

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9573

Council of United Nations Special Fund has approved a project which will pour \$1,157,600 into an agricultural research program in Cuba.

Apparently, the purpose of this project is to enable Castro to carry on research in agriculture designed to relieve the Cubans of their reliance on sugar as the principal product of their soil. The newspaper account of this action relates that the Governing Council acted over the protests of the United States, but also pointed out that 40 percent of the Special Fund, raised by "voluntary" contributions, comes from the United States of America.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, the story by John Molleson which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 25, 1961, under the heading "U.N. Votes Cuba \$1,157,600 Over Protest by United States."

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

U.N. VOTES CUBA \$1,157,600 OVER PROTEST BY UNITED STATES

(By John Molleson)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., May 24.—The United Nations Special Fund today approved a \$1,157,600 grant to the Cuban Government for agricultural research. The step was taken by the Fund's 18-nation Governing Council despite the expressed reservations of the United States, which contributes 40 percent of the Fund's annual budget.

Diplomatic sources said the United States based its reservation on a changed economic situation in Cuba in recent months. Livestock herds have been decimated, Cuban agronomists have lost their jobs, and Cuba has shown a reluctance to cooperate with other multilateral aid programs, it was said.

Some members of the Council, it was reliably reported, agreed with the United States, while other nations concluded that the American objections were politically motivated. The Council is composed of nine members from contributing countries and nine from receiving countries.

AIM OF PROJECT

The aim of the Cuban project is to expand agricultural research, with special attention to livestock, production, soil classification, conservation and crop diversification. Cuba will contribute \$1,878,000 to the 5-year project under the terms of the agreement worked out between the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization and the Cuban Government last February.

In accordance with tradition, no vote was taken at today's session of the Governing Council. In the discussions of projects, only economic considerations are theoretically allowed to control the decisions.

While expressing its reservations, the United States stated its confidence that Paul Hoffman, managing director of the Fund, would make every effort to determine if the project could be carried out as originally planned.

Mr. BRIDGES, Madam President, although the Herald Tribune has a very high reputation for accuracy, I could scarcely credit my senses when I read this extraordinary story. I requested the staff of the Appropriations Committee to verify this report. I have here a memorandum headed "U.S. Action on

U.N. Special Fund Project in Cuba." This document is not a newspaper story. This is an official report.

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

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

Subject: U.S. action on U.N. Special Fund project in Cuba.

The project calls for an allocation by the Special Fund of approximately \$1.1 million to assist in the expansion of agricultural research at the Central Experimental Station in Santiago de Las Vagas. This project, primarily of a research nature, will extend over a period of 5 years. The Cuban Government is required to contribute approximately \$1.8 million. The Cuban project was 1 of 42 proposed projects reviewed by the Governing Council at its semiannual meeting on May 23-24.

The U.N. Special Fund derives its resources from voluntary contributions pledged annually. Pledges for 1961 are about \$48 million, of which 40 percent is contributed by the United States on a matching basis.

There are 18 nations represented on the Governing Council—9 from more developed countries and 9 from less developed countries. The present membership includes, in addition to the United States, France, Italy, Sweden, Japan, the United Kingdom, Canada, Mexico, Guatemala, the Netherlands, India, Senegal, Pakistan, Ghana, Thailand, Argentina, Yugoslavia, and the U.S.S.R.

All projects recommended by the managing director (Paul Hoffman) so far have been approved without a formal vote after project by project discussion. There are precedents for objections to individual projects: for example, the U.S.S.R. objected to a project for the Republic of China (Formosa) and the U.A.R. objected to a project for Israel. Both were approved by the Governing Council. The Special Fund charter provides that Special Fund assistance shall not be means of political or economic interference or be accompanied by political conditions. The United States has consistently maintained that the integrity of economic and technical institutions of the U.N. be preserved against the intrusion of political motives.

At the Council meeting, the United States objected to the project on technical, economic and administrative grounds based largely on conditions in Cuba which have arisen since the project originally was screened by the Special Fund staff. Our representative questioned the successful implementation of the project under present conditions in Cuba and his statements were made a matter of record. He stated that we have complete confidence in the managing director and the staff of the Special Fund and are assured that the project will not go forward until they have satisfied themselves on the questions we have raised and that the project can be undertaken successfully. Several other delegates supported the need for careful consideration of the objectives raised by the United States. In view of the fact that approval by the Governing Council merely constitutes authorization to the managing director to enter into detailed negotiations, the effect of the U.S. position was to gain assurance that the project would receive further careful study. This was done without damaging the integrity of the Special Fund, with our statement making clear the grounds for the U.S. position. No vote was taken on any of the projects, in accordance with precedents of the Special Fund.

18 members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Special Fund showing amounts they pledged for 1961, the amounts paid in, and the balance due in each case

Country	Pledged	Paid	Balance due
1. Argentina.....	\$97,561	\$1,557	\$96,004
2. Canada.....	2,350,000	2,350,000	0
3. France.....	1,072,066	607,649	464,417
4. Guatemala.....	8,000	0	8,000
5. Ghana.....	0	0	0
6. India.....	1,750,000	1,750,000	0
7. Italy.....	1,350,000	750,000	600,000
8. Japan.....	1,422,483	1,422,483	0
9. Mexico.....	34,000	34,000	0
10. Netherlands.....	2,561,436	2,561,436	0
11. Pakistan.....	129,998	129,998	0
12. Senegal.....	140,000	0	40,000
13. Sweden.....	2,100,000	2,100,000	0
14. Thailand.....	160,000	160,000	0
15. U.S.S.R.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	0
16. United Kingdom.....	5,000,000	5,000,000	0
17. United States.....	18,811,869	17,864,143	\$947,726
18. Yugoslavia.....	192,000	192,000	0
Total.....	38,079,413	35,023,266	2,156,147

¹ This pledge was announced for the U.N. Special Fund and the U.N. Technical Assistance Fund, but the allocation of a portion to these funds has not been made.

² The United States agrees each year to contribute an amount equivalent to 40 percent of the total amount collected.

Mr. BRIDGES, Madam President, it is hard to believe—but it is true. The United Nations Special Fund approved, on the recommendation of its managing director, a project to hand over to Castro nearly half a million American dollars. Even more incredible, but also true, the managing director of the Special Fund who recommended this project is an American—Paul Hoffman.

And, equally startling, but also true, the protest lodged by the representative of the United States was not on the grounds that Castro is a blackmailer, a blood-soaked dictator who denies his nation the right to vote, a bandit who villifies our leaders and the clergy of his own nation, the leader of an outlaw government with which we have broken diplomatic relations—no, none of these things are protested. Our U.S. delegate objected on "technical, economic, and administrative grounds."

