

1963

United States will be making a contribution to this project whether direct or indirect, and this is intolerable.

To grant any amount of aid to the Communist nation that has confiscated more than \$1 billion worth of American property and has not paid a cent in compensation is utterly unthinkable.

Mr. Speaker, while the subject of Cuba is under discussion, I wish to go on record as being in complete disagreement with the theory now apparently in vogue in administration circles that no one but the administration should discuss Cuba. In these days of managed news, I sincerely believe that it is the responsibility and duty of each citizen, and, particularly, each Member of Congress, to constructively discuss and, if necessary, as in this case, dare to criticize the decisions being made and carried out in our State Department by the administration. These men are not omniscient; their decisions are not sacrosanct.

This Nation is one of representative government, and as one Representative, I object to our financing anti-American policies. If this means that the Congress must cut off support for the Special Fund, then this must be done.

I have voiced my support of the United Nations in the past, as have the vast majority of Americans. However, this U.N. action demands a serious reappraisal of our role in the U.N. My deep concern has been voiced to the administration, and I sincerely hope that other Members of Congress will join in expressing their disapproval. Cuba today is a center for Communist subversive activities throughout the Western Hemisphere. Our every action must be to weaken communism in Cuba, not strengthen it.

A REAPPRAISAL OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. BRUCE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the future of the Alliance for Progress. So far there has been very little progress, and too little leadership from the United States. The program cannot be allowed to continue to flounder. The future of the Western Hemisphere is at stake.

I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a memorandum prepared by three members of the Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress—COMAP: Emilio G. Collado, vice president and director, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; David Rockefeller, president, the Chase Manhattan Bank; and Walter B. Wriston, executive vice president, First National City Bank.

The authors call for a comprehensive reappraisal of the policies and actions that will help the Alliance for Progress to achieve its basic objectives. They urge that increased emphasis be placed on the "encouragement of private initiative and investment, both local and foreign." It is their further belief that:

The United States should concentrate its economic aid program in countries that show

the greatest inclination to adopt measures to improve the investment climate and withhold aid from others until satisfactory performance has been demonstrated.

This is an important study and I hope that it receives the widest possible attention.

The text of the statement follows:

A REAPPRAISAL OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Last spring, the Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress (COMAP) was launched with a view to seeking ways in which American business could further the Alliance. A few days ago, the Chairman of the Committee—J. Peter Grace—submitted a report to the Commerce Department and to other agencies, recommending certain legislative proposals relating to the Alliance. The following memorandum sets out the observations and conclusions of three members of COMAP who, while agreeing with many of the points made in the Grace report feel that there are certain aspects of the problem which need a somewhat different emphasis. For this reason we feel justified in submitting a separate commentary.

"We have become increasingly concerned lest the Alliance for Progress fail to achieve its objectives for lack of a proper focus for its activities.

"As one illustration, the initial concept of COMAP's role appears to have been directed at finding ways to meet the Punta del Este program of \$300 million a year of net new U.S. private investment in Latin America by devising short-range measures on the part of the United States to encourage such investment. If such measures would really get the Alliance off the ground, they might be justified. But we are disturbed by the feeling that even if such measures were taken, and were successful in inducing an expanded flow of U.S. investments into Latin America, the basic problem of making the area attractive to local savers and investors would remain. Indeed, such a program could do positive harm by making local governments feel even less urgency than they do now for achieving a proper investment climate.

"What is needed is a comprehensive reappraisal, not of the broad objectives of the Alliance for Progress, but of the policies and actions which will best achieve these objectives. The first year's operation of the Alliance saw heavy emphasis placed on government planning, government-to-government loans and grants, income redistribution through tax and land reform, public housing, and other social welfare measures. Many of these steps were commendable. Yet they were not in most cases accompanied by efforts to push through economic reforms which would encourage private initiative and enterprise. The continued outflow of private funds from Latin America is sufficient proof of the critical character of the current situation.

