

tragic from a psychological standpoint, that the entire episode is unforgivable.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL APPRENTICESHIP BILL

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

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a Federal apprenticeship bill to prohibit discrimination in apprenticeship, on-the-job training, upgrading, and other joint labor-management training programs.

The bill covers labor organizations, employers, and certain other hiring and training organizations.

It sets up an Apprenticeship Training Commission composed of five salaried commissioners to be appointed by the President on a bipartisan basis.

Jurisdiction of the States having effective antidiscrimination laws is preserved. The Commission would have the power to utilize regional, State, and local agencies to accomplish its purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the need for such legislation is clear. The best available estimates indicate that only 2 percent of those undergoing apprentice training in the United States are Negro; and that out of a Negro work force of some 7 million—11 to 20 percent are unemployed—twice that of other workers.

Apprentice training in all its aspects covers well over one-half million jobs a year. Where discrimination exists in this area it prejudices American society from the home to the school and wastes some of our best human resources.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, on June 4, I joined in introducing the Equal Rights Act of 1963 to enable individuals and the Federal Government to initiate civil cases to enforce 14th amendment guarantees in the use of public facilities; and to enable the Attorney General to invoke Bill of Rights protections for individuals by initiating civil injunctive actions on their behalf.

It is my hope that the Congress will enact this additional legislation introduced today as the right—on merit—to seek gainful employment is basic to our concept of democracy and the denial of this right to join a union or to participate in joint labor-management training programs hurts the individual, the family, and the community.

MCCORMACK PARK

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I walked to the office through the area bounded by Independence Avenue and C Street. This is the area from which the buildings were recently removed. The cellars have been filled in and the open spaces have been graded and seeded and are now covered with a pleasant growth of fresh, green grass. A remarkable number of trees have been preserved and stand in full foliage. Birds flit from tree to tree and fill the air with pleasant song. Altogether, this is a peaceful and verdant oasis in the midst of the brick and concrete of Capitol Hill.

I have never been clear as to the reason for the acquisition of this property. Speaker Rayburn indicated that it would be used for an addition to the Library of Congress. Others have proposed its use as a memorial to James Madison, but there appears to be no clear-cut decision or policy in this regard.

By spending a small amount of money, this area could be made into a pleasant park which would provide a much needed area of recreation and repose in the midst of the legislative hurly-burly of the Hill. A few more trees could be planted, some shrubbery installed, paths constructed and benches set about at convenient intervals. A Roman-style fountain could be installed so that the musical splash of its water could provide a note of refreshment in the warm summer weather.

I regretted losing the rows of historic houses which were demolished in the course of this reconstruction, but it may be that we have acquired a more satisfying natural asset if we have the good sense to preserve it.

Since this park should have a name, I suggest that it be named in honor of the present Speaker of the House. We now have the Cannon, Longworth and Rayburn Office Buildings.

Why not McCormack Park?

PRAYER IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

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

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I placed at the desk for the first time as a Member of the House a discharge petition to bring before the House my resolution, House Resolution 407 that would provide a rule to debate and act upon House Joint Resolution 9, to amend the Constitution to offset the Supreme Court decision to permit prayer in public schools and all public places on a voluntary, nondenominational basis. The petition is before the House. We need 218 signatures.

I call your attention to the wonderful action of the great and honored Speaker of the House in having placed above his desk the words "In God we trust." And he does place his trust in Almighty God. I always did respect our great Speaker, but this action on his part even increased my respect for him.

Not only should we amend the Constitution to offset the two cases the

Supreme Court has already decided, but these cases now under preparation, one to remove "In God we trust" from our currency and another to take "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance.

As I said before, the urgency of this matter leaves me with no alternative but to file this petition. I know many Members, like myself, have never signed a discharge petition. I have never signed one for material things, or for material benefits. This discharge petition deals with our belief in Almighty God and our right to preserve it. I believe our faith in Almighty God is the foundation of our country. If we do not take action and sign this discharge petition, I think we are doing a disservice to our religion and our free society. I urge you to sign this petition now as rapidly as possible in order to bring this matter before the House.