Madam President, it is high time the members of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate did some objecting on "technical, economic, and administrative grounds" before we approve any further outlay of taxpayers' money for such nonsense as this contribution to Castro.

I plan to ask some very "technical" questions about the "administrative" aspects of this \$48 million fund and the "economic" reasons why the United States should contribute 40 percent of that amount.

Whether the United Nations knows it or not—the American people know Castro is an enemy of the United States—you know it, Mr. President, and I know it. I, for one, do not propose to approve a program to give the enemies of the United States any handouts from the pockets of the American taxpayer.

To me it is inconceivable that we should condone this action. It is inconceivable, too, that we should have in

9574

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 24

Cuba at the present time a group of so-called technical experts negotiating with Castro on tractors, or bulldozers, for the release of political prisoners. All these things are almost beyond the realm of comprehension. Here is a great power, the United States of America, that has proud traditions, that has shown every friendship for the country of Cuba, that fought a war to make Cuba free, that has maintained the economy of Cuba by subsidizing the sugar crop for a long period of years, and now, one after another, we are taking steps which, to my mind, stultify our senses.

This last event, which I mentioned, paying taxpayers' money, through the United Nations, to a country that is threatening us and is now holding us up for ransom and blackmail, is more than I can stand for in silence.

There may be some people around this country who enjoy seeing American citizens negotiate a ransom agreement. I just want to register the fact that there is one Senator who does not like it, who protests it; and I hope this country will wake up before it is too late.

It is shocking to find the United Nations being used for the purpose of paying money to Cuba when we have at the moment such strained relations with Cuba, and when we have now—even though it is a private committee—a group of technicians negotiating to pay blackmail and ransom. It just does not make sense.

I predict further trouble, nothing but trouble, in the months and years ahead. The sooner we face up to it, the better.

People who like to close their eyes to all that is going on are welcome to close them. My eyes are open. They have been open for some time. Two and a half years ago I stated my views predicting what Castro meant to this country—that he was a menace to the freedom of his own country. Everything that I warned would happen has come true, and more. I think some people now finally should be awakened to the danger.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Madam President, I wish to say a few words about the matter which the Senator from New Hampshire discussed a few moments ago. I was astounded that our delegate to the United Nations had not taken a more forceful position with reference to the payment to Cuba. If the Senator from New Hampshire were sitting, as I was sitting this morning, and as the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut and other members of the Internal Security Subcommittee have sat, in hearings about the Fairplay for Cuba Committee, he would understand, as I am sure he does understand, and as members of the committee understand, that the Fairplay for Cuba Committee has developed into simply a pro-Communist organization. There may have been some sincere people in it in the beginning, and there may still be, but the organizers of it and the active members are following the Communist line completely.

The Senator from New Hampshire is being very realistic when he points out what we are up against in Castro's Cuba. I congratulate him on his remarks.

PROPOSED SUMMER RECESS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MCGEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Full-Time Job," published in the Washington Post of June 14, 1961, regarding a proposed summer recess of Congress, and pointing out the necessity for full-time operations, with reasonable allowance for summer vacations, campaigning, and contacts with constituents.

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

FULL-TIME JOB

Congress seems to be settling down to its hot weather siege in Washington. Hope that it might finish its work by the end of July are steadily fading, and most of the wishful talk is now of adjournment by Labor Day. Even that target date seems to be enveloped in a deep haze because of Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD's determination to bring out of the Rules Committee a proposal to curb filibustering in the Senate.

The numerous unfinished tasks are usually cited as an argument against the summer recess for which many Congressmen have been pleading. We think that they point in the opposite direction. They suggest that the idea of Congress finishing its legislative work from January to July or August is really an illusion and that the Congress would do well to acknowledge the necessity for full-time operations, with reasonable allowance for summer vacations, campaigning and contacts with constituents.

The chief opposition to any change in thinking about the congressional sessions seems to come from Speaker RAYBURN, who derides talk of a summer recess as "non-sense." Maybe this means nothing more than that Texas is hotter than Washington in summer. A Congressional Quarterly poll indicates that a majority of those who responded (175) are willing to let the present arrangement stand, but this is far short of a majority of the total membership, and 109 specifically favored a summer recess. We surmise that this number will grow as more of the younger and less inflexible Members come to realize that serving in Congress is a full-time job.

GOALS OF RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, did my State of Tennessee the honor of appearing before a joint meeting of resource development groups in Fayetteville recently.

This meeting, sponsored by the Tennessee River and Tributaries Association and by the Elk River Development Association was an important landmark along the road to great achievements such as have been exemplified by the Tennessee Valley Authority over the years.

It marked a vigorous stride into a New Frontier. The future growth and development of our economy, not only in Tennessee, but in many other portions of our Nation relies upon leadership such as that offered by Secretary Udall and groups similar to the Tennessee Rivers and Tributaries Association and the Elk River Development Association.

Mr. Udall's remarks sounded a strong keynote which should give encouragement to all those seeking progress toward our goals of resource development.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Udall's speech be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY HON. STEWART L. UDALL, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, AT THE TENNESSEE RIVER TRIBUTARIES ASSOCIATION AND ELK RIVER DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, FAYETTEVILLE, TENN., MAY 12, 1961

You do me a unique honor in asking me to talk with you about development of water resources. You were in the frontlines of the long battle for water development in this region when I was a schoolboy in a little Arizona ranch town. You were among the first New Frontiersmen because you were pioneers in a coordinated, comprehensive river development plan. To all of you residents of the Tennessee Valley, the subject of water and its planned control and use is far from novel.

I understand your valleywide association is only slightly more than a year old. You can accomplish much through joint and coordinated action, and you hold it within your power to be of considerable assistance to the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. You are holding fast to the original brilliant concept of TVA. You well realize that we can no longer afford to be piecemeal in our development of water resources. We must devise plans which will transcend the interests of individual localities or agencies, and which will conform to a broad plan of integrated development of all the resources of a great watershed. This is no time for stand-patters, it is no time for the overly cautious approach to resource development—it is a time for broad-gaged planning and bold action. President Kennedy has told us, "Failures to act now may be opportunities lost forever."

Years ago you and other far-sighted men set the pattern. You saw the opportunities available in harnessing the mighty Tennessee and making it work for mankind. In so doing, you made the three letters TVA synonymous with the idea of overall basin development.

It wasn't a simple matter. I'm sure many of you vividly remember the slow and often disappointing struggle which you underwent before TVA became a reality. Perhaps by now, though, that stirring story is "old hat" to some of your neighbors in this valley. I know that you here tonight, representing various area development associations, have not forgotten and will not forget.