"Many countries in Latin America need social reforms as well as measures to provide greater equality of opportunity. However, these broad objectives cannot be achieved without a more rapid rate of economic advance than now is in prospect. And rapid economic growth cannot be achieved without greater emphasis on the private sector. The fact is that some 80 percent of Latin America's national income is today generated by private activities. Consequently, the Alliance for Progress can succeed if—and only if—it builds upon this base and places far greater emphasis on the encouragement of private initiative and investment, both local and foreign.

"To reorient the Alliance for Progress in a direction which offers promise of achieving its objectives involves difficult and sweeping economic reforms. Currencies need to be stabilized through measures to bring government budgets under control and to avoid in-

flationary increases in the supply of money and credit. Efforts along these lines could lead to the removal of the many exchange controls which still remain and which inhibit economic growth in many nations. At the same time, governments should act to remove the network of other controls which restrict enterprise and sustain local, high-cost monopolies. Economic growth, and the real benefits to all participants in the community which can accrue from growth, are maximized in an atmosphere of political and economic stability under which competitive private enterprise can thrive.

"In a very real sense, the Alliance for Progress is concerned with the age-old problem of trying to bake a bigger pie and divide the slices more evenly at the same time. The emphasis to date has been mostly on the side of slicing the pie. While such efforts may be desirable in the long run, the immediate effect has been to shrink the potential size of the pie. Experience around the world shows clearly that the national welfare is better served by far through policies which enlarge the entire pie.

"To accelerate economic advance in Latin America, efforts on many fronts will be required. Governments have important roles to play—in such areas as schools, health, farm extension services and roads. However, the overriding needs is for an increased flow of private capital from both local and foreign sources and for a significant and continuing improvement in the efficiency with which all resources, including most importantly human resources, are used.

"For these reasons, we urge that U.S. policies be reoriented to place far greater emphasis on the encouragement of private enterprise and investment. What has been done to date along these lines is simply not enough. The encouragement of private enterprise, local and foreign, must become the main thrust of the Alliance. This would involve two major changes in U.S. policy.

"The first requirement is that the governments—and, as far as possible, the people—of Latin America know that the United States has changed its policy so as to put primary stress on improvement in the general business climate as a prerequisite for social development and reform. It must be made clear that U.S. policy in this hemisphere is based on the need for rapid economic growth and on the belief, confirmed by all available evidence, that this can be achieved within a reasonably free political framework only if private capital is given the opportunity to work in a favorable environment. This means that our policies should be consistent throughout the area and should discourage tendencies toward nationalization of industries and encourage setting up explicit rules which provide for truly reasonable indemnification where nationalization has taken place.

"In addition we should discourage policies which tend to distort normal economic relationships—policies leading to overvalued, and multivalued exchange systems, complex import controls with high and highly variable tariffs, quotas and other forms of trade restriction, price controls and highly unpredictable budgetary practice. In short, emphasis should be placed on creating an atmosphere in which private business planning can go on without undue concern about possible changes in the rules of the game. Countries following these policies should be given tangible and active support.

"To make this position clear and unambiguous, it would be necessary for the President to proclaim it in a major address in which he not only spells out the rationale behind the new policy, but also indicates the tools available to the United States to help make it effective. The most important of these tools would be the U.S. foreign aid program.

A second requirement concerns a change in the criteria for granting aid. U.S. foreign aid policy is a branch of U.S. foreign policy, which should be directed toward achieving specific foreign policy goals. By and large it has not been effectively used for this purpose in Latin America. In its simplest terms, our goal in Latin America should be to help nations of the area grow economically while they retain internal political freedom, and thus remain part of the Western community of nations. Without economic growth the other goals will be much more difficult—if not impossible—to achieve. In order to get growth—which comes first both in time and in relation to goals involving redistribution of income—capital is needed. Most of this must come from internal sources. Thus, foreign aid should be used as an inducement to nations to adopt policies which will improve the business climate and thereby increase domestic savings and investments. The United States should concentrate its economic aid program in countries that show the greatest inclination to adopt measures to improve the investment climate, and withhold aid from others until satisfactory performance has been demonstrated.