I also stated in a personal letter to all my colleagues in the House, that:

The urgency of this matter leaves me no alternative, if, as I believe, we are to prevent the advocates of a godless society to accomplish in the United States, that which the Communists have accomplished in Soviet Russia. I cannot sit idly by and permit this to happen.

This discharge petition does not provide any ordinary legislation but it will give the people of this country the right to decide, through their State legislatures, to amend the constitution and re-establish the basic law of the land as we knew it for the past 150 years.

END THE KOREAN WAR STATE OF EMERGENCY

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week I introduced a bill to end the state of emergency which has existed in this country since 1950. I have two principal reasons for introducing the bill, H.R. 7408.

First. Ending the state of emergency would require that Congress take positive action, under the Reorganization Act of 1946, to remain in session if our business is not finished by July 31. This might hopefully result in some effort toward shorter sessions of the Congress.

Second. Ending the state of emergency would require an examination of the extraordinary powers which still accrue to the Federal Government as a result of this state of emergency, powers which—if still needed—should be provided by appropriate statute not by the excuse of a state of emergency because of a war which ended a decade ago.

I will press for early consideration of this bill as a separate measure or as part of consideration which may be given to revisions of law to improve congressional procedures. I will welcome support from others who join me in these beliefs.

For the information of the Members, I will list a few of the provisions in law which remain in effect because of the state of emergency. There are dozens of others, perhaps even scores, many of

11774

them obscure and unused at the present time. The examples are:

Control over consumer credit may be exercised only "during the time of war beginning after" August 8, 1947, "or any national emergency declared by the President"—Public Law 80-386.

Contracts for supplies and services, under Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, may be negotiated without advertising if determined to be necessary in the public interest "during the period of a national emergency declared by the President or by the Congress"—Public Law 81-152.

Contracts for supplies and services, under the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, may be negotiated without advertising if determined to be necessary in the public interest "during the period of a national emergency declared by the President or by the Congress"—Public Law 81-110.

During any national emergency declared by the President or by the Congress, "the United States may have exclusive or nonexclusive control and possession of airports disposed of as surplus under authority of this act"—Public Law 80-289.

The President may provide for the control and anchorage of foreign-flag vessels in territorial waters of the United States, whenever he "finds that the security of the United States is endangered by reason of actual or threatened war, or invasion, or insurrection, or subversive activity," and so forth—Public Law 81-679.

Charters of vessels may be terminated by the Federal Maritime Board and vessels of citizens may be requisitioned "whenever the President shall proclaim that the security of the national defense makes it advisable, or during any national emergency declared by proclamation of the President"—Public Law 76-328.

LOYAL-TO-ORVILLE OATH DROPPED

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hundreds of conscientious, able ASCS committeemen who are trying to represent the best interests of the farmers who elected them, I want to thank Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman for his belated action in canceling his earlier loyal-to-Orville oath. His action announced in today's Federal Register carries out the purpose of my House Joint Resolution 413 which I introduced May 14.

Farm programs initiated by the Kennedy administration are not necessarily what the farmers themselves want. For example, the wheat certificate plan the administration backed was firmly defeated by wheat farmers in the May 21 referendum.

Farmer-elected ASCS committeemen should not be required to ignore farmer sentiment by pledging support for whatever control schemes emerge from Capitol Hill. I am glad that Mr. Freeman backed up and I hope he stays put.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY AND CUBA

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recent reports of the groundwork which preceded the Organization of American States Council meeting July 3 are extremely disturbing. On July 5 the New York Times reported that Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs U. Alexis Johnson had met with Latin American delegates to the OAS. According to the Times, which described its sources as "diplomatic informants," Mr. Johnson had told the OAS delegates that Cuba no longer constituted a military threat to the hemisphere.

We all know the result of the OAS Council meeting which followed. The Council split on the efforts to apply stronger sanctions against Communist Cuba.

Cuba does constitute a threat to this hemisphere, and I doubt that any Member of Congress now in office would deny it.