The world outside this beautiful valley of yours continues to hold up TVA as a shining example of the best that man can accomplish in utilizing nature. Just 6 days ago, the Christian Science Monitor carried a long story about the Cauca Valley Corp., a new river development effort in the South American nation of Colombia. It quoted the English-speaking general manager of the CVC as saying, "We think we are admirably suited for a TVA-type development." It isn't the admittedly great water development works of Russia that these South Americans look to as a guide—it is your own, our own, TVA. And so it goes, everywhere in the free world. Do not, yourselves, become immune to the great accomplishments around you.

Not all of the development of the Tennessee River region is to be spoken of in the past tense. Part of the job still remains to be done. I'm sure you recall the words of the late George Norris who said in his autobiography:

clation for Retarded Children, in professional groups, like the American Academy of Pediatrics and the Association on Mental Deficiency—would also play an important part in developing what I believe could be a landmark toward new action.

3. The research phase alone on mental retardation is an enormous one. It involves public and private research, study by the National Institute of Neurological Disease and Blindness, the National Institute for Mental Health and other Federal units. It includes the historic collaborative study on perinatal problems, which of course, cuts across the board to a host of research areas.

A consultative study as proposed by this amendment could look at the "big picture" of all biomedical research, bearing on mental retardation—its cause, diagnosis, therapy (to the extent possible), etc.

4. Fortunately, H.R. 7035, like earlier appropriation bills, takes significant note of the retardation problem. H.R. 7035 soundly provides \$1 million more for teachers of the mentally retarded; this is one of the most important needs in this field. It is, however, but one of the many phases of the needs of the mentally retarded—medical, educational, vocational, parental, community, etc.

5. One of the virtues of taking a rounded look at the total needs of the mentally retarded is that it will bring to light what might be termed "gap areas." In other words, we will find out what is now lacking in services to the mentally retarded.

6. There is much to be gained and nothing to lose from a consultative study of this nature.

Surgeon generals' consultative groups have in the past provided invaluable guidance, as have HEW Secretary advisory groups, such as the one proposed herein.

The need for this particular study has been carefully determined; its direct and indirect dividends could be immense to literally millions of families across the Nation. It would lay the basis for well-rounded, instead of piecemeal or ad hoc action in the future.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962—AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PEACE CORPS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators DOUGLAS, MOSS, and NEUBERGER be added as cosponsors to S. 2000, a bill to establish a Peace Corps, which I introduced on June 1 on behalf of myself and Senators FULBRIGHT, PELL, CLARK, SMITH of Massachusetts, MCGEE, HART, and GORE.

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

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS FROM OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE PROGRAM — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, on June 7, 1961 the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] introduced a bill to exempt from coverage under the old-age survivors and disability insurance program self-employed individuals who hold certain religious beliefs.

I believe this to be a very worthy bill. I have discussed the proposal of my appearing as a cosponsor of the bill with the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania, and he has agreed. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that my name may appear as a cosponsor of Senate bill 2031.

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

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, yesterday I introduced S. 2069. On the next printing of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] be added as a cosponsor.

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

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ENACTMENT OF THE HOMESTEAD ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under the order of the Senate of June 7, the names of Senators CASE of South Dakota, MORSE, and PROXMIRE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2027) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the enactment of the Homestead Act, introduced by Mr. CURTIS (for himself and other Senators), on June 7, 1961.

OBSERVANCE OF CENTENNIAL OF ENACTMENT OF THE HOMESTEAD ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of June 7, 1961, the names of Senators HUMPHREY, CASE of South Dakota, MCCARTHY, MORSE, and PROXMIRE were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 98) to provide for the observance of the centennial of the enactment of the Homestead Act, introduced by Mr. CURTIS (for himself and other Senators), on June 7, 1961.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H.R. 7218) "An act to provide that the authorized strength of the

Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall be not less than three thousand officers and members," was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION OF ROBERT M. MCKINNEY TO BE AMBASSADOR TO SWITZERLAND

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Robert M. McKinney, of New Mexico, to be Ambassador to Switzerland.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 14, 1961, he represented to the President of the United States the following bills and joint resolutions:

S. 847. An act to change the name of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Incorporated, and for other purposes;

S. 1852. An act to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution designating the week of May 13-19, 1962, as Police Week and designating May 14, 1962, as Peace Officers Memorial Day.

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

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Address entitled "Economic, Social, and Political Implications of Community Development," delivered at the closing session of the Inter-Regional Conference on Community Development, May 6, 12, Seoul, Korea.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address delivered by Senator LONG of Missouri to the American Stockyards Association, at St. Joseph, Mo., on June 7, 1961.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Address delivered by Secretary of Labor Goldberg at dedication of Library of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, Ohio, June 3, 1961.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

Address entitled "Parks for America Is Our Common Concern," delivered by National Park Service Director Conrad L. Wirth at the annual meeting of the Outdoor Writers' Association of America, at Grand Teton National Park, Wyo., June 2-9, 1961.

By Mr. HARTKE:

Address of Mr. Edward H. Foley at testimonial dinner honoring him for his service as General Chairman of the 1961 Inauguration.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Article entitled "A Dangerous Business: Government Seen Involved if Tractor Deal Is Made," written by Roscoe Drummond and published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 26, 1961, relating to the proposed exchange of tractors for Cuban prisoners captured during the recent abortive invasion of Cuba.

Article entitled "Accepting Castro's Swap Is Immortal," written by George E. Sokolsky and published in the New York Journal American of May 29, 1961, relating to the proposed exchange of tractors for Cuban prisoners.

Editorial entitled "What Goes On Here?" published in the Manchester Union Leader of May 31, 1961, regarding the proposed exchange of tractors for Cuban prisoners.

Editorial entitled "Nazis Once Offered To Trade Jews for Trucks—The Morals of Dictator Castro Are Similar," published in the Knoxville, Tenn., Journal of May 27, 1961, relating to the proposed exchange of tractors for Cuban prisoners.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Editorial comment by various newspapers on the obstacles in connection with Geneva nuclear test ban talks.

Editorial entitled "Saving the Park Lands," published in the Washington Post of June 14, 1961, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Memorial Parkway and purchase of land for future park sites.

By Mr. BUSH:

Editorial on the dangers of massive deficit spending, published in the Wall Street Journal of June 9, 1961.

By Mr. PROXMIER:

Editorial tributes to the late Daniel Webster Hoan, of Milwaukee.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Editorial on confusion resulting from too much governmental interference and regulation of business enterprise, published in the Wall Street Journal of June 14, 1961.

Letter on the current crime wave, written by John Wyndham to the editor of the National Review, and published on June 17, 1961.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Article entitled "Protecting Presidential Prestige," written by Claude Witze and published in the Air Force magazine.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Article by Mr. Phil Conley, entitled, "Birth of West Virginia."