The extent to which this policy would differ from the present one in Latin America can be seen by indicating what it would not involve:

"1. Unless there are overpowering political considerations, the United States would not lend money or make grants in countries which persist in policies which discourage private investment.

"2. The United States would not grant balance-of-payments loans of the bail-out variety though it should cooperate with the IMF on constructive balance-of-payments loans and stabilization programs.

"3. The United States would not provide foreign aid in such a way as to finance the expropriation of privately owned companies in any field of endeavor.

"On the positive side, the United States would seek opportunities to get individual countries started toward rapid growth. Assistance on a relatively large scale would be focused in a few countries that appeared most likely to carry out measures needed to encourage investments and establish the widest area of economic freedom.

"Nowhere in the whole broad range of current economic problems is there one more compellingly significant for the United States than that of supporting the economic and social advance of our neighbors to the South.

"We are persuaded that the most important way in which the United States can help is by exporting the ideas implicit in a free economy. Certainly, money or goods alone will not do the job. Free enterprise is the basis of our own growth, and it provided the framework on which our social and political institutions, imperfect as they still are, have evolved. We feel certain that free enterprise can be the basis of growth in Latin America—indeed, that there is no known alternative that still permits a substantial measure of individual freedom.

"We also believe, however, that to encourage such an evolution in Latin America the United States must change its role—from one that emphasizes short run economic palliatives combined with recommendations for sweeping social and economic reforms to one that places the greatest emphasis on the longer-run goals of creating an environment in which freedom of the

marketplace is recognized for what it is, a major pillar of free and prosperous societies.

"EMILIO G. COLLADO,
"Vice President and Director,
"Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.
"DAVID ROCKEFELLER,
"President,
"The Chase Manhattan Bank.
"WALTER B. WAISTON,
"Executive Vice President,
"First National City Bank."

THE CUBAN QUESTION

(Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. BRUCE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, because of its importance I am today placing in the Record a column by Walter Lippmann entitled "On the Cuban Question Today." In the column Mr. Lippmann puts down his reasons for believing that our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New York, Senator KEATING, has won the right to be listened to. Mr. Lippmann states in his article that after too long a delay the administration finally did what it should have done in the beginning, which was to arrange for consultation and an exchange of information between Senator KEATING and the CIA. Mr. Lippmann goes on and states that no matter what the consultation and exchange lead to he is not sure it will repair altogether the damage done to public confidence by the misleading information given out—the administration—in September and October.

The administration may well have also to make a full explanation of what went wrong in September and early October—

States Mr. Lippmann.

Mr. Lippmann's article is timely and I commend it to the attention of the Members of the House and Senate:

ON THE CUBAN QUESTION TODAY
(By Walter Lippmann)

In the past week the administration has gone to extraordinary lengths to win the country's confidence in the reliability of its information about the military situation in Cuba. Since the October confrontation there can, of course, be no lack of confidence in the President's courage and determination to protect American interests once the facts of a threat are established.

The crisis of confidence originates in what happened in the 8 weeks before the October confrontation. During the month of September and into October the administration was insisting that the Soviet Union had not brought offensive weapons into Cuba. Senator KEATING was insisting that they had. When he was found to have been right, there occurred a loss of confidence in the administration's intelligence services which it is still struggling to repair.

With others, I have had firsthand experience which enables me to understand how difficult it is to restore confidence once it has been shaken. On two occasions it was explained to me by high officials how reliable was our photographic surveillance of the island, and how certainly we could detect the exact nature of the weapons being

installed in Cuba. These private explanations came after the President had said categorically in his press conference of September 13 that "these new shipments do not constitute a serious threat to any other part of the hemisphere." Some 2 weeks later, on October 3, the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Ball, gave to a congressional committee a summary of the intelligence information which came from the CIA. The point of the summary was that there were no offensive weapons in Cuba.

But in fact there were. A week later, on October 10, Senator KEATING insisted that there were intermediate range missiles in Cuba, and 5 days later the President received the photographs which confirmed the charge.

