed.

U.S. Errs in Canceling Atomic Plane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Carroll, Hearst Headline Service aviation writer, gives an accurate appraisal of the mistake the United States makes in canceling its aircraft nuclear propulsion program in an article which was released by the Hearst Service on May 16, 1961.

I concur wholeheartedly in Mr. Carroll's opinion that the United States should press on with the atomic-powered plane project. I hope there will be a reconsideration on the part of the administration and that orders to cancel the project will be rescinded and that a directive will be forthcoming to restore the program.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include Mr. Carroll's article:

BILLION INVESTED, U.S. ERRS IN DUMPING
ATOM PLANE

(By George Carroll)

After 15 years of hard, often frustrating work and an investment of a billion dollars, the Government has scuttled America's nuclear-powered plane project just as it was reaching the edge of success.

It was, in the opinion of many, including this writer, a profoundly wrong decision. Worse, it could be politically disastrous.

It could give the Russians a powerful propaganda triumph if they beat us to the punch in flying nuclear power.

Defense Secretary Robert McNamara scrapped the project despite the fact that General Electric, the principal engine contractor involved, promised it could have an A-plane aloft by 1963 and test-flown by 1965 if another \$197 million were allotted.

McNamara, and the others who helped shape or supported his decision, contended there was no immediate prospect of a "militarily useful plane."

Having followed the program since its inception in 1946, this writer is absolutely convinced the United States should press on with the project.

We have already invested a billion. We can and should invest another \$197 million to prevent Russia, in effect, from backing into a triumphant first that should have been ours.

Others agree. Aviation Week magazine, the most authoritative trade journal in the aircraft industry, assailed McNamara in a double-spread editorial for his "monumentally unsound decision."

Declared Aviation Week's editor, Robert Hotz:

"It falsely proclaims to the world that we have failed technically in another field where the Soviet Union is certain to publicly demonstrate its success soon."

The magazine's editorial took cognizance of the "militarily useful" argument and disposed of it as follows:

"Some of the Pentagon experts who kicked the ANP (Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion) program around had a philosophy that would have demanded the Wright brothers be required to solve the problems of super-

sonic flight before they launched their machine at Kitty Hawk."

Hotz declared both GE, which has put many ground test hours on a mocked-up plane engine powered by the atom, and Pratt & Whitney, working on a more sophisticated type of engine, have supersonic designs, not just the slower-than-sound blueprints spoken of by the Defense Department.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev linked the flight of a Red A-plane with the first Russian Moon probe. He made good on his latter promise but not the nuclear plane part. There are unsubstantiated reports that one experimental Soviet A-plane blew apart.

This year our Central Intelligence Agency received information the Russians had a supersonic A-plane capable of staying in the air 3 months with rotating crews and adept at sneaking undetected through the Soviet Union's best radar defenses.

Almost unlimited endurance on a single charge of uranium fuel would be the big asset of any workable atomic-powered airplane.

Future rockets and satellites are certain to have nuclear power and A-plane proponents insist we should learn all we can about it by harnessing it to aircraft at the earliest possible moment.

President Kennedy obviously has been sold a different bill of goods by the technical experts who have his ear.

Lyndon Johnson Goes Shopping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of our district traveling in Hong Kong was in that city when Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON visited there and sent me a copy of the Hong Kong Standard, an English-printed newspaper, of Tuesday, May 16, 1961. The following is a page 1 box description of at least one of the Vice President's days in Hong Kong. Perhaps the Vice President is prompted by a false desire to increase employment in this country and stop the outflow of gold:

LYNDON JOHNSON GOES SHOPPING

What did U.S. Vice President Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON do after his arrival at Kai Tak Airport at about 3:15 p.m. yesterday?

At 3:30 p.m., the U.S. Vice President, accompanied by U.S. consulate officials and a motorcade of members of the security force, arrived at the recently opened Ambassador Hotel in Tsimshatsui.

At 3:50 p.m., Mr. JOHNSON, looking fresh and sporty in a spotless, white Hawaiian shirt emerged from the hotel accompanied by Mr. Sam P. Gilstrap, officer in charge, U.S. consul general here. A motorcade of policemen followed him and the party about 50 yards behind. When Mr. JOHNSON noticed that he was being followed, he stopped the car, alighted and waved at the policemen indicating to them not to follow.

At 4 p.m., the U.S. Vice President arrived at a tailorshop on Carnarvon Road, where he spent the next hour or so selecting materials and getting measurements taken for suits. Later, he proceeded to the Miramar Hotel Arcade and bought some shoes.