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "How To Start Things Booming Again," written by the Honorable Luther Hodges, Secretary of Commerce, and published in This Week magazine of June 18, 1961.

By Mr. KEATING:

Article containing questions and answers about courses on communism to be taught in schools, published in the New York Daily News of May 27, 1961.

By Mr. COTTON:

Winning essays by New Hampshire high school seniors in an essay contest sponsored by the Manchester (N.H.) National Bank, on the subject of communism.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Resolution adopted May 9 and 16, 1961, by the Forum of the Men's Class of the Riverside Church in New York City, regarding the foreign-aid program.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

Letter to him dated April 21, 1961, from Byron W. Hansford, Colorado commissioner of education; resolution dated March 9, 1961, of Colorado State Board of Education, relative to the establishment of a universal language; and article entitled "Man Against Babble," written by Jacob Ornstein, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

Article entitled "Arlene Deens Bridge of Friendship," published in the Denver Post, issue of June 11, concerning visit of young Filipino woman to Nebraska.

DEFENSE CONTRACT AWARDS

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, last week the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] renewed his criticism of what he termed a "great disparity" in the distribution of defense work.

In his remarks in the Senate on June 6, Senator KEATING stated that the gap in the distribution of defense procurement dollars is apparently increasing, rather than decreasing, under the new administration. He pointed out that "one State, which is neither the biggest nor the most populous, gets nearly one-quarter of the value of all military prime contract awards"; and that "during the first 3 months of 1961, California got 23.3 percent of defense procurement dollars—more than twice as much as New York."

Since Senator KEATING continues to make his charges on an area basis, I should like to point out that the State of California comprises an area of 156,750 square miles. The area of six of the industrial States on the eastern seaboard totals 123,158 square miles. Yet these States combined, smaller in size than California, received 32.6 percent of the defense contracts during the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration. These States are New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Maryland—a contiguous bloc.

In his June 6 remarks, Senator KEATING also made the statement that by comparison to the Eisenhower administration, the present administration "seems to be causing a real depression for New York State defense contractors."

Without arguing Senator KEATING's point, I wish to cite some figures to show that California's defense industry also has its problems.

Figures prepared by the Bank of America indicate that employment in California's defense industry complex in March of this year was more than 20,000 jobs less than its peak in 1959. Employment in aircraft categories was 48,000 below its 1959 peak. The report notes that—"no precise measurement of California's total share of defense procurement expenditures is possible owing to the lack of detailed data on the amount and geographical distribution of subcontracting and the location of specific work done under prime contracts."

The Bank of America report also shows that 8.3 percent of California's total labor force were unemployed in March 1961 an increase of 37.8 percent over 1960. This represents an unemployed force of 540,000, or about 10 percent of the country's total unemployed of 5,495,000. I may add that the Department of Labor, in its May 13 report, places California's State insured unemployment at 6.8 percent—compared with 6.1 percent for New York, and 5.9 percent for the country as a whole.

To return to Senator KEATING's charge of "great disparity" in the distribution of defense work in the United States:

On April 24 of this year, I made some extended remarks in the Senate on the subject of defense procurement contracts. At that time I called attention to the explanatory footnotes that ac-

company the regularly issued report of the Secretary of Defense, entitled "Military Prime Contract Awards by State." No reading of the figures in these reports should be made without the benefit of this explanatory language. I regret that in making this assertions on the matter of defense contract awards, Senator KEATING fails to read this very important language into the RECORD.

I think the footnotes bear a rereading at this point:

It is emphasized that data on prime contracts by State do not provide any direct indication as to the State in which actual production work is done. For the majority of the contracts with manufacturers, the data reflect the location of the plant where the product will be finally processed and assembled. Construction contracts are shown for the State where construction is to be performed. However, for some contracts with large companies with more than one plant, and for contracts with service, wholesale, or other distribution firms, the location is usually the address of the contractor's main office.

More important is the fact that the reports refer to prime contracts only, and cannot in any way reflect the distribution of the very substantial amount of material and component fabrication and other subcontract work that may be done outside the State where final assembly or delivery takes place.

I think it should be clear to everyone how easy it is to get a distorted picture if we fail to use this language as a backdrop in interpreting the figures on military prime contract awards.

In any case, the points that Senator KEATING raises ignore the fact that the basic criteria used in granting defense contracts are neither geography, nor unemployment, nor politics. They shy clear of the fact that the Department of Defense makes its awards, first and foremost, on the basis of capability, experience, and cost.

In California, we have the experienced personnel, the plant capability, and the product quality that enable the Federal Government to get the best possible product at the lowest possible total cost. For more than 25 years the United States has turned to concerns in California for most of its aeronautical and aerospace needs. As a result, we have built up the comprehensive capacity to tackle, with maximum efficiency and minimum time, almost every phase of producing the modern weapons of war.

We are living in the most critical period of our Nation's history, and we cannot allow defense procurement to be awarded on any basis other than competence and excellence. As long as great numbers of people who possess the necessary skills, would rather live in California, and as long as contracts are awarded in the best interest of the country, I will continue to rise to the defense of California's carrying out its responsibility as a major producer of our defense needs.

UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND
PROPOSAL FOR CUBA

Mr. BRIDGES. Madam President, it is a shocking experience to pick up a newspaper and read that the Governing

1961

The U.S. Department of Commerce sent export survey teams to key areas of the world last year. Our experts who went to Australia and New Zealand came back and told us of a startling number of cases in which potential new customers had been almost literally "turned under." They heard complaints from executives of more than 100 firms "down under." Though growing in the special soil of the export situation, most of them originate in the same root as our selling troubles at home—we're just not being courteous to the customer.

I was shocked and ashamed to hear that Australian businessmen, and many of their colleagues in other lands, said that a number of U.S. firms failed to answer their mail, acknowledge orders, or supply needed technical information.

The situation is similar in our own backyard—Mexico and Central America. Though we are still the leading supplier there, our share of the market has been declining, while West Germany, Japan and others are improving their positions. Why? Not just lower prices. The 150 local businessmen interviewed in this area said we could overcome a price disadvantage of as much as 15 percent—if we gave thoughtful consideration to the needs of the local distributors on such matters as credit, delivery, service, parts, and packaging.

Thoughtful consideration to the needs of the customer—that's our problem everywhere. But so pitifully little is being done about it in relation to the need! Only about 1 percent of the people engaged in sales and service are taking extension courses in distribution. And less than 10 percent of industry's research dollar goes to improve the efficiency of marketing the products that are improved with the other 90 percent.