This is how Senator KEATING won the right to be listened to, and this is why the administration has now, belatedly, made the right move, which is to arrange for consultation and an exchange of information between Senator KEATING and the CIA.

This should put an end to the unseemly controversy about who is telling the truth between a Senator of the United States and the President of the United States. But I am not sure it will repair altogether the damage done to public confidence by the misleading information given out in September and October. The administration may well have also to make a full explanation of what went wrong in September and early October.

Examining the remarkable intelligence briefing by Mr. John Hughes of the Defense Department, I find myself quite convinced that our photographic intelligence is now reliable. But I am struck by the fact that there was a blank space in Mr. Hughes' testimony for the period from September 5 to October 14.

Photographs taken on August 29 of the San Cristobal area and on September 5 at Sagua la Grande show positively that no missile sites had been built. The next photograph referred to by Mr. Hughes is that of October 14. It shows intermediate range missile sites being erected. This is the photograph which precipitated the international crisis.

Where, we are bound to ask, was our photographic intelligence between September 5 and October 14? That was when the administration was telling the country that there were no offensive weapons in Cuba. This is the source of the infection which will have to be removed if full confidence is to be restored.

Having said this, I would say that there is no reason to doubt the thoroughness or the reliability of our photographic surveillance of Cuba and of the sea around it. The situation is extraordinary. We are depending on being able to fly daily photographic reconnaissance planes at high and low altitude. In Cuba there are a large number of the latest antiaircraft weapons manned by Soviet soldiers.

We may say, how come? Up to the present—knock on wood—the Soviet antiaircraft gunners are not attacking our reconnaissance planes. They must be under orders from Moscow where it is well known that if the planes were attacked there would be an immediate reprisal.

But where does this leave us? It leaves us with a fragile revised version of the original Khrushchev-Kennedy agreement. In the key letter of October 27, President Kennedy accepted the following terms of settlement: The U.S.S.R. would remove offensive weapon systems under United Nations observation and supervision. When this was done, the United States would end the quarantine and

would give assurances against an invasion of Cuba. The U.S.S.R. removed the missiles, and the United States of America ended the quarantine. But Castro would not permit United Nations observers to come to Cuba, and consequently the United States would give no assurances against invasion.

What we have now is a substitute for the original agreement. We are able to carry on photographic reconnaissance without interference from the Soviet antiaircraft weapons. And Cuba is getting, in lieu of a U.S. guarantee against invasion, a buildup of its defensive capabilities. Both Moscow and Washington know that this strange working arrangement cannot be upset deliberately without bringing on a much mightier confrontation than that of last October.

CLOSE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN REPRESENTATIVES AND PUBLISHERS OF WEEKLY PAPERS

(Mr. HARDING (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, one of the privileges of serving a congressional district in the Nation's Capital is the close relationship that a Congressman has with the publishers of weekly papers in his district.

During the past couple of years I have come to know and to admire the publisher of a small newspaper in Shoshone, Idaho—Herb Love.

This man can best be described by the inscription on a plaque recently presented to him by the Idaho Press Association which bestowed upon him the Master Editor-Publisher Award which is the highest honor the weekly press can bestow upon one of its members.

The inscription reads:

He has worked hard, lived honestly, thought soundly, influenced wisely, and is entitled to the highest honor in his profession.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the Record the account of the awarding of this honor to Herb Love as it is reported in the Lincoln County Journal of January 17, 1963.

This excellent county paper is now being published by a young and energetic newspaperman, John George, who gives every indication of also becoming one of Idaho's outstanding weekly publishers.

The above-mentioned follows:

IDAHO'S HIGHEST JOURNALISM HONOR AWARDED TO EDITOR FROM SHOSHONE

The highest honor that the Idaho Press Association can bestow on one of its members, the Master Editor-Publisher Award, was presented to Herb H. Love, Saturday night. The award crowns a journalistic career of 23 years.

Editors and publishers throughout Idaho, assembled at Hotel Boise for a banquet at the conclusion of their annual meeting, vigorously applauded their approval when the name of the winner was announced.