Even the State Department press officer Richard Phillips would not deny that Cuba remains a threat to this hemisphere. In a press conference which followed the article on Johnson, Phillips said:

Cuban directed subversion efforts increased during the past year.

And evidence bears out this fact, as we have just seen in Venezuela where American oil properties are being sabotaged by Castro agents.

Even a special OAS factfinding committee states that Castro subversion is threatening the security of this hemisphere.

I strongly urge that there be some corrections made in our diplomatic community to erase the absurd notion that the American people want or will accept peaceful coexistence with Communist Castro.

This situation has been pointed up in a recent editorial of the Miami Herald, newspaper which is known for its authoritative comments and influence in the field of inter-American affairs. Editor Don Shoemaker's knowledgeable analysis of OAS shows genuine alertness, and under unanimous consent I include it at this point in the Record.

WASHINGTON DOES THE SCUTTILING: AN INSIDE JOB ON THE OAS

When the Organization of American States voted 14 to 1, with 4 abstentions, for new curbs on Communist subversion from Cuba, we raised a question: "Was the lack of unanimity in the OAS Council due to tiptoeing leadership by U.S. spokesmen?"

The answer, it turns out, is worse than "yes." The influence of the United States proved to be leadership in reverse—away from instead of toward a hemisphere quarantine on the focus of infection in Cuba.

The OAS had scheduled a meeting July 3 to act on a committee report calling on all member nations to break off diplomatic ties with Communist Cuba and halt the flow of agents, money, and propaganda from the occupied island into the rest of the New World.

On June 28, according to the New York Times, U. Alexis Johnson, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, held

a secret meeting with the OAS Council. The Times was told that Mr. Johnson gave the OAS delegates an appraisal of the changing conditions in Cuba and said Cuba no longer constituted a military threat to the hemisphere.

By contrast, the OAS committee had reported that Communist subversion from Cuba was intensifying.

The New York Times also reported: "U.S. officials who have been analyzing Castro's offers to 'normalize' relations believe they are motivated by a genuine desire to relieve external pressures on his regime at a time when it must concentrate on solving pressing economic difficulties.

"They point out that Havana radio's recent broadcasts to the United States and Latin America have shown less aggressiveness.

"Similar observations were made by Latin American diplomats who recently returned from Cuba. They said that Castro had personally assured the governments of Brazil and Mexico that he would abandon his campaign to subvert the Latin American nations."

The State Department promptly denied that Mr. Johnson had reported a definite decrease of tensions in United States-Cuban relations. The State Department's official voice did not, however, deny that Mr. Johnson met secretly with the OAS Council.

What the New York Times reported was the impression gleaned from the June 28 session by Latin American diplomats. The denial, after the split vote on July 3, was too late to mend the damage.

The only conclusion we can draw from this set of facts is that the State Department tried to scuttle, in advance, the OAS program for united action against communism in Cuba. Although almost three-fourths of the members voted for the plan, its failure is virtually guaranteed by the U.S. leadership-in-reverse.

The State Department tiptoed backward at a time when most people in the United States wanted action to evict communism from Cuba. Incidents such as this make us wonder whether U.S. foreign policy nowadays isn't indeed "foreign" to the will of the people who must support it with part of their earnings and, if need be, with their lifeblood.

LOYALTY OATH RESCINDED BY FREEMAN

(Mr. DOLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call Members attention to the Federal Register of Thursday, July 11, 1963. On page 706 you will find that Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, has rescinded the so-called loyalty oath. I commend him for it as about 37 House Members have introduced resolutions to rescind the ridiculous oath and I am please to learn congressional action will not be necessary. Let me also call your attention that in the so-called loyalty oath, or pledge, promulgated on March 1, 1963, every county committeeman, elected by the farmers, not appointed or selected by Mr. Freeman, would have been required to take a written oath that "he would support the program that he was called upon to administer." It is high time, and again I commend the Secretary, for finally taking this action. It will be well received by hundreds of ASC committeemen throughout the country.

aware of U.S. humiliation and degradation by Castro-communism, and is still waiting for "Tio Sam" to roll up his sleeves. The Mexican does not care a fig for propaganda about 'radical social reforms' because he has been hearing all this for 50 years, and it goes in one ear and out the other. What would powerfully impress him would be to see the United States pin Castro's ears back and eject communism from Cuba."