NEEDED: 6 MILLION EXPERTS ON SELLING

Without more training, where will we get the 6 million additional people who will be needed during the next decade in sales, clerical, and service occupations? How will they learn to sell and service the deluge of new products that's on the way—even today, about one-third of all sales revenue is from products that did not exist 10 years ago.

Salesmanship alone, of course, will not provide a magic solution to our complex economic problems. The President has sent to Congress a whole package of constructive proposals to help us grow. But I believe salesmanship can give just that extra push we need to get moving toward the new heights of which our economy is capable.

If we did a better selling job at home, it could bring about a slight but important shift in how we consumers divide our income between spending and saving. During the prosperous year 1955 we spent 93.7 percent of our personal income after taxes; in the last quarter of 1960, only 92.4. A 1-percent shift in favor of spending would mean sales of about \$3,500 million more goods. Once consumer goods start moving faster, businessmen will be more inclined to invest in modern machinery, which is a key to prosperity at home to success in competing for the export market.

If we project a vigorous desire to serve we should also be able to do a much better job of selling abroad. Today we send only 4 percent of our gross national product into the channels of world trade, a far smaller percentage than other nations. We—business, labor, and government together—have a heavy stake in increasing exports. For business it means greater profits. For labor, every \$6,000 of export sales provides one job. For the government, and that means for all of us, it helps to keep the dollar sound, as the President has pledged to do.

Any businessman who really wants to sell his products or services at home or abroad can get help from the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Suppose he wants to know where the best domestic sales opportunities are. He can draw on \$135 million worth of our census statistics, some of them broken down as fine as a city block.

HELP IN SELLING OVERSEAS

If he wants to sell overseas (and I hope more manufacturers will—today less than 5 percent do) we can help him with information we and the State Department collect from 260 oversea points. (Much of this material is published in our Foreign Commerce Weekly, available for \$6 a year from the U.S. Government Printing Office. A bit of selling by Luther Hodges, with no apologies made.)

Businessmen and women who have tapped the resources of our Washington or field offices often tell us that this act was the starting point of their selling-success stories. Mrs. Helen Sullivan, export manager of Mixermobile Manufacturers, Portland, Oreg., offers this colorful example:

"The first step we took was to analyze the foreign market with the help of the local department of commerce.

"It was up to us to make each one of our prospective dealers feel that he was the only one who could sell Scoopmobiles for us and that his success was the most important job that we had.

"We followed with the very best possible service we could render. To illustrate: A cable from Stockholm advised us they had a machine down at Kiruna, at the Arctic Circle, and could we air freight the repair part. Well, I dashed downstairs to make sure we had the part, tagged it for export, sent out an S O S for the boxer-carpenter, and dashed back upstairs to make up the shipping papers. Within 40 minutes that part was on its way to the airport. The Swedes now think that Scoopmobiles are the next best thing to nude bathing."

We may never face the same problem as Mrs. Sullivan, but whether we're doing business across the Atlantic or on Broadway or Broad Street, let's take the "how can I help you?" approach.

Businessmen must study intensively the customer's needs and wants, using both Government data and personal investigation. Then they should do some critical self-questioning: "Is our product, in the form we now make and package it, just what the customer can best use? Could we perhaps adapt it just a little better to his requirements?"

Having made sure what the customer wants, they face the all-important step of presenting the product to him. That boils down finally to an effective person-to-person contact. The best advertising in the world will be useless if a rude or uninterested salesperson handles the job.

We must face up to our growing need for salespeople who radiate courtesy and an attitude of service to the customer, and have the knowledge about the product to be really helpful. Anyone who wants to make a career in selling must recognize that it takes training, and from time to time retraining, to keep up with change.

THE ONE WORD SECRET OF SELLING

Some may ask, "Is a career in sales worth that much effort?" I can testify that it is, both in financial reward and the satisfaction that comes from being of service.

The problem of salesmanship is not a problem for businessmen alone. What I am talking about is an attitude toward people, which concerns every one of us. It could be boiled down to the one word courtesy, defined as a regard for the other fellow.

If we breathe this spirit into our transactions, we'll get results. I know I have always found this so. During my first campaign for public office, I introduced myself to a stranger and told him I'd like him to vote for me as Lieutenant Governor of North Carolina. "I will," he said.

I was so taken aback by his prompt response that I asked, "Why?"

He said, "Because you're the first person who's ever been interested enough to ask me."

SECRETARY HODGES' THREE-POINT CODE FOR SALESMAN

1. The customer is a human being. As such, he deserves and will get my respect and courtesy whether he buys anything or not.
2. The customer is an individual. He has his own special needs and feelings. I will seek to understand his feelings, just as I hope he will try to understand mine.
3. The customer has a right to information and the salesman an obligation to provide it. As a salesman who takes pride in his job, I will make it a point to learn all there is to know about my merchandise.

Cuba

Cuba Moves Into U.S. Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorial by Gould Lincoln contained in the Washington Evening Star, June 13, 1961, be reprinted in its entirety in the RECORD:

CUBA MOVES INTO U.S. POLITICS

(By Gould Lincoln)

Efforts to keep the Cuban problem out of partisan politics are fast going down the drain. Both President Kennedy and former President Dwight D. Eisenhower have attempted in the past to avoid this in the interest of a united front by this country in dealing with vital foreign affairs. Republican National Chairman WILLIAM E. MILLER, Member of Congress from New York, however, has brought the Cuban issue—as between the two political parties—right out into the open. His vehicle was his statement in a television and radio interview with Senators Scott and Clark of Pennsylvania that President Kennedy had revoked an Eisenhower plan to give the anti-Castro Cuban invaders air support. The Republican chairman said this was a fatal mistake on the part of President Kennedy—since he [Kennedy] had permitted the Cuban invasion and had allowed American support of the venture. Mr. Kennedy's second mistake, Mr. MILLER insisted, was to announce at the time of the invasion that the United States would use none of its Armed Forces to aid an invasion. In view of that statement, Mr. MILLER argued, how could any one expect anti-Castro Cubans in the island to rise up against the dictator?

It was Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, who first broached the subject of the Eisenhower plan for the invasion of Cuba during the interview with Chairman MILLER. As Secretary of the Interior Udall did soon after the invasion of Cuba failed, Senator CLARK charged that the invasion plan had been inherited by President Kennedy from the Eisenhower administration. He added that if Mr. Kennedy had agreed to use U.S. Armed Forces we would have violated our treaty obligations and that we would have been permanently in the doghouse with other Latin American nations. Mr. MILLER's response came quickly. While Mr. MILLER did not say it, there is strong belief that had Mr. Eisenhower been in the White House when the anti-Castro invasion took place, the invaders

would have had air and naval support—or there would have been no invasion.

