

it so long we are not really conscious of what it is. While we have the courage and will to die for freedom, we sometimes wonder if we have the guts to live for freedom.

It is particularly refreshing to me to see those seemingly few dedicated individuals today who are living and working and fighting to preserve this precious inheritance. My friend, Mr. Ben H. Wooten, chairman of the board of the First National Bank in Dallas, Tex., is one such individual. A living example and dynamic exponent of the free-enterprise system, Ben Wooten travels thousands of miles each year speaking to Americans about their precious heritage, their freedom and their responsibilities.

We had the honor and privilege of having this free enterprise spokesman visit our west Texas area this month to speak at the annual chamber of commerce banquet in Pecos, Tex. I commend Ben Wooten for the very excellent, non-partisan, thought provoking message he delivered.

I would like, unanimous consent, to include Mr. Ben Wooten's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

**THE WILL TO BE ECONOMICALLY FREE**

(By Ben H. Wooten, chairman of the board, First National Bank in Dallas, annual chamber of commerce banquet, Pecos, Tex., Tuesday, March 12, 1963)

Anyone is honored by an invitation to talk to this outstanding group. If I were able to coin beautiful and expressive phrases at will, I could better tell you of my gratitude for being with you this evening. My mind wanders down memory lane and dwells upon my most precious possessions—friends. Friendships have been likened unto the homing ships that touch our evening shores; unto the flowers fair that sweeten the desert air; unto the stars that slip out at night and give us light after the sun has gone away. There is a poem I like very much:

"It is always a joy in life to find,  
 At every turn of the road,  
 A strong arm of the comrade kind,  
 To help me onward with my load.

"And since I have no gold to give,  
 'Tis love must make amends,  
 It is my prayer that while I live,  
 God shall make me worthy of my friends."

I trust that God shall make me worthy of my friends in Pecos.

My subject is an abiding one, namely, "The Will To Be Economically Free." I have no apologies for the seriousness of my talk and it is completely nonpartisan.

In the din of battle with accompanying stresses and strains, men do not falter in pushing the fray even to death in order that freedom survives. Yet, history tells us again and again that in order to keep freedom, we must daily live it, embrace it economically as well as guard it militarily.

With Kipling, let us pray:

"God of our fathers, known of old,  
 Lord of our far flung battle lines,  
 Beneath whose awful hands we hold,  
 Dominion over palm and pine,  
 Lord, God of Hosts, be with us yet,  
 Lest we forget, lest we forget."

We must not forget that the economic fallacy of continuously spending more than we collect will ultimately do for us what it has done for every people in history—namely, financial destruction and poverty. A broke United States would truly be a world tragedy. We must not forget that nations, like indi-

viduals, are financially broke when their liabilities exceed their assets. This is a simple financial and economic fact easily understood—one that cannot be circumvented.

Robert Louis Stevenson once said: "Soon or late everybody sits down to his banquet of consequences." Regardless of the amount of wealth possessed by our Nation, if we continue in our annual deficits and unbalanced payments, we will finally come to the banquet of consequences that result from further depreciation of the dollar. We, of course, will spend whether at a deficit or not any amount necessary to defend our country, but certainly, until the great danger is past, we should not adopt any new give-away plans abroad or at home.

Back in the year 1932, one of the presidential candidates said along with other things that, if elected, his party would support laws establishing a minimum wage, unemployment insurance, medical care, a 30-hour week and improved workmen's compensation. He further stated that his party would support spending \$5 billion annually for relief and another \$5 billion for public works. He favored Federal aid to agriculture and socialization of power. His party wanted steep increases in income and inheritance taxes and a tax on the interest of Government securities. He also asked Federal aid for homeowners who had mortgage problems. This platform was offered the American people by the presidential candidate of the Socialist Party. He did not win the office of president but his platform cast before it the shadow of coming events. It is not my purpose today to discuss the merits of any individual plank in the Socialist candidate's program; however, we must, in the light of present-day policies and laws, admit that in the main his socialistic ideas have prevailed in the United States.

I once read an article by a young man who said: "I favor private enterprise because I am poor. I would never be happy to be a mere cog in the wheel. I could never be happy were every choice concerning my life made by someone else. I would rather be poor and live under the freedom and opportunities that private enterprise offers than to be rich and live in a penthouse on Manhattan Island under the restrictions of national socialism."

Like the young man who favored private enterprise, let us remember that economic freedom is a personal thing, a precious thing to be valued much greater than subsistence security. There is no economic reason whatever for us to surrender the mastery of our individual fate to the state. We have the highest living standard in the world under our unique American system, and we should never tamper with success. Every American should keep in mind that if he becomes a ward of the state, he will no longer be a free man.

Woodrow Wilson said: "Liberty has never come from the government. Liberty has always come from the subjects of it. The history of liberty is a history of limitations of governmental power, not the increase of it."

Judge Louis D. Brandeis said: "Experience should teach us to be more on our guard to protect our liberties when the government's purposes are beneficent."

Benjamin Franklin said: "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither safety nor liberty."

During the past 5 or 6 years especially, we have heard a great deal and witnessed the followthrough of at least one philosophy of Abraham Lincoln, namely, "You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred." We do not quarrel with

this statement; however, we direct attention to other admonitions of Mr. Lincoln just as important, just as vital and deserving of as much attention as the one quoted above. We regret that these admonitions appear to be ignored by a large segment of our people in authority. Mr. Lincoln gave us nine essential economic "cannots" all worthy of our deep concern. They are as follows:

"(1) You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn.

"(2) You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.

"(3) You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.

"(4) You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

"(5) You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.

"(6) You cannot help little men by tearing down big men.

"(7) You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.

"(8) You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could do for themselves.

"(9) You cannot build character and courage by taking away men's initiative and independence."

In effect, these great Americans—Messrs. Wilson, Brandeis, Franklin, and Lincoln—say that the socialist state makes beggars out of proud men, cowards of strong men, and serfs of freemen. The socialist state ultimately brings inflation through the deficit door and continued spiraling inflation always produces restrictions on personal liberties.

Inflation has long been the greatest destroyer of freedom in the world. Deficit financing is inflationary. When the value of a nation's money is lost, some kind of dictatorship usually takes hold in order to avoid complete chaos. We would be reminded that since 1946 the value of the dollar has gone down 21½ cents.

We may well ask what can you and I do about it. The antidote is a renewed faith in God, in ourselves, in the American tradition, and the principles under which we have reached the highest living standards of any people ever on earth. Let us emphasize thrift, courage, personal independence, a willingness to live for individual economic freedom, and support office-seekers that are dedicated in purpose and deed to the tenets of Americanism. Under drastic inflation the American people would suffer more intensely than the people of any other nation in history in that 90 percent of all the life insurance in the world is written in the United States. The security we have provided through insurance loses the exact amount as the dollar in circulation.

John Milton once said: "Awake, arise, or be forever fallen." This admonition was given 275 years ago, but it is applicable today to every American, so let's resolve that our individual freedoms shall not be further whittled away. We are firmly of the opinion that in the afternoon of life when the gold of the sunset has been driven away by the gray of the twilight, there will be more dignity, joy and comfort in living off what we have created for ourselves than in wondering for whom to vote in order to keep a socialistic stipend from being cut. Liberty is more precious than any governmental handout or subsidy.

We are reminded that Ella Wheeler Wilcox once wrote:

"One ship drives east, another west,  
 With the self-same gale that blows;  
 'Tis the set of the sail, and not the gale,  
 That determines the way we go."

It is certainly time for us to reexamine the setting of our economic sails and steer our financial ship of state into the harbor

of a sound dollar and there permanently drop anchor.

An author whose name I do not know once wrote:

"Isn't it strange that princes and kings,  
And clowns that caper in sawdust rings,  
And common folk like you and me,  
Are builders of eternity.

"To each is given a book of rules,  
A shapeless mass, a bag of tools,  
And each must make 'ere life has flown  
A stumbling block or a stepping stone."

We know the rules of individual freedom and we have the tools to maintain and promote it. Let's resolve that we shall be stepping stones along the pathway of freedom and humbly pray that we shall have the will, the courage, and the determination to bear the personal economic risks of freedom and thus keep America what it is today—the most blessed place this side of Heaven.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

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

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, several months ago, we were expressing concern over a rash of violent crime in the District of Columbia. In the ensuing months, that rash has become a virulent fever. It is in a critical stage. I am not one who believes that crime can be prevented, or even abated, solely by rigid police methods. But law enforcement is an important and essential factor in securing the peace and guaranteeing the safety of citizens as they go about upon their lawful occasions. The Congress must not neglect to provide the legislative tools for law enforcement.

On March 15, 1963, the practice of investigative arrest in the District of Columbia was terminated by administrative order. I did not condone the practice and do not mourn it. Every reasonable man must be concerned, however, with the legal void created when the suspension of investigative arrest was not coordinated with the substitution of some constitutional alternative.

In fairness to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, it is generally known that they did seasonably prepare a recommendation for authorizing judicial officers to require the giving of evidence relating to crimes. The Commissioners draft has not been offered as a bill, allegedly because it is the subject of an extended constitutional debate in some pigeonhole in the Justice Department.

With all deference to the able lawyers in the Justice Department, I would submit to the House that there are some Members here who are capable of considering constitutional issues. If there is to be a debate on this subject, let it be open, let it be free, and above all, let it begin.

I have, therefore, today introduced the draft legislation on this subject. It has been neither ratified by the Bureau of the Budget nor confirmed by the Justice Department. To be candid, I have not had an opportunity to research the constitutional history of this procedure and

I cannot personally vouch for every word in this bill. I am offering it as a basis of discussion to encourage prompt action. The people of the Nation's Capital look to us for protection. We must act now to provide it.

*Cuba*

**THE CUBAN SITUATION**

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have as of this date sent the following letter to the Secretary of State:

MARCH 21, 1963.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,  
Secretary of State,  
Department of State,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have called to the attention of the Congress, and to your agency, previously, my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, March 14, and Monday, March 18, evidencing my concern over the existing open door of subversion through the Cuban Embassy and Cubana Airlines in Mexico City, which facilitates the visitation of not only Latin American but U.S. citizens as well to Cuba.

By the State Department's own announcement of January 18, 1961, such travel by U.S. citizens is in violation of the U.S. law, punishable by penalty of \$5,000 or 5 years in jail, or both.

It is quite obvious that a number of persons visiting Cuba by this route are engaging in subversive activities and rendering services to the Castro Communist government, which appears obvious for two reasons, the first being that Cuban Embassy approval, thus Castro government approval, is necessary and, secondly, some of those known to have visited Cuba since the State Department announcement have known Communist backgrounds.

This open door to subversion in this Hemisphere obviously must be closed and I am therefore asking that a strong protest be made to the Mexican Government, urging that government to withhold flight permission from any and all U.S. citizens who attempt, contrary to U.S. laws, to secure passage to Cuba and to demand that the Cuban Government stop issuing visas to those citizens and that all other Latin American governments be encouraged to make a similar demand of Mexico.

I am requesting that unified action by all the Latin American countries in this respect be taken up by the State Department through the Organization of American States, believing that a strongly worded protest from that Organization and from a number of Latin American nations and the United States could result in closing this open door to subversion.

I am further recommending that the State Department consider, in the event the Mexican Government does not heed this protest, that Alliance for Progress funds be withheld from Mexico until this necessary action is taken.

I am further requesting that the State Department, in cooperation with the Department of Justice, seek immediate prosecution of persons known to have violated the law, title 8, United States Code, section 1185, particularly in view of the fact that some of these persons who have visited Cuba since January 18, 1961, are known to have Communist backgrounds and others have openly and notoriously evidenced their recent visitations to Cuba in the Worker and the Peoples World, Communist front newspapers. Public statements emanating from the State Department to the effect that prosecution is

difficult would seem to be without substance in view of the notoriety some of these Cuban travelers are providing themselves.

I would be delighted to discuss this matter with you or your representative at your convenience and to make available to you such information as I have. I also suggest that the House Un-American Activities Committee has a copy of the list of some 73 U.S. citizens who, in the short period of 4 months, illegally visited Cuba through this open door of subversion through Mexico, the list of which I turned over to the committee and I am sure the committee would make it available to your Department. I have already asked that this list be made available to the Justice Department.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,  
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have previously set forth in the RECORD some 73 U.S. citizens who have gone to Cuba despite the fact it is illegal.

*Cuba*

**BIPARTISAN OPPOSITION**

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat has a well-deserved reputation as one of the fairest, most forthright newspapers in the country. In its lead editorial of March 6, the Globe focuses a clear and timely light on the subject of "Bipartisan Opposition," noting that:

The fact is, antagonism for the sterile policy Mr. Kennedy improvises at Cuba is itself bipartisan. Responsible Members of Congress are Americans first, party members second. If they fear an administration shuffling into critical national hazard, they have an obligation to oppose policy.

**BIPARTISAN OPPOSITION**

Administration spokesmen, even the President by his attitude, are blaming Republican politics for the bristling worry in Congress and the wide public disenchantment over Kennedy policy in Cuba.

But far more than that is at the root of national anxiety about our acute fumbling at Cuba.

Many Democrats have joined GOP Members of Congress in opposition, at least in open criticism, of New Frontier ploys in the Castro-Soviet issue.

The deep concern transcends politics. It is a rising fear that the country, under Mr. Kennedy's vacillating tactics and endless temporizing, nurtures in Cuba the military and subversive seeds of Communist takeover throughout Latin America—eventually a bloodless Moscow triumph in the Western Hemisphere.

The lament is heard in Washington that politics should end at the water's edge; bipartisan backing ought to rally behind the President's Cuba policy—no matter apparently what it is. Closed ranks will always be true in time of war. It is neither wise nor realistic under present conditions.

The fact is antagonism for the sterile policy Mr. Kennedy improvises at Cuba is itself bipartisan. Responsible Members of Congress are Americans first, party members, second. If they fear an administration shuffling into critical national hazard, they have an obligation to oppose policy.

This is precisely what has been happening on Capitol Hill. The back-and-fill conduct of the New Frontier at the time of the abortive Cuban blockade—and subsequent

in raising the standards of living of their people, and thus to help them maintain and strengthen free institutions and democratic values.

If our aid is not being effectively used, we will fail, or at least fall short of the objectives of our country and of the countries we assist.

So I submit the resolution today, and I have asked that it lie on the desk until April 1. I expect to consult with other Senators about it. Later, next week, I shall elaborate in more detail on my reasons for submitting the resolution.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until Monday next at 12 noon.