"Honor," so Hugo Salinas Price concludes, is a word that is respected far more than peace or tolerance in Mexico. "Each year," he says, "many people kill and are killed for its sake. That is the issue in the minds of Mexicans; an old-fashioned, unsophisticated issue which has not been grasped in Washington."

To be perfectly fair, some people do grasp the issue in Washington. Republican Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado, would restore Uncle—or "Tio"—Sam's "dignidad" by creating a Cuban government-in-exile and letting it set up its provisional capital on the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo. This would be throwing something right in Fidel Castro's face. The Mexican Government, along with the Brazilian Government, might officially object to the infringement of the concept of self-determination implied in backing a Cuban government-in-exile with the guns of a foreign naval base. But, as Hugo Salinas Price insists, the Latin American respects dignity more than he does finicking over nice shades of legality.

So get going, "Tio" Sam. You have nothing to lose but your loss of face.

Getting Through Customs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the editor of *Changing Times*, the Kiplinger magazine, has written an excellent column which is designed to answer questions and to acquaint a U.S. tourist with general customs requirements and has consented to its insertion in the RECORD.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

GETTING THROUGH CUSTOMS—A QUICK GUIDE FOR FOLKS RETURNING FROM ABROAD

For those lucky people who plan to travel abroad this summer, here's some advice that may save time, money, and a possible tangle with the law.

There's a customs inspector waiting for you at the dock, airport, or border point where you return to this country. His job is to see that you comply with a set of rather complicated regulations. The best way to prepare for that rendezvous is to learn those regulations now, before you leave. Listed below are the key points you should know about.

Declarations: When you reenter the United States, you must disclose to the customs authorities all the purchases you made abroad, including any clothing, watches, or jewelry you may be wearing at the time, goods being carried in your luggage and articles that you are having sent home for your own use. (Packages sent to others do not have to be declared; see section on gifts.)

The airline or ship steward will usually distribute forms on which to enumerate the items and their costs. If not, you give the

details to the inspector orally. He will then check through part or all of your luggage. There are two steps you can take to speed up these formalities: (1) Keep all your receipts in one, quickly accessible place. This will make it easier to fill out the form and to verify a price if the inspector questions it. (2) Pack your purchases together in one or two suitcases. That way he won't be forced to look through every bit of your luggage.

Exemptions: Most products imported into the United States are subject to tariffs. As a tourist, though, you are entitled to bring back a certain amount duty free—without having to make a tariff payment—if—

You have been out of this United States for at least 48 hours.

The merchandise is for personal rather than business use.

You haven't claimed an exemption on another trip within the previous 31 days.

At one time, tourists were allowed \$500 duty free. The amount was temporarily reduced to \$100. This new limit was scheduled to expire July 1, but Congress is working on a bill to continue it. Check with customs officials at the airport, seaport, or border point where you depart, for the amount in effect at the time you leave.

The exemption applies to every U.S. resident whether he's an adult or a babe in arms. Members of a family traveling together are allowed to pool their exemptions. A husband, wife, and two children, consequently, are permitted combined duty-free imports of \$400. Remember, too, that the exemption is based on the wholesale value of the items, unless they were made to order for you. The Customs Bureau figures the wholesale value at 40 percent under the store's full retail price, so \$100 of exemptions really works out to about \$166 in retail purchases.

When you bring in more than your exemption, you have to pay tariffs on the surplus, again on the product's wholesale value. Duties vary from product to product. The inspector will tell you which articles carry the highest rates. You can then claim as many of those as possible under the exemption and pay the tariffs on the rest.

Virgin Islands: If you're returning from the Virgin Islands (those that are a territory of the United States, not the Islands administered by Britain), you get a \$200 exemption. But only half of the \$200 can consist of goods bought outside the islands.