The honor is one that is not lightly given. Winners are determined by a selection committee of Idaho editors and publishers.

The inscription on the plaque presented Mr. Love sums up the devotion and talent he has given to journalism in these words:

"He has worked hard, lived honorably, thought soundly, influenced unselfishly, and

is entitled to the highest honor in his profession."

Lincoln County may well be proud of the man who has served them so well for the past 19 years.

Mr. Love was born in South Dakota and reared in Iowa. He attended Iowa State Teachers College and Iowa State College, earning his bachelor of arts degree from the teachers college in 1924. During World War I he served in the U.S. Navy.

The new master editor-publisher came to Idaho in 1925 to serve as superintendent of schools at Fairfield, a post he held for 2 years. He coached athletics at Halley for a year, and was an instructor in the Wendell school for 2 years before leaving the teaching profession because of physical disability.

He married Helen Shuey of Wendell at Richfield in 1929. The couple have two children, a son, John, employed by Ball Products Co. of Boulder, Colo., and a daughter, Mrs. Judith Abraham, a student at Kansas City Art Institute.

From 1933 to 1944 Mr. Love was assessor of Gooding County, resigning in his sixth term to assume ownership of the Lincoln County Journal.

He founded the Gooding Independent in 1936 and owned the paper until 1940, at which time it was sold and merged with the Gooding Leader. He is a charter member of the Gooding Lions Club and served as its president just before coming to Shoshone.

Mr. Love was commander of the Shoshone American Legion Post in 1949, and was elected district commander in 1950. He is also a past president of the Shoshone Chamber of Commerce and the Shoshone Rotary Club. From 1955 to 1959 he served on the Shoshone City Council.

Mr. Love purchased the Journal from Glen Maxwell in May of 1944 and operated the paper for almost 19 years.

He was president of the Idaho Press Association in 1948, and was a director of the Idaho Newspaper Advertising Service for two terms before being elected president of that organization.

Mr. and Mrs. Love will remain in Shoshone, but plan an extended trip through Colorado, Texas, and Florida this winter.

GENERAL EXCELLENCE

The Lincoln County Journal was awarded first place for general excellence in its circulation bracket at the press association's annual convention in Boise last weekend. The Journal has now won the top award for 4 years in succession.

Contest judges were publishers and press association managers in Arizona, Montana, Nevada, and Washington.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

(Mr. ST. GERMAIN (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the measure I am introducing today, a bill to establish a land and water conservation fund, embodies the administration's program to further provide for the outdoor recreation needs of the Nation.

In his conservation message last year, President Kennedy warned that our present sources of recreation are not adequate to meet current demands. It is his view and mine that we must take positive action now, for as he wisely points out, "actions deferred are all too

often opportunities lost, particularly in safeguarding our natural resources."

The legislation I am presenting today is a far-reaching proposal which provides for today's recreation needs while anticipating those of the near future. While the bill is fundamentally the same as the one submitted last year, the new version authorizes a program for 50 percent matching grants to the States for planning, and 30-percent grants for acquisition and development of needed outdoor recreation resources. The States will share the funds available in the following manner: one-fifth divided equally, three-fifths apportioned on the basis of population, and one-fifth allocated according to need.

In order for a State to qualify for assistance, it must have a comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan, and the States are eligible to receive assistance in the preparation of such a plan and for the training of necessary personnel. Also, in anticipation of escalating prices for the future acquisition of land for recreational purposes, the bill limits expenditures for State development work for the next 10 years to 10 percent of the funds available for State assistance. The funds provided by this bill will also be available for acquisition of land and water which is authorized for areas of the national park system and areas administered by the Secretary of the Interior for outdoor recreation purposes; the national forest system; purposes of national areas for the preservation of species of fish or wildlife threatened with extinction; and incidental recreation purposes in connection with national fish and wildlife conservation areas as authorized by law.