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

#### ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a remarkable address which was delivered yesterday by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON. The address was delivered at the First Inter-American Defense College graduation at Fort McNair. The speech was heard by many Central and South American ambassadors and distinguished representatives of those countries in both civilian and military life. It was received enthusiastically. In fact, I have been told today that many of the embassies of the South American and Central American countries have asked for copies of the speech, including the tape recording that was made of it.

The Vice President not only gave a challenging message relating to the need for solidarity and the cooperation among the members of the American states, but presented some good, hard, factual material concerning our relationships with all the countries of this hemisphere, including Cuba.

I call to the attention of the Senate particularly the facts the Vice President outlined relating to Cuba.

First. He said in Cuba, under communism, the gross national product has fallen by 25 percent.

Second. In Cuba, as elsewhere, communism has demonstrated again its inability to meet the food requirements of the people. Food consumption has declined 15 percent under Castro.

Third. Sugar production, the lifeblood of Cuba's economy traditionally, has consistently declined each year under the Communist regime, and the 1963 crop will be the smallest since the end of World War II.

Fourth. The Cuban economy has already cost the Soviet Union more than \$1 billion.

Fifth. It is of significance to Americans in each republic of this hemisphere that since communism seized control of Cuba, nearly a quarter million people have fled from Cuba.

These are the facts, as the Vice President cited them. I am sure when this colleagues in the Senate study this speech, they will find it to be one of the most thought provoking and one of the most ably documented speeches on U.S. policy relating to Latin American countries that has been delivered to date.

I compliment the Vice President and thank him for this splendid presentation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

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

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, FIRST INTER-AMERICAN DEFENSE COLLEGE GRADUATION, FORT MCNAIR, WASHINGTON, D.C.

This is a proud occasion for all the Americas—and all Americans. Only a year ago the Inter-American Defense Board observed its 20th anniversary by meeting with President Kennedy to discuss the concept of the Inter-American Defense College. The college was an improved plan then—but still on paper. Today the first class of the college meets for graduation.

It is fitting that the emphasis of the college emphasizes more than the study of military affairs alone. As the charter of this institution spells out, economic, political, and social factors—as well as military—"constitute essential components of inter-American defense."

The Republics of this hemisphere share the common purpose of safeguarding peace, independence and well-being of all men who bear the name of Americans. But that purpose cannot be accomplished by arms alone. To preserve peace, to maintain independence, and to further the well-being of all our people, we must achieve political, economic and social stability under responsible and responsible democratic institutions.

That is the purpose of the Alliance for Progress. That is the purpose of the deliberations underway today in Central America. That is—and will continue to be—the purpose of our expanding efforts to achieve greater unity and more effective cooperation among the free nations of this New World.

At this moment, the most urgent problem in our hemisphere is the existence of communism in Cuba. Our mutual objective is to end that Communist regime in Cuba. We cannot be really content until communism is gone from Cuba and gone from this hemisphere.

The united action last October of the Organization of American States made indelibly clear that the Americas will not acquiesce to the establishment of Communist arms in the Western Hemisphere.

Equally, we shall not be content until the last of Soviet forces are withdrawn from Cuban soil.

We are mutually determined that the Cuban people shall have opportunity to choose their own government, freely and without oppression.

If the naked attempt of the Soviet Union to transform Cuba into a military threat to the hemisphere required realism of us all, no less realism is required of us in meeting the broader threat to our security which is presented by the presence of poverty, privation, illiteracy, disease, and injustice anywhere among our Republics.

The basic problem of security in our hemisphere is not Cuba, not Castro, not communism. The most impressive lesson learned from Cuba is that communism is not the answer to the need of this hemisphere. Cuba is clearly proving to be for the Communists a showcase of failure—not a show window of

success. Where West Berlin stands behind the Iron Curtain as a conspicuous example of the superiority of freedom, Cuba today exists within the community of free American Republics as an even more glaring example of Communist failure in and for the New World.

We must not overlook—we must not minimize—the significance and importance of these facts:

1. In Cuba, under communism, the gross national product has fallen by 25 percent.

2. In Cuba, as elsewhere, communism has demonstrated again its inability to meet the food requirements of the people. Food consumption has declined 15 percent under Castro. For the past 1 year, foodstuffs have been rationed. Clothing was added to the ration list last month.

3. Sugar production, the lifeblood of Cuba's economy traditionally, has consistently declined each year under the Communist regime and the 1963 crop will be the smallest since the end of World War II.

4. The Cuban economy has already cost the Soviet Union more than \$1 billion. We estimate that Cuba currently is costing the Soviets \$1 million per day. Yet even this support has been unable to arrest the deterioration and decline of the Cuban economy.

5. Finally, it is of significance to Americans in each Republic of this hemisphere that since communism seized control of Cuba, nearly a quarter million people have fled from Cuba. The United States has issued authorizations to another 300,000 Cubans to enter this country if they are permitted to leave their island prison. I might add that we have received nearly 600,000 individual Cuban requests for visa waivers.

To rectify these facts is to rectify a story of failure—the failure of communism in this hemisphere. That failure is inherent in the Communist system itself. But we must not overlook the fact that this failure is also a result of the unity and cooperation of free nations acting together through nonmilitary means to accelerate and precipitate that failure.

While some argue that the application of selective controls are not enough, it is well for us to examine the results of our efforts in this regard.

1. In 1962, free world trade with Cuba was less than \$90 million—only one-tenth the precommunism level. That trade will be even lower this year.

2. Total trade between Cuba and all of Latin America last year was only \$12 million and will virtually disappear this year. I would emphasize that a large portion of the free world's limited 1962 trade with Cuba was food. None of it was in arms. None of it was strategic goods. None of Cuba's oil came from or is coming from free world sources.

3. Contrary to some beliefs, free world countries are cooperating closely in these efforts. Free world shipping to Cuban ports is now one-tenth what it was before October. Where in January 1962 128 free world ships put in at Cuban ports, in January of this year only 12 free world ships carried cargoes to Cuba.

4. Increasingly effective political isolation of the Communist regime in Cuba has been achieved on a hemispheric basis. Fourteen Latin American countries have broken diplomatic relations with Cuba. Last October complete hemispheric solidarity on the Cuban issue was achieved for the first time with the unanimous vote in support of the quarantine. In many student and labor elections in the hemisphere during the past 2 years there have been significant gains for the democratic forces and a significant decline in the appeal and influence of Castro communism.

5. Members of the OAS are now taking vigorous steps to deal with the threat of Cuban subversion of democratic institutions throughout the hemisphere.

More could be mentioned. These measures make the point, however, that both the will and the capacity of American Republics to unite in common purpose is maturing responsibility—and this offers all of us solid and tangible encouragement to believe that we can achieve and maintain the unity essential to meet and master the long-standing and continuing problems of our hemisphere.

If Cuba offers to Americans, North and South, convincing proof that communism does not hold the answer to the needs and aspirations of the peoples of this hemisphere, we must not fail to look at the other side of the coin. Communism's failure merely underscores for us freedom's responsibilities. The needs of this hemisphere are needs of the people. Those needs must be met—and we must meet them under freedom.

The presence of Communist forces in Cuba is testimony to the ultimate failure of communism in this hemisphere. Those forces are there because communism cannot—in either the New World or the Old World—dare to permit the people to exercise the rights of representative democracy.

The high purpose of the Alliance for Progress is to make real for all the peoples of the Americas a democratic alternative to the doctrine and dogma and defaults of totalitarianism—in all its forms.

The ultimate goal of the Alliance for Progress is to serve the people of this hemisphere. The Alliance for Progress is for people—it was designed to solve human problems, to help people to live better and more productive, more dignified and satisfactory lives. Through the Alliance, we are trying to make accessible for every citizen of this hemisphere the opportunity to satisfy men's basic needs for home, land, work, and schooling in an environment of freedom and health and opportunity.

The real story of the Alliance for Progress is not the present story of its difficulties but, rather, the long-range story of its absolute necessity. All alliances, all effective confederations, all successful unifications among freemen have begun uncertainty. Unity itself is more difficult to achieve than are the works which flow from unity. But unity of purpose is the special genius of this hemisphere and we can be confident that this genius will find its finest hour in the 10 years of common purpose of our efforts through the Alliance for Progress.

Building new industries and new roads, laying new rails, and modernizing old agricultures are difficult labors. Even so, it is easier and quicker to do these things than to produce a people with an economy capable of fully utilizing such works. Under the Alliance for Progress, we are trying to do both. Long, hard years may lie ahead. But those years of effort and progress will be neither so long nor so hard as the years of inertia and inaction which lie forever behind us.

In the work that we must do as Americans, the military of the American Republics will be filling a creative and constructive role of the first magnitude. Under the civic action program, we began last year actively encouraging Latin American armed forces to expand their participation in public works, in improving agriculture, transportation and communications, health, sanitation, and other such lasting contributions to economic and social development. Such work has been performed as a matter of standard practice over the years by armed forces in a number of our Republics, such as Peru, Bolivia, Brazil, and Chile. In Peru and Bolivia, this country has supported engineer construction units through our military as-

istance program—and we are now actively planning expansion of this program in other countries of the hemisphere.

Because we live in a hemisphere where peace has found a home, we can realistically look forward to utilizing our military forces for the full realization of the promise of peace. This is a pioneering concept—a new departure in the affairs of man. It is a new departure of which all members of the military of our Republics can be especially proud to take an active and creative part.

All of our achievements in hemispheric unity—whether military or nonmilitary in character—aim toward the common purpose of realizing the fruits of peace. We must not be deterred from this goal. We must maintain the strength, efficiency, and alertness of our military forces. We must be sure of our state of preparedness, as we must be swift in our response to danger. But the presence of military challenges must not mislead us to believe that the solution of our problems in this hemisphere is a military solution alone—or even foremost.

Today, as throughout the modern history of the Western Hemisphere, our guard must be constant and strong against subversion of our democratic institutions and integrity. But we can well recall the words of a great free world leader—not of our hemisphere—Winston Churchill, who said: "The first victory we have to win is to avoid a battle; the second, if we cannot avoid it, to win it."

Against the dangers which face us, we must bring the response of responsible freemen to bear—the response of greater unity, constant cooperation, continuing joint purpose. There can be no peace in the hemisphere unless there is peace in the world and there will be no peace in the world if we are irresponsible as peacekeepers in the hemispheres. Our purpose is peace—with honor. But we shall not allow our honor to be compromised, our freedom to be jeopardized, and our opportunity to be defaulted.

#### ASSISTANCE IN PROVISION OF HOUSING FOR ELDERLY PERSONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly persons on behalf of myself, Senator MORSE, Senator RANDOLPH, Senator McINTYRE, and Senator NEUBERGER. I ask that the bill be allowed to lie on the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bill (S. 1170) to assist in the provision of housing for elderly persons, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in his message on the aging, President Kennedy painted a full portrait of the sorry plight in which many of our older citizens find themselves. He drew attention, in particular, to the very special problems of shelter faced by those who are past their middle sixties.

One-fourth do not have households of their own, but live in the homes of relatives, in lodging houses, or in institutions. Of the remainder, over 30 percent live in substandard housing lacking

a private bath, toilet, or hot running water, or which is otherwise dilapidated or deficient. And many others live in housing unsafe or unsuitable for elderly people.

The President further pointed out that almost half of those over 65 and living alone receive \$1,000 or less a year. About half the spending units headed by persons over 65 have liquid assets of less than \$1,000. Two-fifths have a total net worth, including their home, of less than \$5,000.

Last year, the Subcommittee on Elderly Housing of the Special Committee on the Aging, of which I had the honor to serve as chairman, held extensive hearings on the shelter problems of the elderly. Out of those hearings came important legislation but it was introduced too late in the session for action.

Mr. President, the subcommittee's findings coincided precisely with those of the President. Many of our older people with very limited income live in rental housing which falls far short of any reasonable standard of health or safety. Nearly 40 percent of those who live in rental housing are in quarters classified as substandard and yet they are frequently charged exorbitant rents.

It is true, of course, that over the years Congress has enacted a variety of measures designed to ease the shelter problems of the elderly. Within the higher income brackets these programs have been generally successful in meeting a vital need. But they fail to meet the requirements of most single older persons and those couples who can afford to pay only \$40 or so per month.

Under the public housing program, for example, approximately 120,000 persons 65 and over now have been provided shelter—just under 80,000 families. But over 2 million elderly persons have incomes low enough to qualify for this kind of housing.

Under section 202 of the Housing Act, long-term loans may be made to private nonprofit corporations, consumer cooperatives, or public bodies which sponsor rental or cooperative housing for older people. Fund authorizations for this program currently are far below the applications. This has occurred despite difficulty in finding sponsors to undertake these projects in specific communities. Such an undertaking requires a high level of expertise—in many communities most available in the local housing authority. Unfortunately, however, such authorities are presently excluded from participation in the program.

The subcommittee found that rental housing stimulated by section 231 of the Housing Act, which insures lenders against losses on mortgages used for construction or rehabilitation of rental accommodations for older persons, has been largely in so-called retirement communities in the sunshine States of Arizona, California, and Florida. Comparatively little use of the program is found in the more populous States.

The FHA loan program for moderate income housing, enacted in 1961, is greatly impaired by its limitation to

Mr. Justice Reed replied, "A rule of law should not be drawn from a figure of speech." He pointed out that Jefferson's letter says religion is a matter between a man and his God; he owes account of it to none other; and the powers of government reach actions only.

He could not see in these propositions any clear prohibition against the released-time program in Champaign. On the contrary, he suggested, Jefferson himself, with Madison's approval, had worked out a scheme by which the University of Virginia could see to it that all students received religious instruction.

The wall builders on the court may be accused of misplaced piety. Their devotional sentiments might better have been directed to the Constitution, which speaks only of the prohibition of establishment and the exercise of freedom, than to words appearing in what may have been a routine acknowledgment of a complimentary address, words written by a man, however great, who did not take part in the adoption of the first amendment.

The same may be said of Mr. Justice Frankfurter's quotation in the McCollum case from General Grant, who there receives what must be the first tribute ever paid him as a political philosopher.

The wall has done what walls usually do: it has obscured the view. It has lent a simplistic air to the discussion of a very complicated matter. Hence, it has caused confusion whenever it has been invoked.

Far from helping to decide cases, it has made opinions and decisions unintelligible. The wall is offered as a reason. It is not a reason; it is a figure of speech.