BLACK EYE FOR UNITED STATES

The Cuban invasion fiasco has been a black eye for the Kennedy administration that will not down. Mr. Kennedy showed his courage when he took on his own shoulders the responsibility immediately after Secretary Udall made his statement that the whole affair had been handed Mr. Kennedy by the Eisenhower administration; that the plans had been made under Mr. Eisenhower and inherited by Mr. Kennedy to carry out. It was a courageous statement by President Kennedy and General Eisenhower declined to be critical, declaring that the country should back President Kennedy in any efforts he made to clean up the Cuban situation.

Nothing has so far been done to clean up that situation. President Kennedy's trip to Europe to meet with President de Gaulle, Prime Minister Macmillan and Premier Khrushchev shoved the Cuban problem into the background for a time. But it is clear from reports from all parts of the country that Americans are exercised, disgruntled and humiliated. The Castro proposal to trade 1,200 Cuban invaders for 500 American-made tractors and the support given the proposal by President Kennedy—as a private citizen—aroused still further criticism of the administration. Democratic supporters of the President have done their best to gloss the thing over by saying that Castro has lost ground in other Latin-American countries by his callous and cynical proposal to barter human beings for machines.

EFFORTS IN HEMISPHERE

The only plan so far advanced by the Kennedy administration to deal with Castro and his pro-Communist government has been to give economic aid to the other Latin-American countries, and to persuade the Organization of American States to go along with an anti-Castro, anti-Communist program. President Kennedy sent Adlai Stevenson, our Ambassador to the United Nations, on a tour of the republics to the south of us to see what could be done to improve our relations. The reports from this trip so far have given no hope that the OAS will do anything about Castro and his government in Cuba.

Red Russia's Premier, Nikita Khrushchev, is keeping the spotlight now on West Berlin and Germany, on Laos and on nuclear test-ban talks. Meanwhile, the Communist drive to take over completely the Castro government in Cuba goes forward, very much as the Communists operated to take over the China mainland. In addition, Castro and his government are receiving a lot of sympathy and support from liberals and so-called intellectuals in this country, who urge the United States to give the Cuban dictator pretty nearly everything he wants.

So far it's a gloomy outlook. If the Communists take over Cuba, as they have virtually done already, it is going to be a Herculean task to prevent the spread of communism into other Latin-American nations. The United States, as leader of the free world, can scarcely regard such a prospect with indifference.

Democratic claims that armed intervention in Cuba by this country would have been and would be a violation of treaty obligations are not so clear when it is recalled that part of our treaty obligations with the OAS is to keep communism out of the Western Hemisphere. Also, what did President Kennedy mean when he told Castro he (Kennedy) would not abandon Cuba to communism?

Tariff Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have inserted in the RECORD an article from a recent issue of the Journal of Commerce and the response to it of Mr. Henry C. Wheeler, president of the Acme Shear Co., of Bridgeport, Conn. Both concern questions of U.S. tariff policy and contain aspects of the questions that I think should be considered by every Member:

TARIFF AID PROGRAM FOR SMALL FIRMS PROPOSED

WASHINGTON.—It has occurred to many people that U.S. small businesses—not the larger corporations—are today the most seriously affected by a rising tide of import competition.

Howard Piquet gave the matter a little more thought, however, and came up with an idea, one that could offer a way out of the awkward entanglements that beset a Government which tries to maintain a qualified free-trade policy.

Dr. Piquet, senior economist with the Library of Congress and one of the country's top tariff experts, says simply that there is a case to be made for protection of efficient small businesses.

SKILLS NEEDED

He assumes that the national interest would be served by the preservation of industries which help preserve special skills. There also are considerations of employment, economic diversification, and national security.

While the tariff at one time was the "mother of the trusts"—that is, it served the purposes of big business—Dr. Piquet says that today it is significant only for protecting smaller industries.

He cites the dreary muster of industries which have gone to the Tariff Commission for help—ax heads and ground chicory are illustrative—and points out that most have been turned down because they couldn't meet the tests of the economic injury.

GOOD SOCIOLOGY

"The preservation of small business enterprise may be poor economics, but it may be good sociology and an important force for preserving democracy," he states.

This is precisely the point raised by Congressmen and Senators who respond to the pleas of constituents for protection. When either the Tariff Commission or the President rejects this point, as so often has been the case, the legislators are then obliged to oppose more general, and more important, foreign trade and aid proposals from the White House.

If the Government decides it wants to protect industries which contribute something special, Dr. Piquet says it can be done. He has devised an efficiency formula to determine which producer deserves protection and which is to be steered into some other line of work.

Other trading nations, told in advance that artistic or social values will get such protection, could adjust to the U.S. policy.

Other trading nations, fully apprised in advance that artistic or social values require

such protection, could be made to understand.

The lower wage rates prevailing abroad give the foreign suppliers of high labor-input products a distinct advantage and Dr. Piquet has a point that it makes no sense to open the door wide to indiscriminate competition.

Arrangements to protect the efficient U.S. small business and ease the inefficient counterpart into some other line of work have at least one advantage: They would help avoid those unseemly wrangles that blow up when the United States slaps a tariff on Icelandic fish or a quota on Japanese cutlery.—J.F.K.

JUNE 6, 1961.

THE JOURNAL OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C.

(Attention of J.F.K.)

DEAR SIR: We read your Newsletter on World Trade in the June 1 issue with great interest, since we are in a small industry that has been seriously hurt by imports.

You might be interested in one case history. We have manufactured household shears and scissors since 1882 in an industry that has probably never employed over five thousand people. At one time we had a sizable export market, particularly to South America. This is all gone. In 1950 there were 27 companies employing from 5 to 400 people. Today—after two tariff reductions—there are only about 9 or 10 of us left, with several of these very close to closing their doors. We applied to the Tariff Commission for relief in 1954 and they recommended to President Eisenhower that we should get added protection. The President rejected this. In 1958 we applied again and, although many more companies had folded in that 4 years, this time the Tariff Commission voted unanimously that we were not being hurt.

Of course, each time a weaker company goes out of business, this temporarily helps those that are left. Thus when we applied for relief, most of the companies were making a profit and, apparently, that is why the Tariff Commission says that we are not being hurt. If carried to the extreme, this means that we can't get any relief until there is only one or two companies left and they are losing money. At that stage, it could well take so long or be so expensive to apply for and get protection that our industry will die, and the skills of the people and the special equipment and tools needed will disappear.

We recognize that the United States must trade, but we can't see why a small group of industries should have to bear the major part of the burden. My company has spent many hundreds of thousands of dollars over the last 12 years and has, I believe, the most modern equipment in the world for making shears and scissors. Shall we ship this equipment and know-how to some foreign country with lower wage rates?