The rule that you must be out of the United States for 48 hours to qualify for an exemption does not apply to goods bought in the islands.

Mexico and Canada: The 48-hour limit also does not apply to Mexico. It does, however, to Canada, and this can raise problems for travelers who swing back and forth over the border on a car trip. You can always bring back \$10 per person duty free, no matter how short a time you've been out of the country. If you're over that amount and haven't fulfilled the 48-hour requirement, consult the border customs officer. You may be permitted to leave your purchases at the customs office the first time you reenter the United States and then pick them up on the next leg of your trip, after having spent the necessary 48 hours in Canada.

Liquor and cigars: Each \$100 exemption can't include more than 100 cigars and 1 gallon of alcoholic beverages. But, again, families can combine exemptions. Thus, a family of, say, 4 can bring in 400 cigars and 4 gallons of liquor.

Try to carry any alcoholic beverages you buy—wine, brandy, or whatever—along with you. U.S. law prohibits shipments by mail, and if you sent the bottles by freight, you could run afoul of State laws. The Customs Bureau will not release shipments that may violate the law of the State to which the shipment is to be made. When

you take it with you, there is less likelihood of becoming enmeshed in these complications.

To-follow: Tourists have been allowed to use their exemptions for "to-follow" shipments—articles they arranged to have sent home. The Treasury Department has asked Congress to revoke this right and limit the exemption to merchandise travelers have with them. When you check on the size of the current exemption, also find out how things stand with this clause of the law.

Gifts: Personal gifts carried as part of your baggage are treated the same way as other merchandise bought in a foreign country. However, while abroad you can send as many gifts as you like to people at home without any tariff payment provided you must meet these conditions:

Each package does not contain goods valued at more than \$10.

No liquor, tobacco products, or perfumes priced at more than \$1 are included.

The same person does not receive more than one gift from you in 1 day.

Make sure to write "Gift Enclosed" and the price of the article on the outside of the package. Otherwise, the recipient will be forced to pay a tariff on the present. These gifts do not have to be declared to the customs inspector when you arrive.

Cars: There is a 6½ percent tariff on cars bought abroad. If the car was used abroad, customs will deduct for depreciation and the 6½ percent will be calculated on the net value. You can reduce the tariff cost by applying all or part of your exemption and those of any members of your family traveling with you. A family of four, for example, could lower a \$1,500 car to \$1,100 and thereby reduce the duty from \$97.50 to \$71.50.

Should Congress eliminate the to-follow privilege, you would not be permitted to take the exemption that way unless you returned on the same boat carrying the car. In any case, before you exhaust your exemption on a car, ask the inspector for the tariff rates on the other goods you are bringing home. The 6½-percent car duty is relatively low. It might be best to conserve the exemption for higher tariff items.

Trademarked products: Companies that make brand-name products can request the Customs Bureau to stop or limit imports of these items by tourists. In many instances, travelers are allowed to import a small amount if the articles are carried in their luggage and not sent home by mail. A number of perfumes, toilet preparations, cameras, binoculars and musical instruments are subject to these restrictions. If you plan to buy any merchandise of this kind, obtain a copy of "Tourists Trademark Information," a Customs Bureau booklet that lists the trademarks and the import rules.

Suppose, now, that you already own a foreign-made camera and want to use it on your trip. It may be a model subject to a trademark restriction when you return. The answer is to take along a receipt, repair slip or anything else that can serve as evidence that you owned the camera before you left. Alternatively, you can register the camera with customs when you leave by filling in a simple, one-page form.

The trademark controls can be bypassed completely by obliterating or removing the brand name from the product before you declare it. With a bottle of perfume, for example, you can tear off the label. If the trademark is molded into the glass, though, you might be required to transfer the contents to another container.