The problems of Mr. Justice Jackson are instructive. In *Everson v. Board of Education* he said in dissent that (1) Catholic education is the rock (another unfortunate metaphor) upon which the Catholic church rests, and aid to a Catholic school is the same as aid to the church. (2) "Our public school, if not a product of Protestantism, at least is more consistent with it than with the Catholic culture and scheme of values."

This would mean that supporting public schools is supporting Protestant churches, or at least something that by being more consistent with them tends to lend them support. (3) Public education is organized on the premise that education can be isolated from all religious teaching so that the school can inculcate all needed temporal knowledge and also maintain a strict and lofty neutrality as to religion.

Mr. Justice Jackson adds, as it seems to me indefensible, "Whether such a disjunction is possible, and if possible whether it is wise, are questions I need not try to answer."

A man who rests his opinion on the necessity of separation is bound to try to answer the question whether separation can in fact occur. If it cannot occur, then, according to his own doctrine, the State will be supporting religious teaching.

Concurring in the McCollum case, Mr. Justice Jackson went in even deeper. There he said: "I think it remains to be demonstrated whether it is possible, even if desirable, completely to isolate and cast out of secular education all that some people may reasonably regard as religious instruction. The fact is, that for good or for ill, nearly everything in our culture worth transmitting, everything which gives meaning to life, is saturated with religious influences. But now one can teach, with satisfaction or even with justice to all faiths, such subjects as the story of the Reformation, the Inquisition, or even the New England effort to found a Church without a bishop and a cate without a King, is more than I know. When instruction turns to proselytizing and imparting knowledge becomes evangelism and, except in the crudest cases, a subtle inquiry.

It is idle to pretend that this task is one for which we can find in the Constitution one word to help us as judges to decide where the secular ends and the sectarian begins in education. Nor can we find guidance in any other legal source.

"It is a matter on which we can find no law but our own prepossessions. If with no surer legal guidance we are to take up and decide every variation of this controversy we are likely to make the legal 'wall of separation between church and state' as winding as the famous serpentine wall designed by Mr. Jefferson for the university he founded."

And sure enough, in the *Zorach* case, Mr. Justice Jackson found that "the wall which the Court was professing to erect between church and state has become even more warped and twisted than I expected."

A man who proposes to erect a wall in the midst of a saturated solution and have the material on one side different from that on the other should not be surprised at the failure of his experiment.

Like Mr. Justice Jackson, the Educational Policies Commission holds that "knowledge about religion is essential for a full understanding of our culture, literature, art, history, and current affairs."

But if knowledge about religion is to be communicated, it will presumably be communicated by somebody who has a view of the subject and who cannot be expected to conceal it. If he is paid by the state, what has happened to the wall?

As Mr. Justice Jackson suggests, the wall is really a permeable membrane, and is getting more porous all the time. The well-worn catalog of, so-called aids to religion that Mr. Justice Reed began in the McCollum case and that Justices Douglas and Stewart reiterated in *Engel v. Vitale* is getting longer every day.

Whenever public policy seems to require the expenditure of public funds for a public purpose, the incidental "aid to religion," if any, is disregarded.

This has been held true of bus transportation, free textbooks, and hospitals. It is true of aid under the GI bill of rights, of school lunches, of expenditures under the National Defense Education Act, of scholarships and fellowships awarded by public agencies, some of which are granted to theological schools.

And certiorari was denied when New York helped Fordham University acquire land in Lincoln Center at less than cost.

As nondiscriminatory tax exemption, which is solid financial aid, has never been successfully challenged when granted a church or church schools, so financial aid directed to a public purpose other than the support of religion has never been struck down by the U.S. Supreme Court even when the financial benefit to religious organizations was obvious.

This is as it should be. When something has to be done through schools, colleges, and universities, it should be self-defeating to try to act as though schools, colleges, and universities under religious auspices did not exist and did not have innumerable students, teachers, and scholars who ought to be involved.

If it is objected that nonbelievers are thereby taxed to aid religion, the answer is that by hypothesis the aid to religion is incidental to an overriding public benefit that cannot be obtained without including institutions under religious auspices, and that, since the object of the religion clauses of the first amendment is to guarantee and promote religious freedom, such incidental benefits, which do not limit religious freedom, do not invalidate the legislation.

Federal aid to education is inevitable, and the sooner it comes the better. The flagrant injustice, to say nothing of shortsightedness, in committing the support of education to 50

States characterized by wide economic disparities and highly mobile populations requires no elaboration here. Federal aid has arrived in a large way by the back door. Its formal admission through the main entrance cannot be long delayed.

Federal aid should go to all educational institutions that meet Federal standards. Mr. Justice Jackson is wrong in saying a school is a church if it is managed by a church and is important to its religious work.

A school is an educational institution and not a church if its object is intellectual development and if it is engaged, bona fide, in this task. The fact that it is owned by a church, or that it gives some religious instruction, or that its teaching is permeated by religion, or that aid to it is incidentally of some benefit to the church is immaterial.

Aid to all educational institutions that meet Federal standards would promote religious freedom as well as education. The overriding public purpose would be to improve education, including education in institutions under religious auspices.

Supporting them would no more be a violation of the first amendment than it would be to hold institutions under religious auspices to Federal standards as a condition of receiving Federal aid.

Since the object of the first amendment is to guarantee and promote religious freedom, including freedom from religion, it is a violation of the amendment to apply pressure, direct or indirect, upon the conscience of any person.

Such pressure may have been present, though Justices Douglas and Stewart did not detect it, in *Engel v. Vitale*. It may also lurk in the *Zorach* case and in *Doremus v. Board of Education*.

The "brief moment with eternity" the Supreme Court of New Jersey there said the statute compelled every child to have every day is not within the competence of the State, and excusing any pupil in the borough of Hawthorne upon request may substitute indirect for direct pressure. Distinctions among schoolchildren on the basis of their religion, or lack of it, are bound to seem invidious.

This brings us back to the perplexities of Mr. Justice Jackson. We may all agree that a school that children are compelled to attend should not hold religious ceremonies in which some children or their parents do not believe.

But suppose the educational authorities, taking the hint from Mr. Justice Jackson and the Educational Policies Commission, decide that every child in such a school, before he reaches the school-leaving age, must take a course in religion, or in the history of religion, or in comparative religion.

Since the object is education and not the propagation of religion, no question can be raised about the support of religion or the invasion of religious freedom. The only questions are whether the course and the teacher are adequate. It is doubtful whether these are questions for the courts, or even for the legislature.

We need to learn what education is and who is responsible for its general direction and its content. I suggest we might try to establish the distinction among edification, indoctrination, and education and then work toward the elimination of everything but education from educational institutions.

My principal objection to the prayer considered in *Engel v. Vitale* is not constitutional; it is educational. The prayer was a part of the so-called moral training program of the board of regents. It had little or no value as such training.

In any event, the primary responsibility of the board of regents is not moral training, which is the province of the family and the church, but education, which may supply the intellectual foundations of morality,

A1650

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 21

but which does not attempt to convey its moral message by way of edification or indoctrination. In general we may say that a teacher who tries to indoctrinate his pupils is incompetent and should be subject to discipline from the proper quarter.

In *Pierce v. Society of Sisters* the court said the child was not the mere creature of the state. Is the school the mere creature of the state?

We may admit the self-evident truth that an educational system supported by taxes cannot survive if it does not command the allegiance of the taxpayers. Does this mean that the policies and curriculum of schools are to be determined by the taxpayers?

Two ancient propositions are the starting point of any discussion of the autonomy of educational institutions. The first is, all men by nature desire to know. The second is, politics is the architectonic science, which determines what shall be studied in the State.

The first proposition is normative; the second is descriptive. Any actual educational system is judged by the degree to which it meets the standard of the first proposition and makes it possible for all men to know. The free speech, free press, and free assembly provisions of the first amendment proclaim this ideal for the United States.

The New York Supreme Court, dismissing a suit to compel the board of education to remove "Oliver Twist" and "The Merchant of Venice" from school libraries and classrooms, said:

"Educational institutions are concerned with the development of free inquiry and learning. The administrative officers must be free to guide teachers and pupils toward that goal. Their discretion must not be interfered with in the absence of proof of actual malevolent intent."

Concurring in *Wieman v. Updegraff*, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, joined by Mr. Justice Douglas, found that State and National power could not limit the functions of educational institutions, from the primary participation of teachers in "that restless enduring process of extending the bounds of understanding and wisdom, to assure which the freedoms of thought, of speech, of inquiry, of worship are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States against infringement by the National or State government."

The wall has no future. What has a future is the rational, nonmetaphorical discussion, in the light of all the provisions of the first amendment, of the methods by which we may guarantee and promote religious freedom and the methods by which we may obtain an educational system worthy of the potentialities and responsibilities of our people.

The first amendment is a charter of learning. It confirms empowerments as well as immunities. We are to learn how to use our freedom.

If we are to be metaphorical, let us recognize that the first amendment is not intended as a fence, or wall, around a vacant lot. Something is supposed to be going on inside. What is supposed to be going on is learning. A political community is an educational life in process.

The wall has no future because it cannot help us learn. If taken literally, it is arbitrary and unreasonable, pretending to separate things that are not in all respects separable, thwarting efforts to understand what education and freedom of (and from) religion demand, hampering us in our search for what we need above everything else, a national idea of education and a national program to carry it out.

If the West has a future, it is as the schoolmaster of the world. If democracy has a future, it lies in struggling to be what no

big, advanced, industrial country has succeeded in becoming, a community learning together to govern itself and to achieve the common good.

American participation in these great enterprises should not be obstructed by a figure of speech.

## Cuban Problem

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a newsletter from the Yorkville Enquirer, York, S.C. from our beloved and distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON. The letter is as follows:

## CUBAN PROBLEM

(By Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina)

Overshadowing all other problems facing the Congress is the needling and dangerous problem of Cuba. In a very short time, Castro and his brand of communism in Cuba has become a great funnel for world communism to pour in on the Western Hemisphere. Castro and Cuba do not just represent an island of Communist activity but a dynamite key which could blast us into world war if treated carelessly.

In view of this situation, it is my opinion that any public official making statements concerning the Cuban situation should do so only with care and when he is armed with facts. Officials of Government, whether they are elected like myself or appointed as they are in the State and Defense Departments, must realize that when they speak to the people of the United States and the world, they have the ability to inflame and excite or to calm and subdue.

## REPUBLICANS RESPONSIBLE

The Kennedy administration inherited the Cuban mess from the previous Republican administration and the very ones who are now attacking the administration for its policy in Cuba, were a part and parcel of the Eisenhower administration which helped to put Castro in office. It was back in 1957 that I conducted an investigation into Communist activity in Latin and Central America. In my published report I warned the Republican State Department and President Eisenhower that unless we took affirmative action in the Caribbean area as well as in other points in Latin America to lead these people away from communism, that world communism would gain a foothold in the Western Hemisphere. Those who now criticize President Kennedy, at that time laughed off my report and continued to ignore Latin America.

Later, when Castro's revolt was progressing in Cuba, the State Department under Eisenhower, together with his own executive orders, halted the shipment of arms and supplies necessary to protect the Cuban Government against the Rebel Castro. The Republican administration closed its eyes at shipments of American arms and other help to Castro's Communist guerrillas in the mountains of Cuba.

## NAIVE STATE DEPARTMENT

Castro had hardly reached Havana to claim his new office of Dictator when the State Department rushed in blindly to recog-

nize the new regime without even so much as asking a question. During all this time, I had pointed out in the Senate by speeches and press releases, Castro was surrounded by a brother and a number of key friends who had been trained by Russians in guerrilla warfare tactics and who had been schooled in communism. Long before the first Russian saw Cuban soil, the Eisenhower administration could have acted out of a just cause when our properties were seized and our citizens jailed and some even shot to death. This was the time to act.

The leadership in the Republican Party which now criticizes Kennedy for his policies toward Cuba, conveniently forgot the mess they made and handed to President Kennedy when he took office. The time to preserve the Monroe Doctrine should have been when it was being torn up and not wait until now when the Russians are holding the pieces.

## NOT POLITICAL ISSUE

Any politician who harps on the Cuban situation to make it a political issue is doing his nation a great disservice. Those who cry invasion without just provocation should accompany their remarks with an estimation of how many Americans will die as a result. We are not cowards but neither do we wish to be foolhardy. So I urge every citizen to weigh carefully the charges and countercharges that may come as a result of major and lesser crises coming from the Cuban situation. We must rid Cuba of communism, but the means we use to achieve this end can be the difference between peace and war.

## Message to Hibernian Society of Baltimore From President Kennedy

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as is customary, the Hibernian Society of Baltimore left no stone unturned to make their St. Patrick's Day celebration last Saturday one of the biggest and best the city has seen for a long time. Approximately a thousand members and guests were in attendance, including all the members of the Maryland congressional delegation.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, GEORGE FALLON, not only the dean of the Maryland delegation in the House, but obviously Irish, was honored by the society by being selected to toast the President. Incidentally, several years ago President Kennedy was the guest speaker at the annual dinner. Following the toast, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], read the following message which was sent to the group by the President:

## THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington.

It has been said, by an Irishman I am sure, that the whole world is Irish on the 17th of March. Perhaps not the whole world, but it is indeed true and worth noting well that the joyful observance of St. Patrick's Day is now fully as much an American as an Irish tradition.

It is no simple matter to fix in words the teeming and contrary past, far less the bounding future of the Gael. Effort, even

"Our Schools and Their Prospects." The report outlines the present state of the at the problem in its fullest dimensions District school system, and spells out what must be done to bring the physical plant up to acceptable standards. The present situation is so poor as to be practically beyond recall, without immediate improvement in the budgetary support given to the District schools.

I am confident that the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress will give this report the full attention and study it deserves. I intend to do whatever I can to see that its basic recommendations are carried out.

If we reject the recommendations contained in "Our Schools and Their Prospects," let us do so honestly, and without deluding ourselves in the process. Let us frankly admit that our District schools are rapidly becoming mere way stations between the streets, the reformatories, and the penitentiaries. If we are willing to accept this policy for District schools, perhaps we might just as well begin cutting the existing budgetary requests.

On the other hand, if we decide to provide more adequate facilities, let us look and courageously accept our responsibilities.

I know the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is deeply concerned about these conditions, in his capacity as chairman of the District Appropriations Subcommittee. He has advocated increased expenditures for the District schools, and has consistently demonstrated a keen determination to bring about a more adequate building and salary program. He certainly will have the full support of the Senator from Minnesota, who is honored to serve with him as a member of the District Appropriations Subcommittee.