We wonder why it wouldn't be possible to have a quota arrangement that would, at least, protect an industry from being completely wiped out. Couldn't we say to other countries—"You can have part of the U.S. market, but we are going to save part of it for our own companies"? Our industry would be happy now if the Government would let us keep even half of the U.S. market. In some cases this has been done; not by our Government but by the foreign countries agreeing to hold down their shipments to the United States. Should we be dependent on the generosity of other countries to decide whether our industry should live or die?

Sincerely yours,

HENRY C. WHEELER,
President, the Acme Shear Co.

A4378

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 14

This is not to argue that everyone out of work can find a job if he wants it. There are many honestly unemployed, for whom the unemployment compensation system was designed.

Chiselers on the system drain the funds which should go to the real unemployed, in the form of larger checks for longer periods. They also swell the statistics to alarming proportions, obscuring the fact that the main trouble is in key industrial areas which have failed to engage in sufficiently vigorous price competition, either for the domestic or the foreign market.

"The crew and passengers were apparently courteously treated while on the ground at San Antonio de Los Banos. Detailed reports from the three crewmembers, supplementing interrogations given at Key West and Miami following arrival by agents of the bureau, are in hands of the Miami office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"It is respectfully requested that action be taken by the U.S. Government to obtain extradition of said Elpir Cofresi to the United States that proper legal action may be taken for his unlawful actions."

The Department of Justice on May 18 replied that it would consider the extradition question only in the event that criminal charges are instituted in a Federal court in this country.

Nothing was said to indicate that the act of piracy complained of had been drawn to the attention of the State Department for action.

Plainly, here is a case where the Government of the United States, by failing to demand redress from Cuba, gives the impression today that it is not going to protect American lives and property abroad.

Here is a case, moreover, in which the lives of American citizens traveling in the air over their own territory were placed in danger by an act of invasion by a national of a foreign state. Piracy of this kind is not immunized by any treaty, and it is within the right of the United States to take steps to gain satisfaction.

A demand from this Government to the Cuban Government for the return of the criminal has not been made. Nor have any steps been planned in the event that the Cuban Government refuses to give up the man who committed the act of piracy.

In connection with the episode, it is a matter of interest to the American people that such an act of piracy was permitted within our own defense zone. The American pilot, who was forced to fly at the point of a gun, did his utmost to attract attention. He flew through restricted military areas between Miami and Key West and at abnormal altitudes as he took a zigzag course. It was learned later that he had been tracked by military radar, but no significance was attached to the flight because it appeared to be going away from the United States. This episode happened too close to a Communist base to be handled in such a careless way by American military authorities charged with the duty of observing what goes on in the air.

Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Chaplain Thomas H. Clare, an American patriot who gave his life in the service of the United States during the Second World War, penned a poem entitled "Our Flag." Chaplain Clare had emigrated to the United States from South Wales, England, and from a deep sense of gratitude for the opportunities and freedom he enjoyed in America was inspired to write this poem while serving with combat troops in India.

I deem it a fitting tribute to Chaplain Clare, at the suggestion of his sister, Miss Dollie Clare, to have his poem

printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this day which we observe as Flag Day. Under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

OUR FLAG

See! Our country's flag is flying
Over village, field, and town;
Symbol to the Nation's children
Of the glorious land they own.
Let us now recall her story
And with reverent voices raise
Songs proclaiming high her glory;
Hymns o'erburdened with her praise.
Like a holy light that shineth
Let her hallow all our ways.

See her now on God's horizon
Flashing, rippling with the breeze.
Hope of men of every nation
Fevered still by war's disease.
In her folds the weary stranger
Seeks and finds a safe retreat.
Born of hope and sired by danger
Never has she known defeat;
In the strife for right and justice
May she triumph, Lord, complete.
—Chaplain Thomas H. Clare.

Confusion Resulting From Too Much Governmental Interference and Regulation of Business Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 14, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there appears in the June 14 edition of the Wall Street Journal an excellent editorial which vividly describes the confusion which results from too much governmental interference and regulation in the field of business enterprise. The antitrust laws and their enforcement are essential to the function of our economic system. Competition cannot exist where price fixing and collusion are permitted.

The purpose of antitrust laws, however, is to foster and insure competition; and it becomes somewhat difficult to detect diminution of competition due to the offering of goods at a price which is characterized as being too low. Vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws must be made, to prevent collusive price fixing and padded prices. Price fixing is the antithesis of competition.

When, however, those enforcing the antitrust laws attack the prices of one company at the same time in different forums, on the grounds that they are both too high and too low to conform to antitrust provisions, there is grave danger that the Government itself becomes, in practical effect, a price fixer, and thereby itself defeats the purpose of the antitrust laws.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Too High and Too Low," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

No U.S. Action on Cuban Piracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorial by David Lawrence contained in the Washington Evening Star, June 13, 1961, be reprinted in its entirety in the RECORD:

NO U.S. ACTION ON CUBAN PIRACY—JUSTICE DEPARTMENT RAPPED FOR FAILING TO PROTEST HIJACKING OF AIRLINER

The Kennedy administration is likely to come in for some severe criticism because it is ignoring the right of American citizens, traveling on commercial planes, to be safeguarded against attack in the air by citizens of foreign governments.

The Department of Justice, which has been busily engaged in trying to get political favor by supporting the nonviolence crusades that provoke violence in the South, has not found time to do anything to secure the extradition of the Cuban pirate who attacked an American passenger plane in the middle of its flight, jeopardizing the lives of the 10 other persons aboard, mostly Americans.

On May 9, the National Airlines sent a letter to Attorney General Kennedy which read as follows:

"National Airlines' Flight 337, a scheduled revenue Convair 440 flight between Miami and Key West by way of Marathon, Fla., departed Marathon Airport at 3:34 p.m. e.s.t., Monday, May 1, 1961, for Key West. Aboard the flight, in addition to the crew of three, were eight passengers.

"Shortly after takeoff, one of the passengers, carried on the manifest as Elpir Cofresi, forcibly entered the cockpit and ordered the pilot at gunpoint to overfly Key West and proceed to Havana, Cuba. The copilot was ordered to leave his seat and take a place in the main cabin, while said Elpir Cofresi took over the copilot's seat and through continued threatening display of the gun required the pilot to proceed to Havana, Cuba, where a landing was subsequently effected at San Antonio de Los Banos at approximately 4:30 p.m., e.s.t.

"The aircraft, of U.S. registry and flown by a scheduled U.S. carrier, with its passengers, was subjected to extreme hazard during the course of the flight into and subsequently out of Cuba. The pilot, at the command of military personnel, was required to shut the engines down and remain within the airplane with the passengers, except for a short period of time, for approximately 3 hours.