At 6:05 p.m., Mr. JOHNSON arrived at the Peninsula Hotel where he spent the next 3 hours at the Dynasty and "bought 24 of these shirts and 24 of those," according to a clerk of the shop. Hotel waiters were seen to go into the shop many times with trays of drinks.

At 9:02 p.m., the Vice President emerged from the Dynasty and returned to the Ambassador through a side door.

Dr. Jesse McNeil Moves on to Greater Community Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Michigan Chronicle of Saturday, May 20, 1961, on Dr. Jesse Jai McNeil, a dedicated public servant, community leader, and churchman of our city of Detroit who is leaving our city for new responsibilities in another part of the country.

As one of his friends and admirers I join all of our people of Michigan in sadness at his departure.

The article is as follows:

DR. JESSE MCNEIL MOVES ON TO GREATER COMMUNITY SERVICE

The decision of Dr. Jesse Jai McNeil to resign his post at Tabernacle Baptist Church and assume full-time responsibilities with the Department of Christian Education of the National Baptist Convention takes from our community one of the men who has symbolized the competence and leadership with which our town has been blessed during the past 15 years or so.

A dedicated theologian and scholar, Dr. McNeil threw himself into the broad arena of civic and community activities from the beginning of his ministry here. Through the Detroit Round Table, the Minister's Alliance, and the Council of Churches, the broad educational background and experience of Dr. McNeil gained early recognition. The weight of his influence and his clear view of social direction soon emerged in the policies and procedures of these organizations.

At the same time, Dr. McNeil gave recognition to the need for community organization as a means of promoting social progress. He threw himself, therefore, into the task of building the community house at Tabernacle and developing a program of activity for the institution including the now well-known Forum Series.

Through this medium there was developed on Detroit's Westside and throughout the city a greater awareness of the problems facing the people of the community.

Simultaneously with the development of these programs, Dr. McNeil found time to participate in the political life of the community in which he lived, thus demonstrating by his example that a good citizen is a well-rounded one who does not hesitate to use his talent and time in every phase of community life.

In a short time his contributions to politics were recognized and he received an appointment to the Corrections Commission of the State of Michigan.

This appointment had significance beyond the realm of mere politics. It placed a Negro for the first time on a very sensitive and important commission. It also gave an opportunity for a man with deep Christian understanding and training in psychology and sociology to work with the problem of rehabilitating those who have made mistakes in our society.

An extensive world traveler and author, Dr. McNeil never stopped the process of his own education and development. By so doing he was able to bring to those with whom he came into contact an ever changing and fresh approach to the myriads of problems with which we are all concerned.

And now after several years of thought and searching, he has come to the conclusion that a great challenge for service lies in the National Baptist educational program and through the medium of writing. There can be no question that he has chosen an area for greater service.

Detroit is naturally sorry to see one of its great community leaders move on to new fields. But we are proud that the record made by Dr. McNeil in Detroit has brought him to the attention of leaders on the national and international scene. We know he will do well in his new efforts. We wish for him every success.

Quoted file

The Deal for Cuban Prisoners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, we have all been fascinated by the latest affront to this Nation by the Cuban dictator, Fidel Castro, in which he asks us to ransom Cuban rebels by giving him 500 bulldozers. There seems to be no end to the gall of this Communist leader.

In this regard the front page editorial of the Indianapolis News, May 22, 1961, edition, is of interest and I herewith submit it for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHAT GOES ON HERE?

As of this writing, self-appointed private citizens' groups—the most notable headed by Eleanor Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Milton Eisenhower—are raising money for the release of some 1,200 Cuban rebels, captured during the recent unsuccessful attempt to rescue their homeland from Communist rule. The money, \$20 million, will be used to purchase tractors or bulldozers for Fidel Castro's Red regime.

One newspaper, supporting the idea of a trade with Castro, declared in a front-page editorial that it believes "a human life is worth more than a machine," and so do we. But, if, for the purpose of preserving human lives, we submit to Castro's brazen blackmail attempt, we will be opening the door to every future tyrant and bully boy, large or small, who decides to make a laughing stock out of the United States. Also, there is the little matter of the law, conveniently overlooked by the State Department, prohibiting private citizens from negotiating with foreign governments. The activities of these self-appointed committees, unofficially supported by our Government, are unprecedented in our own history or in the history of international diplomacy.