*Kennedy*  
**PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S MEETING WITH THE PRESIDENTS OF THE CENTRAL AMERICAN REPUBLICS**

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to comment on President Kennedy's trip, this week, to Costa Rica, to meet with the Presidents of the six Central American Republics. This is, indeed, a notable event. It is one more indication that the Kennedy administration considers Latin America to be one of the most critical areas in the world. The personal visit of our President is a true reflection of the importance which our country places on the Alliance for Progress. It is hard to overestimate the importance of a Presidential visit to the long-neglected Central American Republics; and already the press reports informing us of the overwhelmingly enthusiastic reception the President received indicate that our Central American neighbors fully appreciate the significance of the visit.

I was sure the President would receive that kind of warm and enthusiastic welcome. In my visits to Central America and South America, I found that President Kennedy is exceedingly popular and highly respected.

The Declaration of Central America, issued by the Presidents of the Central

American countries, along with the President of Panama and the President of the United States, is a remarkable document, and in the years ahead will rank as one of the basic documents of the Alliance for Progress. In this document the Presidents of the seven countries addressed themselves to two key problems facing the Central American area: First, the problem of Central American economic integration, and second, the problem of the threat to the internal security of the Central American countries from Castro-Communist subversion.

In my report, on the Alliance for Progress that was issued last week, it was my privilege to discuss these matters at some length.

Today I will note only one or two highlights contained in the Declaration of Central America. First, I am happy to note the expressed determination of the seven Presidents to accelerate programs aimed at achieving the economic integration of the area, and that the United States has indicated a willingness to make a substantial contribution to a special fund to promote regional integration. I take particular pleasure in noting that this proposal is similar to one contained in my report on the Alliance for Progress. I am also encouraged that the President of the United States indicated our willingness to make available substantial assistance to implement a regional plan for economic and social development, when such a plan is completed by the Central American countries. In all of these actions, our Government is once again making unmistakably clear our support of the regional integration movement in Central America.

On the question of resisting Communist subversion in Central America, it is encouraging to note that the Declaration of Central America places high priority on early action by members of the OAS to restrict movement of materiel, propaganda and funds, as well as arms and trained saboteurs, to and from Cuba. To achieve this aim, the Central American countries and the United States will cooperate in joint programs for additional air and sea surveillance to cut down on the movement of men and materiel from Cuba, and will work out a system of exchanging intelligence information on the movement of people, money, propaganda and arms between Cuba and Central American countries.

Third, I am happy to note that the Presidents took note of the plight of the Cuban people, and expressed their sympathy for them. In my report last week I stated:

At the same time it is important that throughout Cuba and all Latin America it be clearly understood that we want the Castro-Communist tyranny to be replaced with the best of governments, that we will not tolerate a rightwing dictatorship. A Cuban government dedicated to political liberty and economic and social reforms will have the firm support of the United States.

It is heartening to note that the Presidents of the Central American countries and the President of the United States share this view. Mr. President, I ask

unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, an article reporting on the meetings in Costa Rica.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 19, 1963]

(By Dan Kurzman, staff reporter)

**COSTA RICA CROWD HAILS KENNEDY—PLEDGE TO CONTAIN CUBA COMMUNISM IS WILDLY CHEERED**

(By Dan Kurzman, Staff Reporter)

SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA, March 18.—This usually sleepy Caribbean capital went wild today as virtually the whole population turned out to welcome President Kennedy in a frenzied reception that surprised even the optimistic observers.

The crowds that greeted Mr. Kennedy were estimated at more than 250,000. After a tumultuous greeting along the 3-mile route from the airport to the Presidential Palace, Mr. Kennedy last night addressed the Presidents of the six Central American Republics in San Jose's ornate National Theater.

**WALL OF DETERMINATION**

"We will build a wall around Cuba—not a wall of mortar or brick or barbed wire but a wall of dedicated men determined to protect their own freedom and sovereignty," he said after hearing speeches by the other conference participants.

In opening his 3-day meeting with the Presidents of the six Middle-American nations he vowed "ferce and unyielding resistance" to the spread of "foreign tyranny" in the Western Hemisphere.

"The Soviet Union through its Cuban puppets absorbed the Cuba nation into its despotic empire—and it now seeks to extend its rule to the shores of continental America," Mr. Kennedy said.

"At the Organization of American States, at this meeting and wherever Americans gather to consult about the future of their continent, we will continue to strengthen the structure of resistance to subversion."

**ALLIANCE STRESSED**

A major portion of the President's speech was devoted to the Alliance for Progress. Mr. Kennedy pledged continued U.S. aid toward the developing Central American Economic Community and congratulated the assembled nations on their long-range economic vision. All except Panama have joined in a move toward economic integration.

"We shall continue under the Alliance to build economies more balanced and less dependent on one or two export commodities," he said. "To this end, we must push forward plans for industrialization, greater crop diversification, strong educational facilities and better utilization of resources."

From the moment the President and his party left the airport, where he was greeted by his host, President Francisco J. Orlich of Costa Rica, the waiting throngs were an explosive mass of emotion. The President's car was swallowed up in a sea of screaming people waving United States and Central American flags, and it was impossible to see him, or the car, even from several feet behind.

Dozens of youths climbed aboard the press buses that followed and stamped on the roof. Others reached into the windows to shake the hands of reporters who were reminded of the tumultuous welcome given President Eisenhower in New Delhi 4 years ago.

Smiling women in summery print dresses held up their children to see the procession. Many people made the V-sign with their fingers.

"This is one of the most important days in Latin American history," one Costa Rican official said.

It was apparent that the spirit of mutual partnership in which the Alliance for Progress was spawning was at last showing signs of blossoming. The Central American people were known to be friendly to the United States, and their hospitality was anticipated. But today's demonstration appeared to indicate more than friendliness. It seemed to reflect a sense of genuine kinship.

The tremendous welcome given Mr. Kennedy augurs well for the 3-day Presidential conference that started today. There is hope here that the wild enthusiasm will give the Alliance for Progress a significant shot in the arm, at least in Central America.

And it seemed to give more meaning to President Orlich's welcoming remark that the results of the Conference may affect all Latin America as well as the rest of the world.

In a brief reply at the airport, Mr. Kennedy said:

"I come here today not only with Members of Congress and the Secretary of State but as the representative of 180 million fellow Americans who want this hemisphere to be free and an example to a watching world in the crucial years of this century," he said.

American officials here are stressing that economic integration under the Alliance will be the main topic of conversation, and that the issue of subversion will be secondary.

The meeting is regarded as a means of putting some teeth into a statement made by President Kennedy at a recent news conference that the social and economic improvement of the Latin nations was the most important hemisphere problem.

Measures to be taken to reduce Castro-Communist subversion, it appears, will be discussed more for political purposes than as a topic of overwhelming importance. The Presidents of the six isthmus nations represented—Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Panama—actually seem more interested in discussing subversion than do the others.

This is attributed by diplomatic observers partly to an honest fear of Castro-Communist activity, partly to efforts to take the minds of the people off explosive domestic problems, and partly to a desire to please what is believed to be a large segment of American popular and congressional opinion.

It is expected that the final communique will recommend that anti-subversion measures be taken by the participating nations individually, particularly in regard to restrictions on travel to and from Cuba.

The United States is likely to set the stage, however, for an impressive offer of economic aid after the conference to facilitate the advancement of the Central American Common Market and other measures for economic integration, which is considered necessary for the area's advancement under the Alliance and the containment of communism.

**Mr. HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, the first article tells of the warm and enthusiastic reception which the President of the United States received when he arrived at San Jose. The article is entitled "Costa Rica Crowd Hails Kennedy." The article states, in part:

This usually sleepy Caribbean capital went wild today as virtually the whole population turned out to welcome President Kennedy in a frenzied reception that surprised even the most optimistic observers.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of President Kennedy's speech, delivered in San Jose on March 18, for the opening of his conference with the presidents of the Central American Republics; also a news article entitled "Anti-Castro Plan Set Up

at San Jose"; also the official text of the Declaration of Central America; and also the text of President Kennedy's speech at Costa Rica University

There being no objection, the addresses, the article, and the declaration were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 19, 1963]  
TEXT OF KENNEDY SPEECH AT SAN JOSE CONFERENCE

In 1825 a son of El Salvador and a citizen of Central America, Antonio Jose Canas, first minister accredited by the United Provinces of General America to the United States, delivered an invitation to Secretary of State Henry Clay.

He asked him to send representatives to the first Inter-American Congress at Panama, a meeting at which he said the struggling new nations of this hemisphere "might consider upon and adopt best plan for defending states of new world from foreign aggression and . . . raise them to that elevation of wealth and power which from their resources they may attain."

Today, 108 years later, we are gathered in this theater in pursuit of those same goals—preservation of our independence, extension of freedom and elevation of welfare of our citizens to a level as high as "from our resources" we can attain.

And today I, too, have come from the United States at the invitation of Central America, which, with Panama, is rapidly attaining a unity of purpose, effort and achievement which has been unknown since the dissolution of that earliest federation.

That early conference did not achieve all its goals. But from it flowed a dream and creation of Bolivar and Canas and Jose Cecilio de Valle of Costa Rica—a dream which became the Inter-American system, and this system has been the most successful, the most fruitful and most enduring system of international order in the history of all the world.

#### UNMATCHED RECORD

We can say this without exaggeration, because every effort to reimpose despotisms of the old world on the people of the new has been ultimately beaten back, because within this system 20 republics have attained full recognition of their dignity as sovereign nations—and because this system has maintained an unmatched record of peaceful relations among its members.

There have been occasional conflicts to mar this record. But nowhere else have nations lived as neighbors with so little hostility and warfare. And today the principle of non-intervention and peaceful resolution of disputes has been so firmly imbedded in our tradition that the heroic democracy in which we meet today can pursue its national goals without an armed force to guard its frontiers. In few other spots in the world would this be true.

We have not attained this strength by trying merely to protect what was already won, to preserve gains of the past to maintain the status quo. If these were our system's goals it would inevitably have crumbled as old orders crumbled.

Instead it has survived, prospered and grown despite wars and revolutions, despite changing ideologies and changing technologies, despite shifts in power and shifts in wealth—because it has itself been an instrument of change, profound revolutionary change which has molded the history of this hemisphere and shaped the thinking of men seeking freedom and dignity.

#### UNIQUE EFFORT

As each powerful new wave of ideas and aspirations has swept across our shores the Inter-American system has been able to

translate these ideas and aspirations into working reality for our people. In this respect it has been unique among efforts at world collaboration and this is why it has endured and will endure in future.

In the first three centuries of our history seeds of Western civilization and culture were here planted. In the next century we established an Inter-American system which helped to complete and maintain our freedom from foreign rule.

This freedom has often been challenged—as it is challenged today in Cuba. But with help of dedicated and brave men—men such as those who drove out Maximilian or men such as those who prevented Spanish reconquest in 1866, men such as Costa Rica's Juan Rafael Mora, who helped drive out William Walker—with such help we have destroyed all efforts at foreign conquest in the past as we will ultimately triumph over aggressors of today.

In the 50 years following its creation the Inter-American system worked to establish politically the equality and national dignity of all its members to extend political democracy and to strengthen the principle that no nation should forcibly impose its will upon another.

Those goals have been largely met. Equality of sovereign states is accepted by all. Intervention and force have been renounced, machinery of peaceful settlement has been strengthened. Democracy rules in most of our lands and it will ultimately prevail over the last vestiges of tyranny in every land in this hemisphere.

#### NEW CHALLENGES

Now, in our own time the Inter-American system faces old foes and new challenges and it is again demonstrating capacity for change which has always given it strength. Foes are stronger and more determined than ever before and challenges are more difficult, more complex and more burdensome.

For today we are faced not merely with protection of new nations, but with remolding of ancient societies—not only with the destruction of political enemies but with the destruction of poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease—not alone with the creation of national dignity, but with the preservation of human dignity. To meet this enormous challenge peoples of the Americas have fashioned an Alianza.

The Alliance for Progress is a system in which all American states have mobilized their resources and energies to secure land for the landless, education for those without schools, and a faster rate of economic growth within a society where all can share in fruits of progress.

Here in Central America we have already begun to move toward goals of Alianza. You have made enormous strides toward creation of the Central American economic community of 13 million people. New regional institutions have been created, a Central American Bank has been established, and centralized planning and direction are going ahead in education, finance, and many other fields.

I congratulate you on your effort to re-establish a historic unity to meet new needs and I pledge my Government's continued assistance to that effort.

#### REFORM CITED

In addition, you have begun to formulate long-range economic development plans essential to the success of Alianza. In nearly every country represented here, new land reform or tax reform programs have been adopted in an effort to meet basic pledges of increased social justice contained in the charter of Punta Del Este and demanded by your people.

In the 2-year period beginning July 1961 under programs supported by the United States as its contribution to the Alliance, al-



most 3,000 new classrooms will have been built in nations represented here today, almost a million new books have been distributed, and tomorrow we will begin to distribute more than 2 million more to children hungry for learning.

More remains to be done. Some 7,600 new homes will have been built during this 2-year period under Alianza programs in these nations, but far more remains to be built.

Six thousand new teachers have been trained as well as many thousands of agricultural workers, public health, and other public administrators. Still more are needed.

During the last 18 months almost 3 million people in Central America—farmers, workers, children, and slum dwellers—have received some form of direct benefit under Alianza, and almost \$250 million of external resources has been committed in support of the alliance in Central America and Panama to help strengthen the basic structure of the economy and at the same time meet basic needs of people for improved health, education, and housing.

#### COFFEE AGREEMENT

Finally a revolutionary worldwide agreement to stabilize the price of coffee has been entered into which we in the United States are determined to make work—to protect your most vital source of export earnings. And we are also willing to move ahead on agreements stabilizing prices of other commodities so that your future prosperity will not depend on often destructive fluctuations of prices beyond your control.

Tomorrow, at El Bosque, we will see with our own eyes how Alianza enters into lives of the citizens of Costa Rica, providing them with new homes in which they and their families could find decent shelter for the first time.

We shall continue under the Alliance to build economies more balanced and less dependent on one or two export commodities. To this end we must push forward plans for industrialization, greater crop diversification, stronger educational facilities and better utilization of resources.

Yet we cannot be satisfied with the progress we have made. Peoples who have waited centuries for opportunity and dignity cannot wait much longer. And unless those of us now making an effort are willing to redouble our efforts, unless the rich are willing to use some of their riches more wisely, unless the privileged are willing to yield up their privileges to common good, unless the young and educated are given opportunity to use their education, and unless governments are willing to dedicate themselves tirelessly to the tasks of governing efficiently and developing swiftly, then let us realize our Alianza will fail and with it will fall the society of free nations which our forefathers labored to build.