Banned goods: Let's assume a store offers you an unmounted jade stone at an irresistibly low price. Don't buy it unless you first take the legal steps necessary to get it through customs. Jade is one of many items that cannot be imported without a special license or a certification that they were not originally produced in Communist China or

1963

complishments of the St. Kilian's Boy-choir of the St. Kilian's Roman Catholic Church in Farmingdale, Long Island. Father Schoof and Mr. Arpad Darazs, choir director, have blended together a choir of consummate skill. They have taken the boys of the parish and through diligent training and example have forged them into a choir that is truly one of the outstanding musical aggregations in the country. These boys have been in demand by organizations throughout the State of New York and the Eastern United States. It is my hope that ultimately every segment of the Nation will have an opportunity of hearing this product of Long Island suburbia.

We hear much today about the musical groups that travel to the United States from the four corners of the earth, and we give them just recognition. I also believe that it is important that organizations of our own, composed of the sons and daughters of our own citizenry who have been trained in the musical accomplishments of both the Old and New World, should receive recognition.

Upon the completion of this boy's choir's most recent triumphant public concert, I wish to praise them and to call to the attention of this honorable body the considerable success of this group of brilliant young performers.

Cuba
 Red Subversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 11, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the headlines which have recently spotlighted our domestic problems of civil rights and the rail strike and the international atomic test ban talks have diverted attention from one of the most pressing problems—Cuba.

While the Kennedy administration studiously avoids bringing the topic of Cuba before the people, the Communists are consolidating their position, using the island as a base for spreading subversion to other Latin American countries, and intensifying our problems for the future.

Just today there was a disturbing report on the wire that Cuban underground leaders had observed an influx of foreigners to Cuba, feverish construction activities, and a clandestine operation on the northern tip of the island which has been closed off to the Cuban people.

Past recent history has shown us that the Russians want Cuba as a military outpost in our hemisphere. It is logical to assume that the influx of what the President likes to call "technicians" and isolation from Cubans themselves of certain areas indicates more Communist military activity.

I regret that there appears to be a brainwashing job being done on the American people. When John F. Ken-

edy ran for office in 1960, he ran on the premise that a Communist Cuba just 90 miles off our shores was intolerable. He pledged to do something about it. Now he is peddling the idea that we are extremely fortunate that he was able to head off a military attack on the United States from Cuba, and that we should learn to live with a Soviet-occupied satellite "just 90 miles from our shores."

Every day poses a more serious problem. Every day of peace purchased by permissive tolerance of communism in Cuba means more bloodshed and sacrifice by Americans when the day comes that we must have a showdown, or accept a Communist-dominated Latin America. Such development would pose clear military danger to the United States.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a column by John Chamberlain, and an editorial, both from the Galesburg (Ill.) Register-Mail of July 9, 1963. These articles point out that the Communists are taking a more direct anti-U.S. position throughout Latin America, and are stepping up their activities. It also points out the weak-kneed protest we have made and the dropoff of our prestige in the eyes of Latin America.

SUBVERSION BY REDS INCREASING

An increase in Fidel Castro's export of Communist subversion to the rest of the hemisphere is taking a mounting toll of U.S. properties. There is obvious New Frontier reluctance to admit that this increase exists, but the U.S. Government and its citizens are being humiliated more and more.

The record shows consistent failure of our foreign service to perform its duty of protecting the rights of American citizens and property overseas, while both are attacked almost daily by Castro-trained terrorists and Marx-oriented government officials throughout Latin America. Our State Department seldom utters so much as a mild protest.

A chronology of such events by the Cuban Information Service includes the following, just since March 1:

March 2—Two Communist bands captured after attacks on hospital in Maracaibo and bank in Ciudad Ojeda; large quantities of arms, munitions, and anti-American literature seized. March 3—Five Communists arrested; police capture anti-American documents and arms after attempt to set fire to Goodyear Rubber Co. March 11—12—Red terrorists blow up U.S.-owned Creole Petroleum Co. pipeline between Maracaibo and coast, destroy 15,000 barrels of oil. March 14—Communists threaten to pirate tanker *Esso Maracaibo* of Creole Oil Co. March 20—Reds raid General Motors office in Puente Anauco, steal keys and keymaking machinery. March 27—Communists bomb Creole Petroleum installation in Lake Maracaibo, wounding two workers.