Revenue sources provided by the bill include proceeds from entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees or charges established by the President for Federal land and water areas; proceeds from the sale of Federal surplus real property; and the proceeds of the 4-cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline and special motor fuels used in motorboats. While the Treasury will hold a portion of these revenues for acquisition of additional lands at Federal and federally assisted projects, the greater portion would be used to help finance State and Federal programs.

For the purpose of assuring the financing of the program when the States are prepared for full participation, advance appropriations of \$60 million a year for 8 years are authorized beginning with the third year, with provision for repayment from one-half of the revenues available to the fund. The fund will be used in the proportion of 60 percent for State purposes and 40 percent either way depending on need.

This measure is in complete accord with the recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. It is fiscally sound and forward looking. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that it will receive favorable action at this session of Congress and that the country will be able to realize its benefits in the near future.

THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT RICE REYNOLDS

Mr. TAYLOR (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, citizens of North Carolina and people across the Nation were saddened last Wednesday by the death of former U.S. Senator Robert Rice Reynolds at his home in Asheville, N.C.

Mr. Reynolds represented North Carolina in the U.S. Senate from 1933 until his retirement from the Senate in 1945. He ranks among the most colorful and controversial figures in American political history. He stormed Washington with a grandeur perhaps never to be duplicated. He was different and glamorous and those about him quickly realized it.

Perhaps no other U.S. Senator brought to Washington such a wide variety of experience as did Robert R. Reynolds. He had been a professional wrestler, a football coach, a war correspondent, an author, an actor, a motion-picture producer, and a criminal lawyer. He loved outdoor life and his earliest political campaigns were conducted traveling by horse in the North Carolina mountains.

His appearance in the Nation's Capital followed his famous campaign of 1932 which he launched with \$20 and a T-model Ford purchased on the installment plan. His majority in the election was one of the largest in North Carolina's history. He arrived in Washington in his "rusty and trusty" Ford and showed no hesitation in driving it to White House teas and other black tie occasions.

When he returned to North Carolina he stated that he had taken his faithful Ford to the Capital and parked it between two Cadillacs in a million-dollar garage which Mr. Hoover had built and that it rolled its mud-splattered eyes around and looked up at him and said: "Bob ain't we in society now."

Bob Reynolds' stories, similar to the one above, are told all over North Carolina. They are told here in Washington. He will be remembered as a legendary son of the Blue Ridge Mountains.

Affectionately known as "Our Bob" by friends back home and sometimes referred to as "Buncombe Bob," Senator Reynolds was the founder of the American Nationalist Party in 1941 and rose to the chairmanship of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

A great deal more could be said about the accomplishments and activities and controversies of Senator Reynolds as a Member of Congress, but I wish to touch briefly on the human qualities of this foremost American citizen.

He was sincerely concerned for the people he represented. His personality was magnetic; his charm, warm and abiding. Perhaps his greatest attribute, however, was that he never forgot his friends.

His rich personality, keen sense of humor, and loyalty to his friends endeared him to the people of North Carolina.

Bob Reynolds loved life and he lived it fully.

PANAMA CANAL PROCRASTINATION PERILOUS

(Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it has been aptly stated that the history of the Panama Canal is one of continuing crises. Those of key character concern the best site and the best type, known as the battle of routes and battle of the levels. Moreover, this pattern of struggle reappears periodically, and since 1947 the question of the proper modernization of the Panama Canal has been beset with repetitions of these old controversies in slightly modified forms.

Over a period of years, a number of Members of the Congress, several in the House but only one in the Senate, who have made serious studies of the canal question and recognized its magnitude, have introduced bills to create the Inter-oceanic Canals Commission. In so doing, it was their purpose to provide an effective agency to develop a timely, definite, and wisely reasoned Isthmian canal policy, which the Congress and the Nation can accept and which time and usage will justify.