#### CUBA UNDER COMMUNISM

Unfortunately, while this new endeavor goes forward we are also confronted by one of the oldest of our enemies. For at the very time that newly independent nations rise in the Caribbean the people of Cuba have been forcibly compelled to submit to new imperialism more ruthless, more powerful, and more deadly in its pursuit of power than any this hemisphere has known.

Just when it was hoped that Cuba was about to enter upon a new era of democracy and social justice, the Soviet Union through its Cuban puppets absorbed the Cuban nation into its despotic empire and it now seeks to extend its rule to shores of the continent itself.

But other foreign powers have discovered the American hemisphere is not fertile ground for foreign tyranny and any effort to spread such rule will meet with fierce and unyielding resistance. For Americans will

not easily yield up those freedoms which they shed so much blood to achieve.

At the OAS, at this meeting and whenever Americans gather to consult about the future of their continent, we will continue to strengthen the structure of resistance to subversion.

I am hopeful that at this meeting we will again increase our capacity to prevent infiltration of Cuban agents, money, and propaganda. We will build a wall around Cuba—not a wall of mortar or brick or barbed wire, but a wall of dedicated men determined to protect their own freedom and sovereignty.

In 1822, Bolivar, father of the inter-American system, said this: "United in heart, in spirit, and in arms this continent \* \* \* must raise its eyes \* \* \* to peer into centuries which lie ahead. It can then contemplate with pride those future generations of men, happy and free, enjoying to full the blessings that heaven bestows on this earth and recalling in their hearts protectors and liberators of our day."

My friends and colleagues: today we meet, representing seven of the great Republics of America, united in spirit and in arms. We are confident of our ultimate success in protecting our freedom, in raising living standards of our citizens, in beginning a new era of hope in American history. Secure in that confidence, we, too, can look forward to future centuries, knowing that our descendants also will gratefully recall in their hearts "protectors and liberators" of our day.

#### ANTI-CASTRO PLAN SET UP AT SAN JOSE—SEVEN PRESIDENTS AGREE ON AID FOR CENTRAL AMERICA

(By Morris W. Rosenberg)

SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA, March 19.—The United States and six middle American nations vowed tonight to halt Castro Communist subversion with ships and planes if necessary and combat the threat of Soviet imperialism via Cuba with a massive assault on economic and social ills.

President Kennedy and the Latin chiefs of state wound up the second day of their San Jose meeting with a 2,000-word "Declaration of Central America" that raised no threat of armed intervention in Cuba but affirmed their "conviction that Cuba soon will join the family of free nations."

They emphasized that in the meantime they would not suffer the Castro regime's efforts to subvert the six nations.

The declaration disclosed arrangements for special U.S. cooperation in additional sea and air surveillance and interception within territorial waters to block any Cuban attempts to smuggle agents, guns, and propaganda into Central America.

#### RESTRICTIONS PLANNED

In addition, the Presidents of Panama, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Honduras summoned a meeting of Interior Ministers for early April to "put into immediate effect common measures to restrict the movement of their nationals to and from Cuba and the flow of material, propaganda, and funds from that country."

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in response to questions at a news briefing, would not rule out a possibility that Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy would represent the United States at the meeting. It probably would be held in Managua, Nicaragua.

Rusk said President Kennedy gave the six Latin Presidents "the full story" of U.S. military commitments in the Cuban crisis. Citing measures to isolate the Castro regime, Rusk said "about the only thing not being done (by the United States) is shooting at Cuba."

After their second closed-door meeting of the day, the seven Presidents sat in a box in Costa Rica's ornate National Theater while Foreign Minister Daniel Oduber of

Costa Rica read the declaration from the stage at a formal meeting of the Foreign Ministers.

Most of the statement was devoted to plans for economic development of the middle American nations, and Mr. Kennedy pledged what was called a substantial initial American contribution to a new fund to finance regional development projects. No figure was given, but Central American leaders spoke earlier of the need for \$200 million.

It was emphasized, however, that money was not enough to turn back the threat of communism.

"In order to carry out their programs for social and economic betterment," it said, "it is essential to reinforce the measures to meet subversive aggression originating in focal points of Communist agitation which Soviet imperialism may maintain in Cuba or in any other place in America."

As for Cuba, the seven Presidents declared they "have no doubt that the genuine Cuban revolution will live again and that its betrayers will fall into the shadows of history and the martyred people of the oppressed isle of the Caribbean will be free from foreign Communist domination."

As the most effective means of combating Communist agitation and social discontent in the area, the declaration emphasized that Panama and the Central American States will join with renewed vigor in implementing the aims of the Alliance for Progress.

Between conference sessions earlier today, Mr. Kennedy visited a suburban housing project under construction as a joint United States-Costa Rican effort and said such projects will further the goals of democracy in this hemisphere.

These goals, he said, "call for ever-increasing standards of living which can liberate each individual for the full use of his capacities in the pursuit of a better life."

Today's sessions fell on the Feast Day of St. Joseph, Patron Saint of Costa Rica. This Roman Catholic holiday is a national holiday here and Mr. Kennedy observed it by attending special services at the San Jose Cathedral.

President Francisco J. Orlich of Costa Rica, his host, was seated at the place of honor in front of the altar and President Kennedy in a special chair nearby.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 20, 1963]  
OFFICIAL TEXT OF DECLARATION OF CENTRAL AMERICA

The Presidents of the Republics of Central America and Panama are determined to improve the well-being of their peoples and are aware, such a task demands a dynamic economic and social development program based on the carefully planned use of human, natural and financial resources. It also depends on important changes of the economic, social, and administrative structure within the framework of principles that govern our democratic institutions. They have met with the President of the United States in San Jose to review difficulties which impede the achievement of these objectives as well as the progress thus far made in the Isthmus since the integration programs began and since the Alliance for Progress was jointly established by the Republics of the hemisphere in August 1961.

Following an analysis of the situation, the Presidents of the Republics of Central America are convinced the best hope for the development of the region is through economic integration and, bearing in mind extraordinary efforts made toward this end in the last decade and of the importance of accelerating overall economic growth, pledge to their peoples:

To accelerate the establishment of a customs union to perfect the functioning of the Central American Common Market—to formulate and implement national economic

and social development plans, coordinating at the Central American level, and progressively to carry out regional planning for various sectors of the economy.

To establish a monetary union and common fiscal monetary and social policies within the program of economic integration.

To cooperate in programs to improve the prices of primary export commodities.

To complete soonest possible reforms needed to achieve the objectives set forth in the Act of Bogotá and the Charter of Punta del Este, especially in the fields of agriculture, taxation, education, public administration and social welfare.

To take the above measures with a view to achieving creation of a Central American Economic Community which will establish relationship with other nations or regional groups having similar objectives.

The Central American Presidents affirm the economic integration movement in itself constitutes an effort which is laying the groundwork for regional planning in which sectoral plans of common interest to the Isthmian Republics serve as a point of departure. Their governments already have taken measures to coordinate national plans so their execution will aid, rather than impede, achievement of the objectives of the economic integration program.

It is intended that the first global plan for harmonious regional development will be presented as soon as possible for evaluation in accordance with procedures set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este. Meanwhile, the Central American Presidents declare their resolve to proceed immediately with their sectoral plans and with projects of interest to the Isthmus. The President of the United States agrees to consider a long-term loan to enable appropriate Central American regional organizations, principally the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to conduct an economic feasibility survey relative to this program of regional development.

The Presidents of Central America reaffirmed their hope the Republic of Panama will participate more closely in the economic integration movement and the President of Panama declares his government fully reaffirms its support of the program of Central American economic integration. He further declares his government is prepared to initiate immediate negotiations with the governments of the general treaty of economic integration as a whole, with a view to concluding a special agreement to facilitate association of his country with the program.

The President of the United States is impressed by the determination of the Presidents of the Central American republics to move as rapidly as possible toward integration of the economies of their countries and their intention to formulate a regional economic development plan within which national plans will be monetary, fiscal, economy and social policies. It is a great step forward in achievement of this objective as well as toward achievement of the goals set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este.

The President of the United States is prepared to offer the greatest cooperation in preparation and implementation of the regional and national development projects of Central America and Panama and declares that his Government will intensify its joint efforts with the governments and appropriate regional organizations in order to extend to them increased technical and financial assistance for this purpose within the framework of the broad regional program entitled joint exposition of the Presidents of Central America and the development plan being prepared by Panama.

#### U.S. CONTRIBUTION

To this end he proposes a fund for Central American economic integration to be made available through the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to which the United States would make an immediate

substantial initial contribution to assist in carrying out regional development projects in accordance with various sectoral plans now being developed by regional organizations.

For the longer term he also declares that as soon as the Central American Republics have formulated an overall regional development plan and as soon as this plan has been evaluated favorably in accordance with procedures established in the Charter of Punta del Este, the United States will enlarge and expand its participation in the fund and will work with the Central American countries in obtaining other free world resources so that the agreed plan can be effectively implemented.

The Presidents have discussed the fundamental importance to economic development of a vigorous and freely competitive private sector and declare their intention of taking necessary steps to encourage private investment which is prepared to accept normal responsibilities compatible with development of a modern economy. These measures include establishment of regional trade and promotion offices for the specific purpose of attracting private foreign investment. They also agree that development banks or corporations should be established in each country as soon as possible to provide credit on reasonable terms for the growth of private industry, the President of the United States offering financial assistance to their operation.

#### BETTER LIVING STANDARD

Currently they agree that economic and social conditions should be created to assure labor of an improved living standard through better distribution of national income. Furthermore, they agree to encourage and support free democratic labor organizations as a means of contributing toward greater worker participation in the common effort on behalf of the general welfare.

The Presidents also agree that opportunities should be given to the people of Central America to build and purchase their homes. There exist in Central America national savings and loan institutions which have been assisted under Alliance for Progress, and others are about to be created. In order to give further support for these national efforts the Presidents of Central America suggest that a regional home loan department which would be a secondary source of home mortgage funds should be created as a division within the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, and the President of the United States agrees to offer technical and financial assistance to it.

The Isthmian Presidents indicate that Central American institutions should be strengthened as much as possible to enable them to play a major role in training personnel who will be needed to put into effect plans for integration of the Isthmus. The large part of the responsibility for training will devolve on the Superior Council of Central American Universities (CSUCA). Recognizing, moreover, that trained manpower at all levels is needed for economic development, they agree to a proposal of the President of the United States to establish a multimillion-dollar scholarship fund for vocational training in agriculture and in industry for young people of outstanding ability who cannot afford normal expenses of such training, to which the United States will offer substantial financial assistance.

#### IMPORTANCE OF COFFEE

The Presidents note the primary role of coffee in the economies of Central America and the importance of an international coffee agreement for achievement of stable and remunerative prices.

They reiterate the intention of their governments to fully support the agreement so

that it will serve as an effective instrument to improve the earnings of exporting countries from coffee and to promote their economic development.

Other primary commodity problems exist and the Isthmian Presidents will hand to President Kennedy studies on these problems.

President Kennedy agrees he will have them reviewed immediately on his return to Washington.

The Presidents, notwithstanding the fact that present conditions are favorable to undertake a solution of economic and social problems of the Isthmus through joint action of countries of area, believe that all of them are faced with an extremely provoked political problem which by its very nature can imperil the exercise of representative democracy and normal development of plans in which their respective governments are engaged to attain as rapidly as possible the highest levels of economic and social justice and to bring to full realization plans for Central American integration. Consequently the Presidents declare that in order to carry out their program for social and economic betterment it is essential to reinforce measures to meet subversive aggression originating in focal points of Communist agitation, which Soviet imperialism may maintain in Cuba or in any other place in America.

The Presidents note that the Council of Organization of American States is actively engaged in maintaining vigilance over continued intervention of the Sino-Soviet powers in this hemisphere as requested by the eighth meeting of consultation of foreign ministers. They express special interest in early completion by the Council of OAS of studies on Castro-Communist subversion in the hemisphere and particularly in early action by the Council on recommendations to the governments for counteracting those activities in these areas.

#### MEETING CALLED

The Presidents agree that the Ministers of Government of the seven countries should meet early in April to develop and put into immediate effect common measures to restrict movement of their nations to and from Cuba and the flow of material propaganda and funds from that country.

This meeting will take action among other things to secure stricter travel and passport controls, including appropriate limitations in passports and other travel documents on travel to Cuba. Cooperative arrangements among not only the countries meeting here but also among the OAS members will have to be sought.

To restrict more effectively not only these movements for subversive purposes of people but also to prevent insofar as possible introduction of money, propaganda, materials, and arms arrangements for additional sea and air surveillance and interception within territorial waters will be worked out with special cooperation from the United States.

In addition to these measures a more rapid and complete exchange of intelligence information on movement of people, propaganda, money, and arms between Cuba and our countries is to be developed by a meeting of ministers.

#### SYMPATHY FOR CUBANS

The Presidents voice their deep sympathy for the people of Cuba and reaffirm their conviction that Cuba soon will join the family of free nations. The Presidents recall how in 1959 the Cuban people were fired with hope of a purely Cuban revolution that was to bring them freedom and social justice, honest government, and free elections, fair sharing of goods, opportunities for all, more schools and jobs, better health and housing, and constructive land reforms, not collectivization of land. In sum a progressive republic which, in the words of Martí,

would be "con todos y para todos." The Presidents declare that they have no doubt that a genuine Cuban revolution will live again, that its betrayers will fall into shadows of history and the martyred people of the oppressed isle of the Caribbean will be free from foreign Communist domination, free to choose for themselves the kind of government they wish to have, and free to join their brothers of the hemisphere in a common undertaking to secure for each individual liberty, dignity, and well being, which are the objectives of all free societies.

Finally the Presidents solemnly reaffirm their adherence to the principles established by treaty of reciprocal assistance of the Rio de Janeiro Charter of the OAS, in the act of Bogotá and in the charter of Punta del Este.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21 1963]  
TEXT OF KENNEDY'S SPEECH AT COSTA RICA UNIVERSITY

It is a great pleasure to leave Washington where I am lectured to by professors to come to Costa Rica where I can talk to students.

In 1834 it was written of your city that "the people of San Jose (are) persuaded that knowledge produces all good and dispels all evil, that from it come good laws, good customs, good government, and that in short it is the soul of all happiness."