April 3—Creole pipeline blown up, repaired. April 8—Creole pipeline again blown up. April 9—Three Venezuelan police cars bombed with "Molotov cocktails" as Reds burn U.S.-owned Adams Chicle Co. in Caracas. April 26—U.S.-owned cordage mill in Caracas burned.

May 24—Red raiding party chased off after one is killed in attack on La Carlota Airport, Caracas, where U.S. military planes are hangared.

June 5—After first notifying a Caracas newspaper they would do so, eight Castro-led gunmen overpower Venezuelan guards at headquarters of U.S. military mission in Caracas, force six U.S. Army officers to strip, then insult and gag them, set building afire

with gasoline and flee with uniforms and valuables. June 15—Communists force way into home of U.S. Embassy Consul Edward T. Long, blind and gag Mrs. Long and maid, paint anti-American slogans on walls and flee. June 20—Communists raid Memphis American School, tie up women employees, raise Communist flag and escape. June 22—Communists blow up American-owned pipeline of Venezuela Transmission Corp., cutting off service to large sections of Caracas.

Perhaps to North Americans some of these occurrences may seem relatively unimportant. Prestige of the United States in Latin America, however, does happen to be very important, as is pointed out in John Chamberlain's column on this page today. Citizens of the United States have a right to expect, and insist on, a more positive degree of protection by our Government in these areas.

CASTRO'S BRAVADO CAPTIVATES MANY LATINOS

(By John Chamberlain)

When I was in Puerto Rico some years ago a member of the Serralles rum-distilling clan tried to explain to me the Latin concept of "dignidad." To translate it as simple "dignity" was not quite right; apparently the concept also included something about honor and inviolability. It was a two-way proposition: dignidad meant that one should be respected, but also that one must have reason to demand respect. The Serralles clan, at the time, was insistent that it be regarded as first-class Spaniards, not as third-class Americans; dignidad was very much on its mind.

Thinking about the business of temporizing with Castro in Cuba, I have more than once recalled that conversation about dignidad in the hot Caribbean coastal town of Ponce. The trouble with the United States in relation to the Castro question is that it has had no dignidad. In putting up with Fidel Castro's diatribes and insults, we do not respect ourselves. And it follows, as the night follows the day, that no dignidad-loving Latin American from the Rio Grande all the way south to Patagonia can respect us.

Confirmation of this suspicion comes from Mexico, in a new Mexican-American bulletin put out by Hugo Salinas Price at Apartado Postal No. 15049 Mexico 15, D.F., which is hereby recommended to the so-called Fourth Floor of the U.S. State Department. Full of dignidad himself, Hugo Salinas Price mimes no words on the subject of Castro. "In the eyes of our people," he says, "the fact that Castro is strong, and that he acts decisively and fearlessly, and the fact that the U.S. is impotent, is an overwhelming argument in favor of Castro. Outwardly, some of our people may not be sympathetic to Castro and communism. But inwardly, they admire his valor, his decision, his will to attain a given goal, even over dead bodies."

This is laying it on the line. Stressing the "honor" component of dignidad, Hugo Salinas Price points out that honor, in Mexican eyes, is bound up with "machismo," which is to be translated as "male-ism." The male Latin American cares very little for speeches on human rights, for, "in the Latin mentality, a man has a perfect right to kill with his hands, with a knife, or with a gun, anyone who dares to humiliate him."

Well, Castro and his sarcastic speechmaking Minister of Economics, the Argentinean "Che" Guevara, have seized every possible occasion to humiliate the United States. And so the Mexicans feel only "hate and contempt" for a nation that allows itself to be so humiliated. "Mexicans," so Hugo Salinas Price continues, "do not care to be allied with a power that has been humiliated, and that tries to buy respect . . . The Mexican is fiercely proud, in the midst of poverty. The Alliance for Progress completely ignores the fact that the Mexican is clearly