"Said Elpir Cofresi was ultimately dealt with his baggage at the request of Cuban officials, and the flight released for a circuitous return to Key West, Fla.

by the well-known columnist Roscoe Drummond, entitled "A Dangerous Business," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Friday, May 26, 1961.

Mr. Drummond, who is a thoroughly experienced and able observer, makes the point, of which all Americans should be aware, that Castro's crude and brazen blackmail proposal is designed simply to make himself stronger. If we are in the position of strengthening a Communist henchman 90 miles from our shores, then it certainly is time that wishful thinking is replaced by hard, sane realism. Mr. Drummond also raises the question of how a committee of private citizens can engage in an international deal, involving a foreign country, without necessarily invoking participation by the U.S. Government. The answer is, of course, that it cannot be done, and the result is that, in the eyes of the world, our Government has been humiliated by a petty, bearded tyrant.

I hope that Mr. Drummond's able and penetrating statement will be read by all thoughtful people.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 26, 1961]

A DANGEROUS BUSINESS—GOVERNMENT SEEN INVOLVED IF TRACTOR DEAL IS MADE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON, MAY 25.—Fidel Castro estimates that the lives of two and two-tenths Cuban prisoners ought to be worth one bulldozer or one truck with spare parts. He gives the United States 10 days to come through—or else.

The fact that such Americans as Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Walter Reuther, Joseph Dodge, and others, volunteer to help raise the money to buy the freedom of the 1,200 Cubans who were captured during the invasion shows that the plight of the freedom fighters instinctively touches the heart and conscience of this Nation. The money is already coming in.

I am not sure this is the way to help Cuba or the United States or enslaved people anywhere. But, if we are going through with it, let us recognize what we are doing, name this Castro thing for what it is, and not pretend that the United States Government somehow has nothing to do with it.

CRUDE BLACKMAIL

This is crude, brazen, high-handed international blackmail perpetrated by a political dictator who is proposing to trade human beings for metal in order to make himself stronger.

This is a dangerous business. Once a nation yields to blackmail, where does it stop? What next? If we yield 500 trucks and bulldozers to Castro, aren't we inviting some other country to throw a few Americans in prison to trade for a dozen airplanes, a steel mill, or a low-interest loan?

There is no way whatsoever to make this Castro thing a little detached, personal deal between a few private American citizens and somebody or other in Havana, with the Government of the United States uninvolved.

Administration officials would like to keep the Government out of it. It seems to me impossible.

After a conference at the White House, Speaker SAM RAYBURN reported: "The President said the Federal Government is out of it and going to stay out of it."

Mrs. Roosevelt said: "We have the agreement of the Government. We got permission beforehand."

A CONTROVERSY?

The hard fact is that the deal cannot be brought off without some Government participation. The Logan Act makes it unlawful for private citizens to negotiate with a foreign government "with intent to influence its conduct in any disputes or controversies with the United States." President Kennedy says he is advised that the Logan Act is not involved because the people-for-tractors deal is not a "controversy." But since Castro has stated that he views the tractor "gift" as "indemnity" or reparations for the invasion, there seems to me a very real controversy here.

I cannot see how the Americans can go to Havana to negotiate the prisoner-tractor arrangement without breaking the law unless they have the authority of the Government. If they have this authority, then the United States makes itself a partner to the deal.

If this deal is to be realized, as its sponsors have described it, then the United States will have to participate at four points: The Government will have to issue export licenses for the machinery, issue visas for the negotiators, authorize them to negotiate so as not to violate the Logan Act, and make contributions tax-deductible. The latter action means that the United States would be paying for part of the cost.

FULBRIGHT'S VIEW

All this is why Senator WILLIAM J. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has said: "I agree that our Government should not in any way lend itself to this kind of blackmailing operation."

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, put it this way on the floor of the Senate: "Not since the days of Hitler, when the infamous Eichmann offered to trade one Jew for one truck, has the civilized world been confronted with such a heinous barter. Would it not be far more humanitarian to exchange food and medical supplies?"

The point is that all the Cuban people, not just the captured invasion fighters, are Castro's prisoners. It seems to me that our objective and the objective of the Organization of American States should be to free the Cuban nation, not just a few of its people.

College Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1961

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of the House an article that appeared in the June 10 edition of the Evening News, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., written by Mr. Hugh H. Holloway, superintendent of schools.

The article follows:

COLLEGE FUNDS

(By Hugh H. Holloway, in Sault School Bulletin)

None of the recipients of public funds are happy with the austerity budget of the most recent legislature. We can understand this readily because schools and colleges are definitely recipients of public funds.

A word of caution is in order, now that the matter is settled. Good sense might show that the legislature has shown good judgment. Rather than spitefully try to keep their judgment from proving correct,

let us try to determine the truth. Let us live within our budget. The people can determine whether the pressure group or the legislature has been wrong.

May I suggest to the colleges that their acts not be arbitrary, that their acts be well thought out to benefit the entire State. Across the board restrictions in enrollment may not be in the best interests of students. Why not determine those areas of education best served by the State institutions and those areas that can be best served by the private colleges?

Let the State institutions use their funds in the areas where the private colleges cannot serve. In this manner the private colleges may effectively absorb the overflow. In this manner the college students of tomorrow may still be served.

Of all States of the Union, Michigan ranks first in the percentage of students in public supported colleges. Even a small change in this percentage will not drop Michigan from her first place spot.

Public education has been tightening its belt for the past 4 years and is still doing a good job. With dedication, effort, cooperation, and hard work, we can produce class one education.

May I recommend that we make the best out of this bad situation. Maybe it is not as bad as many of us think.

Let's Get the Facts on Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on extension of unemployment compensation some of us pointed out that there were many misleading figures used in compiling unemployment statistics. How much outline the actual figures are is clearly indicated in the editorial, which I include herein, from the Washington Daily News.

BULLETIN UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Any commonsense consideration of the U.S. unemployment problem should start by disposing of some of the myths which confuse the issue.

Principal among these is the idea that there are nearly 5 million seeking work and unable to find it. The exact, current figure, issued by the Government, is 4,768,000.

The impression these figures convey obviously is false. In high percentage—no one knows how high—these figures are built into the system and are multiplied by it.

Consider, for instance, the millions retiring from the labor market for reasons of age; in the case of women, to get married, or just because they are sick of work and can avoid it. They don't intend to go back to work. They are not hunting jobs. They are avoiding them. And yet they can collect unemployment compensation for half a year or more. For this length of time they are statistically unemployed.

Another fairly large class is composed of those not looking for steady work. They pile up enough credits to get on unemployment compensation, lay off until it runs out, get another job and repeat the process.

There is, furthermore, a class which would rather maintain a mere existence on relief than work for a living. These also add to the unemployment statistics.