This great university is proof of that judgment, for from behind its walls have come much of the knowledge, the skill and the learning that have made Costa Rica one of the most enlightened and progressive democracies in the world—a principal source of good laws, good customs and a good government. Although I am not sure that your university courses can take credit for the beautiful women for which your country is also famous, they are well represented here today. I think therefore it is appropriate that the first speech by any United States President to a student audience in Latin America should take place at this center of learning in a nation so dedicated to democracy, and I am honored that you have invited me here.

For the past 3 days seven Presidents of seven American nations have been grappling with great questions which confront this hemisphere. On the answers to these questions depends the preservation of our liberties, the extension of democracy and the welfare and dignity of our people. But behind all the efforts of this week, behind the communiques and declarations, elaborate programs and the ambitious projects, lengthy speeches and formal proclamations, behind all this there has been one fundamental and essential assumption. And that is the assumption that you students—and young people of Latin America—are prepared to take up the great cause of liberty and welfare on which we are embarked.

More than half the population of Latin America is in your age group or younger. Without your effort and sacrifice and leadership, the plans and hopes of today's leaders for tomorrow's hemisphere will be doomed to failure. But with your help we can and will succeed.

This is an awesome task and a great opportunity. For we—you and I—are embarked together on a great adventure, the greatest perhaps since an Italian mariner first set sail for the West and touched on this old land. To you has been given the task of demonstrating that free men can conquer ancient enemies of poverty, hunger and ignorance—of protecting freedom against those who would destroy it—of bringing hope to those who search for hope—and of extending liberty to those who lack it. This is an immense task. It is filled with difficulties and dangers, hardships and hazards. But you have also been given an

opportunity to shape history and serve man which has come to few generations of men.

#### RENDEZVOUS WITH DESTINY

And what Franklin Roosevelt said to the people of the United States I can say now here to you: This generation of Americans—your generation of Americans—has a rendezvous with destiny.

I am confident that you will meet that rendezvous. For I can remember my own country when it was quite different from the country we know today. It was not so many years ago that I was a university student as you are now. And at that time only 1 out of every 10 American farms was electrified—half the farmers of our Southland were tenants and sharecroppers—thousands of families in the Tennessee River Valley had cash incomes of less than \$100 a year—and all this was in addition to a great depression which had thrown 12 million people out of work, 10 times the population of your country and almost the population of all Central America. This was the United States of my own university days.

Then under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt we carried through a great New Deal. One program after another brought an end to tenancy, helped farmers win title to their own land, brought electricity to the countryside, transformed the poverty-stricken Tennessee Valley into a thriving industrial and agricultural area, and demonstrated to every man the immense power of an affirmative free government—the power which adds the idea of social responsibility to the idea of individual liberty.

I tell you this story not out of any sense of complacency or satisfaction that the job in my country is done. For we in the United States still have much unfinished work—to improve our housing and cities, our economy, our education and equal opportunities for all our citizens. That fight is still going forward.

But the New Deal does illustrate the transformation which a single energetic generation can make in the life of a country. And it is also an illustration of the capacity of free men to achieve a profound peaceful revolution on behalf of economic progress and social justice.

It is perhaps difficult for you to think of the United States as a revolutionary country—a country which has carried out many basic and sweeping social changes during its short history. But my country like all the countries of the Americas is the possessor of a profound revolutionary tradition which has helped shape the modern world. For it was in Philadelphia in 1776 and in Guatemala in 1821 that the American nations became the first to strike against colonial rule. And today in Africa, Asia and the Middle East, newly emerging nations are still struggling to perfect national independence and the freedom from foreign domination which we were first to achieve.

#### TRIBUTE TO FREE MEN

This history is an answer to those who claim that free people lack the drive and flexibility to remold the societies in which they live. The history of the Americas—the history of your own country in last 20 years—is a tribute to the capacity of free men to call upon the deepest reservoirs of human mind and spirit. And if the task of progress with freedom is more complex, subtle and difficult than the promise of progress without freedom, we are unafraid of the challenge. We are prepared to follow that path which advances man's welfare without destroying his dignity. And we know that lessons of our past promise success for our future.

Our goals for the future of this hemisphere—the challenge we have issued to you and to your compatriots throughout the Americas—is contained in the *Allianza para*

*el Progreso*. Within the framework of this *Allianza* are contained four basic principles of American society which it will be your task to build.

First of these is the right of each nation to govern itself, to be free from outside dictation or coercion, to mold its own economy and society in any fashion consistent with the will of its people. Within our inter-American system we will accept no new empires and no domination of one nation by another.

Second is the right of each individual citizen to political freedom and individual liberty—the right to speak his view, to worship God in his own way, to select the government which rules him and to reject it when it no longer serves the good of the nation. We have taken great strides toward achievement of this right in the last two decades but the job is not yet finished and it will not be finished until every American lives under freedom.

Third is the right to social justice, the right of every citizen to participate in the progress of his nation. This means land for the landless and education for those who are today denied the right to learn. It may often mean that ancient institutions which serve merely to perpetuate the privileges of a fortunate few will be ended. It means that rich and poor alike must bear a fair share of the burden of national development. It will not be easy to achieve social justice but the experience of my own nation has been that once it is achieved it leads inevitably to a richer and fuller life for all.

The fourth principle of the *Allianza* is the right of every nation to pursue a course of rapid economic progress which modern knowledge and technology have made possible. We of the United States who have been fortunate in our own development have committed vast resources to assist those who have been less fortunate. And Latin American nations themselves have pledged to mobilize their own resources and energies to carry forward the task of development. This task is not easy either. To break centuries-old bonds of hunger and poverty and ignorance will require sacrifice and unending toil. But we are determined to pursue this road.

These are principles of our *Allianza para el Progreso* whose ultimate fulfillment is in your hands. They will not be attained by speeches or documents but by work and sacrifice, courage and endurance, on the part of millions of individuals throughout this hemisphere.

I speak to you as men and women pursuing the highest calling of a free society. A distinguished leader of my own country, Thomas Jefferson, once warned us that "if a nation expects to be ignorant and free \* \* \* it expects what never was and never will be, that no other foundation than education can be devised for preservation of freedom and happiness."

That is why you who are fortunate enough to be attending this school have also assumed a great obligation along with that opportunity. A distinguished rector of your university—for whom this campus is named—Dr. Ordigo Facio—wrote that "liberty is not a thing but a way of life which needs to constantly grow, to expand, to become stronger, if it is to live—for her to stop is to surrender—to become rigid is to lose the breath of life."

In your hands, my friends, have been placed tools of knowledge and skill which can make liberty grow and flourish.

Now I return to the United States. I return with the renewed confidence that I have seen here at this university those whose efforts will insure that the hopes and labors of my generation of Americans shall not have been in vain.

March 21

4502

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I particularly call to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of those who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarkable address delivered by President Kennedy to the young people at the University of Costa Rica.

Frequently we hear it said that university students in such countries are not very friendly to American visitors. On the other hand, I have never found that to be the case when, as a Senator, I have visited these countries. In my visits, I have found the university students to be very friendly, very active, very inquisitive, and sometimes quite probing with their questions. But they are always willing to listen and always willing to learn.

President Kennedy thrilled the students there, and I am sure he set an excellent example for the Presidents of other great countries. In his address, President Kennedy cited the history of the United States as an example of the revolutionary, progressive spirit which should grip a people who are seeking a better life.

Mr. President, earlier in these remarks I mentioned that last week I had released a report entitled "A Report on the Alliance for Progress," based upon two trips to South and Central America. I now ask unanimous consent that selected excerpts from this report be printed at this point in the Record.

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

[From release of Mar. 16, 1963]

SELECTED EXCERPTS: REPORT ON ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

In terms of where it was a year ago, the Alianza para el Progreso has taken a giant leap forward. In terms of where it has yet to go, it has taken only a short faltering step.

In reviewing the Alliance today, there are solid grounds for encouragement—and serious grounds for concern. The Alliance has begun to gather momentum; the question is whether it can maintain and increase this momentum sufficiently to overcome the obstacles it now faces and those which loom in the near future.

Latin America needs a new deal. And the United States needs to understand that the changes we are calling for in Latin America—the reforms that we are demanding—will bring in their wake political, economic, and social developments which may not be readily understood or even acceptable to the United States. We are asking for a peaceful democratic revolution. We ought to understand that such a development is unique in history, particularly in areas where oppression, exploitation, poverty, and discrimination have been an established pattern for many generations. Such a democratic revolution, if it can be accomplished, may bring into power democratic governments that are left of center. In other words, liberal, progressive, and even radical political parties will be in the ascendancy and in power. We should be prepared to see a good deal of disorder, temporary confusion, and political disarray as the reforms and changes come about.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE ALLIANCE

The Alliance is not just another U.S. aid program, but rather a cooperative endeavor by 19 Latin American countries and the United States to enjoy more fully the cul-

tural, spiritual, and material riches available in the 20th century, and to put these within the reach of full populations rather than only a select few. Its origins and its operation spring from both the northern and the southern half of the hemisphere.

Now that the Alliance is in operation, it is readily acknowledged that the actions of Latin American countries themselves in achieving the goals of the Alliance are far more important than those of the United States.

It is silly to think that a program of the magnitude of the Alianza para el Progreso can be carried out without making any mistakes. Indeed, the effort to do so is the biggest mistake of all. The most sterile box score is the one that reads, "no runs, no hits, no errors." A team can survive a few errors if it gets some runs; but no matter how flawless its play, it will surely lose without runs. The Alianza has made a few hits; it has managed to get some men on base. But it badly needs some runs, and it ought to be prepared to take a few chances to get them.

For 2 years now, the emphasis (in the aid program) has been on long-range development—on economic growth and social progress. With some exceptions, and oversimplifying the matter somewhat, the United States has been trying to run a development program with a machine designed for a technical assistance program.

We speak of Latin America, but at best it is only a phrase that represents abroad generalization and roughly identifies a geographical area. Actually, Latin America is made up of individual nation states all with their own history, background, and culture, and all very different. Therefore, we must face the fact that each country requires special and separate consideration. There is no general program that can be applied universally.

Whatever we do in Latin America we need to remember that Brazil is the key to success or failure. Brazil is the big country, and if the Alliance for Progress fails in Brazil and if our relationships with Brazil deteriorate to the point of noncooperation or emotional hostility, then whatever we seek to do in the Western Hemisphere will be endangered. It should be recognized that the success or failure of the Alliance for Progress in either Chile or Argentina will have far-reaching consequences in the hemisphere.

The experience of the past 2 years indicates that a basic mistake made was not in switching from technical assistance to economic development but in attempting to apply the new economic development formula universally. U.S. officials have attempted to apply it to Venezuela, Chile, and Mexico—with good reason—but also to Honduras, Paraguay, Ecuador, and Guatemala—which are at an entirely different stage in their development. The latter countries at the present time need further technical assistance before any economic development program can ever succeed.

Economic aid to be effective must be used where there is competence in management, skilled workers, and modern business know-how. Capital without the trained people is but a palliative. It yields little or no development. At best, it gives only temporary relief. The U.S. aid program and those of other aid institutions participating in the Alliance must be prepared to gear aid programs to the development level of the various countries in Latin America, not just to those of the more advanced countries. This will require a different balance of technical assistance and capital aid in the Central American countries than in the advanced countries of the southern cone such as Argentina and Chile.

Another factor in administration, closely related to the second is that at the same time that this process of change from tech-

nical assistance to economic development was occurring, the administrative machinery in Washington was becoming even more complex, which is to say more cumbersome and less capable of making decisions, even wrong decisions. One expects some administrative confusion in launching a new program, but much of this is plainly inexcusable, especially in a government which thinks it is good enough to include projects in public administration among some of its technical assistance programs abroad. I for one have never received an adequate answer to the question, "Why does it take a year to decide whether to build a housing project in the Dominican Republic, and then another year to actually build it?" Something is wrong here. If there are not sufficient loan officers or engineers available to review and appraise proposals, more should be hired—and if the law does not permit this it should be changed. If legislation is required, Congress should be informed accordingly.

Since 1948 there have been 10 administrators of the foreign aid program. The location of the agency has changed almost as frequently as the administrators. Sheer movement of physical facilities all over the city has created chaos and destroyed morale. Movement of files, desks, and partitions has been enough to leave officials in a state of permanent bewilderment. Under two administrations (1953-63) the foreign aid program has been the best example of administrative bungling in the Federal Government. In actual handling of the aid program, both have operated under the assumption that the program is temporary even while claiming to recognize that it is permanent.

Possibly the greatest single factor in weakening the morale of the aid agency is the succession of 1-year appointees as administrator. It is to be hoped that the appointment by President Kennedy of an experienced administrator, known to have the President's confidence will mean the end of the senseless pattern in which 1-year men are expected to do a 10 year-job. The knowledge by upper echelon officials that the policy directives they must implement will not be changed every year will do much to improve their morale and that of their subordinates. The knowledge that the AID Administrator enjoys the complete confidence of the President will do even more.

To implement successfully such a program requires experienced professionals who will remain in the program over a long period of time. We have learned over the past decade that you cannot tackle 30-year problems with 5-year plans using 1-year money. We must learn that the job cannot be done with 2-year personnel—who leave the program 6 months after they have really learned their job. One must not only recruit good men at both the higher and lower levels but must hold them. The Foreign Service has succeeded in this. The foreign aid program has not.

THE ROLE OF AID

Who makes the key decisions on aid matters for Latin America? Where are they made? On the political side in the State Department the locus of decision making has been fairly clear since the spring of 1962. This unfortunately, is not true on the foreign aid side. When the Alliance was first announced, it was suggested that U.S. programs under it be directed from the White House. This was considered but rejected in view of the formidable obstacles that would result in coordinating them with the State Department. The Alliance aid program was placed with the rest of the foreign aid program in the State Department. Yet it often appeared that the Alliance program was in the State Department and key decisions were made in the White House. If those responsible for the direction of the Alliance aid program are to stand a chance

of success, they must have the authority commensurate with their responsibilities. Effective orderly administration of the Alliance program is impossible if designated Alliance officials cannot make final decisions.

The morale of AID personnel in Washington dealing with Latin America is suffering. In some of the missions abroad it is even worse. There is no more urgent task for the Washington headquarters of AID than to give a sense of confidence and firm policy direction to officials in the field. A good way to start would be to delegate more authority to AID mission chiefs and to ambassadors. If the Administration feels a man cannot be trusted, it ought to replace him with a man it feels can be trusted. But it ought not to give men responsibility without authority.