Unfortunately, this task has been complicated immeasurably by the ratification in 1955 of a secretly contrived canal treaty between the United States and Panama and by the nationalization in 1956 of the Suez Canal by Egypt. Despite the inherent differences between the juridical foundations of the two inter-oceanic canals, this action by Egypt served to evoke a chain of aggressive nationalistic and communistic revolutionary inspired agitations in Panama, some of them marked by mob violence led by well-trained leaders. The long-range objectives of this revolutionary movement is the wresting of the sovereign control of the Panama Canal from the United States and the extortion of greater benefits from the toll revenues. The only basis for such aims is that inherent in Panama's geographical location, which is adjacent to the Canal Zone territory. The difficulties of securing increased transit capacity have now become severely aggravated by the necessity for safeguarding the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the United States over the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone.

As a start in this direction, I made a series of major addresses in the House beginning in 1957 and continuing up to the present Congress. These included, in comprehensive detail, the diplomatic and legislative history of the acquisition by the United States in 1904 of our territorial possession known as the Panama Canal Zone.

Though these efforts were generally ignored in the mass news media of the United States or, when presented, had their meaning distorted, they were prominently featured in the press of Panama, especially in the Spanish language papers, which I follow closely. Through the latter, they have produced echoes from various countries of Latin America.

The failure on the part of elements in our Department of State to stop the depredations of Isthmian agitators by means of forthright declarations of U.S. policy, in the course of time, has led to a chain of diplomatic victories by Panama, making the United States a laughing stock in the Western Hemisphere. So confident did anti-U.S. extremists become that the Panamanian National Assembly even attempted to encircle the Canal Zone by enacting legislation extending the 3-mile limit to 12 miles, with Panama controlling the water at each end of the zone's 3-mile limit, which could have made that waterway another Berlin. This attempt, our Government very promptly and properly refused to recognize, but friction resulted.

The radical leadership in the Panama National Assembly, which includes some Marxist-Leninists, obviously understood the significance of my researches in the exposure of their schemes and did not stop with the attempted encirclement of the Canal Zone. It followed up by giving me the unique distinction of being formally declared as public enemy No. 1 of Panama.

The situation on the Isthmus was worsened on September 17, 1960, when the President of the United States, in a mistaken gesture of friendship, by an Executive order soon after the adjournment of the Congress, directed the formal display of the Panamanian flag outside the flag of the United States at one place in the Canal Zone as evidence of a so-called titular sovereignty of Panama over the zone. This unfortunate precedent of striking the American flag in the Canal Zone, as predicted by me on the floor of the House, merely served to open the door, for in Panama and elsewhere, the action was interpreted as a belated United States recognition of Panamanian sovereignty.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would invite attention to the fact that on February 2, 1960, after full debate, the House of Representatives approved House Concurrent Resolution 459, 86th Congress, against such display by the overwhelming vote of 381 to 12, which was transmitted to the Senate but, for reasons not published, was never acted upon by that body. In addition, the Congress passed the Gross amendment to the Department of Commerce Appropriations Act prohibiting the expenditure of funds embraced in the act for such purpose. No wonder Isthmian extremists became emboldened and arrogant.

Under these circumstances, the necessity for an effective counterpoise to Panama became clearly evident. This compensating force developed in the form of growing demands for a second canal at Nicaragua, the ancient rival of the Panamanian site, and elsewhere. In an address to the House on June 30, 1960, I undertook to give a comprehensive description of the Nicaraguan project, which was largely based on a 1931 report—House Document No. 139, 72d Congress—and to advocate its consideration. The second canal idea, thus stimulated, served as an antidote for Castroism in Panama and to still some of the violent

UNCLASSIFIED				CONFIDENTIAL				SECRET			
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY											
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP											
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS						DATE		INITIALS		
1	DCI 7D5617								<i>[Handwritten initials]</i>		
2											
3	<i>Leg Counsel 7D01</i>										
4											
5											
6											
ACTION				DIRECT REPLY				PREPARE REPLY			
APPROVAL				DISPATCH				RECOMMENDATION			
COMMENT				FILE				RETURN			
CONCURRENCE				INFORMATION				SIGNATURE			
Remarks:											
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER											
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.								DATE			
Legislative Counsel, 7D01								19 Feb 63			
UNCLASSIFIED				CONFIDENTIAL				SECRET			