Since mission directors are the representatives of the U.S. Government in the field, it is essential that they understand the thinking of their Washington superiors and enjoy their confidence. This understanding and confidence will ordinarily be gained through regular consultations in Washington, during which directors meet individually with the AID Administrator and the Director of the Latin American region. Ready access to one's superiors in Washington is essential. I am encouraged to hear that the new AID Administrator places a high priority on regular meetings with aid mission directors.

#### THE COST OF THE ALLIANCE

There are at least three striking differences which should be noted between those three successful programs (point four, food for peace, and Peace Corps) and the economic and military aid programs. All three of these involve the outlay of comparatively small amounts of American dollars. All three have an immediate impact upon the recipient country. All three benefit the common people, rather than the elite group. Because they benefit the common people, they have been gratefully received.

Both military and economic aid are expensive—they involve expenditure of large sums of money. In both cases, the impact of the aid is usually delayed. There is a long time span between the agreement to support the building of a dam, an airport, or an industrial plant and the realization of the goal. In both cases, the immediate benefits are often enjoyed to a disproportionate extent by a small minority of the population—by the military, by contractors, businessmen, and high government officials. There is a pressing need for those types of immediate impact projects which will at least partially satisfy popular demand while long-range projects are being developed. Such programs in education, health, and housing can yield quick politically valuable results.

As the Alliance for Progress develops and more and more countries qualify for the above combination of aid programs, the total aid required may substantially increase. The United States must be prepared to face this prospect. For example, if the plans currently being discussed in Brazil to mobilize the resources of that great country to meet pressing economic and social problems are carried through, the United States should be prepared to render the massive assistance required—assistance which would undoubtedly be on a scale similar to that now available to India.

We should prepare to face the fact that the prospect of increasing of our aid program in Latin America may require a careful re-evaluation of our assistance to other parts of the world.

#### RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The importance of rural development can hardly be overstated. Over half of the countries of Latin America continue to spend sizable amounts of precious foreign exchange reserves to import food to feed their populations. This occurs in countries that are pri-

marily agricultural. For the common man in most of Latin America, the key to a higher standard of living in the near future is still an increase in agricultural productivity. In this field the United States has a record of proven performance. We abound in technical expertise in the field of agriculture and the key to success appears to be our ability to secure the widespread adoption of known and proven techniques.

A successful agricultural program will require not only support of programs aimed at providing supervised credit, seed and fertilizer, machinery, land drainage, but will require continued technical assistance on a large scale. In the United States this massive dissemination of technical know-how was achieved through the agricultural extension system of county agents. Until some Latin American equivalent of this is realized, it is doubtful this can be done even through cooperatives. The choice in Latin America is between cooperatives and collectivism. Cooperatives provide an opportunity to pool resources and technical expertise.

#### LABOR

Throughout the Central American area, as well as Mexico and Venezuela, progress during the past year has been made in the field of labor. Mexico is a good example. Through our labor information officers assigned to USIA, we are now reaching the trade union movement in Mexico. One reason why we are now being effective is because we are using experienced union men. Five of the nine labor information officers now serving in Mexico City have a union background. These men have earned the confidence of Mexican labor leaders and now are beginning to make an impact in a labor milieu long dominated by Marxist-oriented groups. Some progress can also be noted in the training of Latin American labor leaders in this country. Through the American Institute for Free Labor Development, hundreds of labor leaders are now being brought to the United States for training. This is an excellent program, but can handle only a small fraction of the total number of leaders eligible. Much more needs to be done in this crucial area.

#### IMPORTANCE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

I found in my discussions in Latin American countries and I find in my discussions with businessmen here in this country much agreement with the U.S. Coordinator's conclusion: Two years after the Alliance was launched, Latin Americans have come a long way in learning the truth—the fact that the Alliance will succeed only if it accords a large role to a vigorous system of modern private enterprise. They have come a long way in facing the fact that of the \$20 billion that will be required from abroad for investment under the Alliance program, \$3 billion must come from the United States in private investments. Many now recognize, if they did not when the Alliance was launched in 1961, that the larger share of the investment capital needed for the Alliance must come from private sources, both domestic and foreign.

The pattern for business success in Latin America has already been established—right here in the United States. The U.S. businessman has a record of unparalleled success in adapting to a changing environment, in combining profitable business ventures with farsighted social welfare programs. In adapting to the changing environment of Latin American countries, American business must follow the same practices implemented here at home: support of education, training of nationals for responsible supervisory and managerial positions; sharing of profits, bona fide collective bargaining; opening up stock ownership to the people of the country. In Brazil a prominent and successful businessman told me that American business must expand its stock ownership to more and more

Brazilians. He said, "Either get naturalized or be nationalized. Become a part of us instead of using us." His analysis may be prejudiced but it seems to represent the attitude of Latin Americans, rich or poor.

To promote new large scale foreign private investment, some system of international insurance may be needed to guarantee new investments. No individual government can supply all the capital needed. But the U.S. Government, working with European and Latin American governments, could devise a system to guarantee capital lent by private banks to private businesses interested in investing in manufacturing enterprises in Latin American countries. This would follow the procedure now in effect for the housing investment guarantee program under section 224 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1961.

Another essential means of strengthening the private sector is through expansion of trade. The private sector of Latin American economies cannot be strengthened unless markets are available for exports, both commodities and manufactured products. The immediate need is to expand trade between Latin American countries—which is now only 10 percent of their total trade.

One possible way of increasing this inter-country trade would be through the establishment of an export credit system modeled on the U.S. Export-Import Bank. Such a system might be worked out through OAS members, possibly administered through institutions such as the Inter-American Development Bank and/or through the Central American Bank.

#### THE BATTLE OF ATTITUDES

Even more important than equipping people with the skills needed in a developing economy is exposing both youth and adults to the values and traditions of a free society. This in turn will require that special attention be given to the institutions and media that shape the minds of the men who shape the society—specifically to the university professors, the teachers, to the textbook writers and publishers, to the writers, journalists, and news media personnel. A good example of progress in this area is the textbook program supported by AID in Central America. For the first time, first and second grade children will have modern textbooks published, not by Marxist-oriented presses shipped in from Eastern Europe, but by pro-Western groups and competent educators. This program could profitably be repeated in over half the countries of the continent.

Strange and alien as it may sound to North American ears, the key to controlling a university in many Latin American capitals is control of the student government. For years, Communists have had free run of universities—have had no competition. The vast majority of students and professors are non-Communists. But through organization Communists have dominated the university scene. It is now being proven that they can be beaten through counterorganization. Marxist influence in the national universities in Chile, Venezuela, and the Dominican Republic is now on the decline because the Christian Democratic student organization backed by other pro-Western groups, have organized and have won the student elections, thereby gaining control of the student government. In these instances, democratic oriented groups have matched the leftwing groups in zeal, in organization and in perseverance—all of which are required to win the intellectual struggle being waged in the universities of Central and South America.

We in the United States are beginning to learn what the Communists have learned long ago—that resources invested in wooing and training the future leaders of society, in all fields, will pay high dividends. But our investment is still a pittance, considering the magnitude of the challenge. I for

one have never heard a convincing explanation of why we have not launched a massive program to bring Latin American students and potential leaders to the United States for training and schooling. By massive, I mean 10,000 per year. The cost would be less than that of one modest highway loan, and the benefit for U.S. foreign policy could not be compared.

#### INFILTRATION OF JOURNALISM

On my trip to the Caribbean area in 1962, I was favorably impressed with improvements in the work of the U.S. Information Agency; its activities seem to have a better sense of proportion and of priority. The Voice of America broadcasts are better, but not yet as good as they ought to be, especially as regards to signal strength. Service to local broadcasters has been effectively strengthened.

In the daily press of many Latin American cities, however, the portrayal of the United States as the "Yanqui imperialist" is continued—or at least goes unchallenged. It is a well-established fact that journalists, and radio and TV commentators are regularly trained in Havana and Moscow and carefully placed in positions in the communications world. The journalist profession has been heavily infiltrated by Marxist trained writers and it is notorious that some large U.S. business firms regularly advertise in the Communist daily that is found in many capital cities.

#### HELP FROM THE CHURCH

One of the most hopeful signs in Latin America in recent years is the renaissance of the Catholic Church and a new awakening on the part of the church leaders to the shocking social and economic problems of the continent. The farsighted social and economic philosophy of Pope John's recent social encyclical *Mater et Magistra* is being strongly pushed by the Vatican. Men who once would have been promoted to mountain parishes for their advanced views are now being appointed bishops and cardinals. Efforts are now being pursued to extend the programs in education and health in which the church has long been involved to the mass of the people. An excellent indication of the change taking place in the church in Latin America is found in the pastoral letter on "Social Reform and Common Good" issued in November 1962 by the 24 Roman Catholic bishops of Chile. The pastoral letter scathingly criticized existing social and economic abuses, deplored the inequality in distribution of incomes, and called on the government to extend and speed up its reforms and its social welfare programs. Offering its own example, the church in Chile is now redistributing most of its own lands to local peasants.

Closely related to the new orientation developing in the church is the growth of the Christian democratic movement in Chile, Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, Brazil, Argentina, and Panama. Although currently electorally strong in only two countries, Chile and Venezuela, these strongly reformist pro-Western parties have growing strength in university and labor circles. Such leaders as Eduardo Frei and Radomiro Tomić, in Chile, and Ralfael Caldera, in Venezuela, can be expected to play an increasingly significant role in providing leadership for progressive democratic forces in Latin America.

#### ECONOMIC INTEGRATION

One of the most promising movements toward economic and political integration is taking place today in Central America. The progress of the six small Central American Republics to achieve economic and political integration is especially gratifying in view of the minimal progress made by the countries of South America in achieving integration through the Latin American free trade

area. President Kennedy's trip to San Jose in mid-March to confer with the Presidents of the six Republics is a grand gesture of the support we are giving to the integration movement.

In order to deal with Central America as a unit, the United States has established an AID mission known as ROCAP (Regional Office Central America and Panama) with headquarters in Guatemala.

ROCAP is only a few months old, and its precise relationship to the U.S. country missions and to Washington has not yet taken form, but its general role is clear: It is to use the AID program as a means of encouraging the Central American economic integration movement. Similarly, the basic role of the Central American Bank for Economic Integration is clear: It is to use credit as an instrument of encouraging the movement. ROCAP has able leadership, it has the strong support of the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, it has been well received by Central American leaders. In the allocation of U.S. funds under the Alliance for Progress program, this regional mission should receive high priority.

As it is our policy to promote integration in Central America, U.S. diplomats and AID officials assigned to Central American countries will be expected to endorse and promote this aim. If the regional mission, the regional bank and the Common Market are the instruments chosen to achieve this goal, then U.S. officials should support them.

I believe the time has come for another dramatic gesture by the United States—this time to accelerate the efforts now being made to achieve economic and social development in Central America. I propose that the United States offer to make available immediately up to \$50 million toward the establishment of a Regional Integration Trust Fund to be administered by the Central American Bank. Because of the preference of some countries for bilateral aid, the decision on whether to accept the offer would be made by the governments of the participating countries. It should be discussed at the meeting of presidents next week in San Jose, Costa Rica. The purpose of the fund would be to initiate new projects and accelerate those now underway that contribute most directly toward economic and political integration.

The following discussion of the Cuban issue reflects the conversations held with numbers of Latin American leaders in the Caribbean and in South America. It should be recognized, of course, that differences exist among Latin leaders on this question.

#### THE THREAT OF TERRORISM

In the case of Latin America today, there is an immediate problem which must be distinguished from the long-range economic and social problems which the Alliance is designed to solve. This is the problem of the external Communist threat from Cuba, backed by the Soviet Union and China. Cuba by itself is not a military threat to the United States, but Cuba as an extension of Soviet military power is a threat to our security. The Cuban threat to Latin America however is not mythological but real. In the immediate sense, it is not economic, but primarily political, propagandistic and paramilitary. The threat arises from the fact that Castro's Cuba, backed by the Soviet Union and China, has become a forward base for the subversion of the hemisphere. It is now a base for indoctrination and training of hundreds of Latin Americans, including training in sabotage, terrorism, and guerrilla tactics. The threat is magnified by the fact that the aroused peoples of Latin America are pressuring their governments to meet basic social and economic problems that have gone unsolved for centuries.

This systematic attempt to subvert democratic governments in Latin America is best seen in the case of Venezuela. Venezuela

is today the No. 1 immediate target of Castro-Communist subversion because the Alliance for Progress is succeeding there. It is the immediate target because the subversion of Venezuela with its huge resources of oil and iron would provide a springboard for the penetration of the entire South American continent. It could convert the Caribbean into a Communist sea. The United States has now made it clear that these attacks on Venezuela will not be permitted to succeed. They will be repelled—regardless of cost. Venezuela has top priority for U.S. support. From Cuba, the Communists have unleashed a continual torrent of intimidation, violence and terror in Venezuela. It is no surprise that of the 1,500 persons from Latin America trained in Cuba in 1962, the largest number have been Venezuelans.

Venezuela has withstood attacks from the radical right and Communist conspirators because its democratic government has been capable of defending itself against armed attack from within and because its action programs in economic and social betterment command popular allegiance. It is obvious to the Betancourt government and to the United States that to cope with such attacks, economic aid alone is not sufficiently effective. Meeting the threat requires measures which are primarily paramilitary, political and propagandistic. All of these programs are designed to provide a shield of security behind which the Alliance for Progress can develop. They are essential to repulse the immediate threat to the stability and internal security that are necessary if the long-term Alliance for Progress economic programs are to succeed.

In considering the Communist problem in relation to the Alliance for Progress, we must therefore always bear in mind the distinction between the two salient Communist threats in the Western Hemisphere: (1) the appeal of the Communist economic model as a solution to the economic needs of impoverished people; (2) the attempt of a Communist regime (i.e., Cuba) and Communist groups within Latin American countries to subvert non-Communist governments through armed attack, internal terror and sabotage and propaganda.

The economic threat cannot be met by military solutions—but rather by effective mobilization of resources and accomplishment of reforms by local governments, combined with U.S. help in the form of foreign aid loans, Food for Peace, the Peace Corps and technical assistance. The subversion and terrorism problem requires specific political and internal security measures. Violence and subversion in Latin America cannot be defeated by relying wholly on the elimination of hunger, poverty and disease.

#### A POLICY ON CUBA

The United States has made it clear that our policy is to eliminate Castroism. The Cuban satellite will never be permitted to gain the status of an Eastern European satellite. Here the commitment itself is more important than the particular means and methods chosen to implement the commitment.

At the same time, it is important that throughout Cuba and all Latin America it is clearly understood that we want the Castro-Communist tyranny to be replaced with a progressive government, that we will not tolerate a rightwing dictatorship. A Cuban Government dedicated to political liberty and economic and social reform will have the firm support of the United States, just as the progressive government of Venezuela does today.

We must emphasize again and again that the United States is dedicated to the welfare of the Cuban people. Although our Government has placed high priority in getting this message to the Cubans themselves (and was particularly successful at the time of the

Cuban crisis in October 1962) a good share of the American public has been so preoccupied with the Castro military threat that it has given too little thought to consideration of a program for post-Castro Cuba. Our goal must be a free Cuba participating in the Alliance for Progress working for economic progress, better health, housing, and education—as well as political liberty.

Latin Americans are acutely aware of being under attack. They sometimes express the feeling that North Americans are mesmerized by Cuba as a military threat, whereas they feel the real war with communism goes on year after year at every level of activity. They are as concerned about the young Brazilian who returns from the Soviet Union, Cuba, or China to enter the journalistic profession as they are about the young Peruvian who comes back trained for guerrilla warfare in the Andes.

In describing the degree of infiltration of Communist-trained opinionmakers into the press, radio, TV and other areas of Latin American life, a perceptive Brazilian concluded that over the past decade the Latin American Republics had already received the billionth bullet in the Communist assault.

Our Latin American friends rightly remind us that the Communist problem existed in Latin America long before Castro came to power in Cuba. The Communist Party has been operating in Latin America for decades, and the threat of communism has been growing because the shocking economic and social problems in so many of these countries have gone unsolved.

Even if Castro and communism should be removed from Cuba, this would not eliminate from the Western Hemisphere the problems of Communist terror, subversion and psychological warfare, nor solve the terrible economic and social ills that plague vast areas of Central and South America. We must keep in mind that Cuba, however important, is only a part of the total problem; part of the total challenge we face in Latin America.

If the Alliance for Progress is to succeed in meeting the staggering problems of poverty, illiteracy, maldistribution of wealth, and economic stagnation in vast areas in Latin America, we must administer and support the Alliance with the same sense of urgency that presently motivates our thinking about Cuba.

We are obliged to take note of the differing attitudes toward Cuba among Latin American countries. The governments of the countries on the South American cone, plus Brazil and Mexico, will continue to be under strong pressure from well-organized groups to oppose firm measures against Castro. Most Latin American leaders in the Caribbean area, on the other hand, will firmly support a strong policy although differing sharply on tactics. In my conversations with leaders of the Caribbean countries, I was repeatedly told that Castro had lost much of the popular appeal that he may once have had, and that public opinion regards his government as a dangerous menace to be eliminated, rather than as a model to be copied. But they look to the United States for leadership. I am hopeful that the guidelines of a common policy with respect to the Cuban problem will be agreed to in San Jose at the meeting of the Presidents.

In implementing such a common policy toward Communist-Castro Cuba, we must recognize that our leaders require wide latitude in choosing means, tactics, and timing. The national interest is not served by emotional and flamboyant public speeches, but rather by cooperative planning, cold reckoning, and persistent action to solve the Cuban problem.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues

particularly to the contents of this report on the organizational structure of the AID administration and the problems which exist in the administration of our Alliance for Progress program. I have called for the same sense of urgency in carrying out this program that we have in our concern over Cuba.

We ought to recognize that whether or not the Communists ever gained a foothold in Cuba, the social and economic problems of South and Central America would be with us. The problems we face today result from years of neglect, years of tyranny, despotism, and aristocracy. Therefore, we are now trying to do in a very few years what should have been underway for decades. Also I have pointed out in the report the importance of our private investments and private enterprise in the Latin American area. I believe that some of the observations on the economic integration movement in Central America are worthy of our thoughtful consideration.

The Central American Republics have possibly done more than any other area in the world, save Western Europe, to develop a program of economic integration and of a common market. They have made great progress. They have competent, experienced, intelligent leaders who are doing their very best to bring about a more stable, just, and progressive society in this hemisphere.

Mr. President, on the same subject matter, I also wish to invite the attention of Senators to an editorial entitled "Castro: Time Waster for Latin Conference," which appeared in the Detroit Free Press, of Tuesday, March 19. It relates to the report by Representative MARTHA GRIFFITHS, on her recent trip into the Latin American area. Representative GRIFFITHS traveled in Panama, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Honduras during December of this past year.

Her report made a very favorable impact upon Members of the House and upon those persons who were privileged to receive it. I commend Representative GRIFFITHS on the very fine report of her study mission and journey. I commend the Detroit Free Press for the thoughtful and constructive editorial that relates to this report and to all the problems that we face in Latin America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### CASTRO A TIME WASTER FOR LATIN CONFERENCE

Telling the Central American nations to forget about Castro for the moment and concentrate on their own problems, as President Kennedy did yesterday, is like telling junior to quit tattling on sister and clean up his own room.

Junior may not like it, but mother knows best.

Without running the real risk of war, there is not much the United States or the Central American nations can do about communism within Cuba right now. The President is doing about as well as anyone can expect.

The real question, which the President wants to deal with, is how to keep commu-

nism and Castroism from spreading throughout Latin America. In the Central American nations, he has a good starting place.

As Representative MARTHA GRIFFITHS reported after her December trip to the area, these six nations—Panama, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Honduras—are largely ignored in the rest of the world. They are, in varying degrees, desperately poor, and their main export crop, coffee, has suffered a 30- to 40-percent price drop.

Some of the nations, in fact, are so poor that they can hardly afford the temporary drop in tax revenue that a sensible tax reform program would bring. Instead, to get working cash, they have to rely on a jerry-built program of high excise taxes on such things as cablegrams and slaughtering licenses.

In Panama, rural roads are so bad, she said, that it takes a farmer longer to get his goods the 7 miles to market than it did for John Glenn to circle the earth. In Honduras, there are no roads in the eastern half of the country, and even the Inter-American Highway is far from the economic center. Instead of being able to use Alliance for Progress funds for developing industries, the money must go first for roads.

In addition, we have long ignored the Central American nations in favor first of Europe, then Asia, and then South America. Since 1939, during the era of the good neighbor policy, U.S. disbursements to Central America, partly in loans already repaid, have come to only \$14.10 per person, or 56 cents a year.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS found that these nations need to do major work on improving their higher education programs, both in the caliber of the work and the role of the universities. Five of the six nations, excluding Panama, have begun to pool their graduate level studies, but this is only a beginning.

A further problem facing these countries—and us—is the simple problem of how to give or lend our money. When we get into aid programs, we do not dip a toe, but plunge head first.

There are, for example, six agencies in the tiny country of Costa Rica borrowing or begging from six different U.S. agencies.

Add on the international lending agencies and the United Nations, and there are 15 channels of U.S. assistance, many working without knowing what the others are doing, and some even working at cross-purposes.

It is no wonder that much of our money is wasted, while the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

To begin on these problems is as much as the Presidents of the six nations, plus Mr. Kennedy, can do in the short and formal time allotted to the San Jose meeting.

It is all well and good that the six Latin Presidents want a declaration of opposition to Castro. But the conference would be a waste if their time is spent discussing how to get rid of him.

Their most effective way, as President Kennedy said, is to solve their own problems, so that the seeds of Castro's communism cannot find fertile soil in Central America.

#### THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND BRAZIL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since we are speaking on matters relating to South and Central America, I should like to take the State Department to task for just a moment for what I consider to be a rather amateurish, unprecedented and, I believe, unwarranted handling of very difficult and sensitive relationships between our country and Brazil.

I cannot imagine how this situation developed. To say that the Government of Brazil was being infiltrated by Com-

munists, and to say so in the public press, does little to help our efforts to improve our relationships in Latin America.

There is a time and a place for making statements of that kind if we believe them and if we have evidence to support them. If other so-called friendly governments were to make that kind of charge about our country, we would be very much disturbed, and rightly so. It is not a good idea for the officials of one country to inject themselves into the internal politics of another country, publicly at least. We had ways of doing this through our embassies and our diplomatic missions. But, as many of the newspapers in our country have noted, there was little to be gained and much to be lost by the rather crude and abrupt public comments upon the situation in Brazil. The Brazilian Republic has many problems. As a fellow member of the OAS we have every right to be concerned about those problems. If Brazil should fall by the wayside or should fall into the lap of the Castroites and Communists, the Alliance for Progress would surely fail. Not only that, but the security of our hemisphere would be seriously jeopardized.

There are many men in the Government of Brazil today—and I know some of them—who are as deeply dedicated to the principles of freedom and democracy as is anyone in our country.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of recent days be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

#### DEALING WITH BRAZIL

Whatever the chill wind from Paris, there is at least one rift in this country's historic alliances that can and should be promptly repaired. Few countries in the world have been older friends and allies than Brazil, the giant Republic of South America, which, more than any other, may determine the success of the Alliance for Progress. For more than 2 years there has been static in United States-Brazilian relations, a melancholy outbreak of petty vexations in which an insistence on being right on small things has obscured larger common goals.

Fortunately, with the visit of Francisco Clementino San Tiago Dantas, Brazil's powerful Minister of Finance, there is at hand an opportunity for a fresh start. Mr. Dantas, a pragmatic liberal leftist of formidable gifts, brings an important distinction to his mission. He represents an administration that has the power (and hopefully) the will to govern. Last January, the voters gave President Goulart the full executive powers that had been withheld from him 2 years before when he succeeded the erratic Janio Quadros.

The overriding hope in this country is that Mr. Goulart will use this power to cope responsibly with the single most pressing economic problem in Brazil—uncontrolled inflation. Though Brazil has had a dramatic rate of economic growth, fiscal insolvency has eaten away at the fruits of development. Everyone acknowledges this. To his credit, President Goulart has begun the task of reform. Brazil's anti-inflation program calls for a 35-percent cut in public expenditures, an elimination of subsidies for fuel and wheat, credit ceilings on Bank of Brazil loans to private firms, an internal price freeze on coffee and wage limitations for government employees.

In the past months, Brazil has received ample and unsolicited criticism in the United States for its failure to set its house in order. What Brazil now needs is support and encouragement in carrying out an anti-inflation program that is long overdue. Specifically, Mr. Dantas is seeking to reschedule debt payments and release \$84 million in aid money held up by the United States pending a genuine counterattack on inflation.

But what Brazil also needs in an affirmative attitude in the United States based on an understanding of life and politics in a swiftly changing country. Brazil is not a banana republic and is on the threshold of great power status. It is foolish to expect Brazil to see eye-to-eye on the details of foreign policy, yet the amount of noise aroused by dissent on specifics has tended to obscure solidarity on fundamentals. When the Cuban crisis shook the world last October, there was no question of where Brazil stood.

As elsewhere in Latin America, there is an exotic spectrum of left-wing politics in Brazil. There are men like Mr. Dantas who describe themselves as liberal leftists. There are nationalists who want free enterprise at home but anti-American policy abroad. There are Moscow Communists and Castro Communists, and some of these, as our Ambassador, Lincoln Gordon, accurately reported, are in the government.

But no responsible U.S. official, emphatically including Mr. Gordon, would describe the government of Brazil as pro-Communist. The places of power are held by non-Communists, leaders whose influence will grow if Brazil prospers. It is this vigorous center, speaking for a burgeoning middle class, that should get more attention than the fanatic fringe. By dealing justly and generously with Brazil, by remembering that the overall terms of trade have tipped to Brazil's disadvantage, and by viewing Brazil in continental perspective, the United States can now give new strength to a faltering partnership.

#### SEISMIC CALCULATIONS SUPPORT U.S. TEST BAN PROPOSAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I had hoped that I might present for the Record of the Senate earlier today some observations on recent statements that have been made by Members of Congress, as well as other citizens, concerning the U.S. proposals at the nuclear test ban conference in Geneva.

I should like to comment today on the seismic calculations that support the U.S. test-ban proposals.

It has been alleged that there is a big hole in our present proposals for a nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviet Union. I would like to point out a few rather substantial holes in this unwarranted attack on the administration's proposals for an effective and safeguarded halt to the further testing of nuclear weapons.

The opponents of the U.S. proposal now assert that underground nuclear explosions below 3 kilotons carried out more than 620 miles inside the borders of the Soviet Union could not be detected by the U.S.-operated network of control posts, which would be located around the periphery of the Soviet Union but outside its borders. In order to create this so-called big hole or zone of undetectability, three assumptions have been made, none of which stands up under close analysis.

My colleagues will recall that about 3 days ago a map appeared in one of the local newspapers, showing a picture of the Soviet Union and an area within the center of the Soviet Union called the zone of undetectability, or the big hole in the proposals of the United States at Geneva.

The map was not drawn very well. As I said earlier, it was a poor example of map drawing. The geographical aspects were even more unlikely and inadequate.

As I said, there were three assumptions which had been made, none which stands up under close analysis.

First, it is assumed that our detection capability necessarily decreased as the distance of the detection station from the location of the clandestine test increased. This assumption is not based on scientific fact.

The truth is that our capabilities to detect underground nuclear explosions at long range are frequently better than our capabilities to detect the same explosions at shorter ranges. This is due to the characteristics of the seismic waves which are generated by an underground nuclear explosion and the manner in which these waves pass from the point of detonation through the earth's crust or mantle to the detection station. For example, detection capability actually increases from about 2,000 to 3,000 miles. As a matter of fact, two relatively simple seismic stations located 2,000 and 2,500 miles away from our Nevada test site detected most of the 3 kiloton underground shots which have occurred in the dry desert dirt at the site. Improved equipment at these two stations would certainly have permitted detection of even smaller explosions.

These significant discoveries as well as overall improvements in our long-range detection capabilities have been the result of the continuing research effort in the field of the seismology of nuclear explosions—an effort which has been carried on by the Department of Defense since 1959.

The second assumption upon which the "big hole" argument is based is that the explosions of 3 kilotons or less would occur in a type of dry sandy soil known as alluvium. The proponents of this theory seem to recognize that tests in harder rock would increase the size of the seismic signals generated by the explosion, and therefore increase its detectability. This Soviet Union, however, contains precious little of the required type of soil to muffle the 3-kiloton tests. In fact, according to a U.S. Geological Survey map, no dry alluvium beds are to be found more than 620 miles inside the Soviet Union, which, according to the theory, would be the distance required to be outside the range of detectability. The two relatively small areas where soil of this alluvium type is shown to exist are both within 500 miles of the southern border of the Soviet Union.

Moreover, testing in this dry, loose soil creates many more hazards of external detection than does testing in other more substantial types of rock. In order to prevent a large cavity clearly visible on the earth's surface, tests in alluvium