

tion for the land that ought to be redistributed in the interest of the general welfare of the country concerned. His views should also be a warning to the Congress and the American people that we stand to waste billions of dollars in the Alliance for Progress unless it deals with more basic issues than it has to date.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

*Cuba*  
**NEITHER WAR NOR PEACE: QUESTIONS ABOUT OUR CUBAN POLICY**

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on March 15, I suggested that we had become obsessed with Fidel Castro and the Cuban problem. Considering the significance of the Cuban regime and its limited economic and military potential, I asked if we had not exaggerated this as a threat to our security. I characterized our obsession with Castro as a fixation that was causing us to lose sight of other more fundamental challenges in the hemisphere and elsewhere in the world. The real bombshells of Latin America—poverty, illiteracy, disease, feudalism, injustice—were being underestimated. Too many critics, I concluded, seemed willing to risk countless lives in a military invasion or naval confrontation leading possibly to nuclear war, while not enough courageous and thoughtful men were giving attention to the basic problems which made Castro possible. What Castro is primarily a threat to is not the United States, but the possibility of peaceful, democratic development in the hemisphere.

Recognizing the necessity for keeping the Cuban dictator under surveillance, I suggested that we devote less time and energy to his fulminations and more to removing the conditions which are the seedbed of violence and communism throughout Latin America.

But bringing the Castro threat into perspective and strengthening such constructive forces as the Alliance for Progress will not directly solve the problem of Castro's Cuba. What, then, can we do specifically about this foreign policy stickler?

There are a few who suggest that we ought to make a direct onslaught against Castro, and, indeed, we have the military force to crush his government. This course is not supported by the Kennedy administration, nor does there seem to be any indication that Congress is ready to enact a resolution calling for a war against Cuba. The American people expressed overwhelming opposition to a military invasion of Cuba in a Gallup poll taken this spring.

Most of our citizens seem to understand, even if some few politicians do not, that a war with Cuba would doubtless create greater problems than it would solve. Historically, even the most well-intentioned U.S. military interventions have poisoned our relations with Latin America for long periods. And if we were to clash with Soviet forces in Cuba, who can be sure that this would not trigger world war III?

Some have suggested that we invoke a naval blockade against Soviet oil shipments to Cuba. But here again, this

means a direct clash of American and Soviet power, albeit on the high seas. To forcefully stop another nation's ships on the open seas is an act of war. Who is to guarantee that this would not balloon into a nuclear exchange?

It is true that when President Kennedy invoked a partial blockade against Cuba last October, he said that we would require the removal of offensive Soviet missiles followed by U.N. inspection as the price for lifting our naval sanction. The missiles were withdrawn, but the Cubans balked at permitting U.N. inspection unless such inspections were extended to U.S. staging areas in Florida.

Those who argue that the President capitulated by removing the naval sanction in the absence of U.N. inspection of Cuba should bear in mind that our reconnaissance planes have been permitted to fly over Cuban territory daily without interference. U.S. photo reconnaissance is fantastically effective in giving our strategists a daily picture of the situation in Cuba.

Actually, President Kennedy scored one of the most spectacular victories of the cold war when he forced Mr. Khrushchev to get his missiles out of Cuba without war. That action was successful because it was thoughtfully planned to achieve important but limited American objectives that gave our adversary enough room to maneuver short of a nuclear showdown.

Those who now call with more partisanship than prudence for precipitous action, invasion, or blockade should count the consequences of their proposals. We are no longer dealing with flintlock rifles or frigates of the early years of our Republic.

Cuba is only one of a score of tension spots around the world, any one of which could escalate into a global holocaust of unspeakable horror.

Those who propose the establishment of an American-backed Cuban government-in-exile at Guantanamo Bay are suggesting that we violate our treaty rights. The U.S. Government has a signed treaty with Cuba which gives us permission to operate a naval base on Cuban soil as a coaling and naval station only. It is both morally repugnant and politically unsound to suggest that we flaunt our treaty obligations by attempting to set up a military force at Guantanamo aimed at the overthrow of the Cuban Government. It is no excuse to say that the Cuban Government is scornful of its obligations. The United States of America did not become the world's greatest champion of human freedom and dignity by adopting the immorality and illegality of our most obnoxious enemies.

Before we condemn our President for his patient efforts to avoid war with Cuba while stimulating the forces of freedom in the hemisphere, we should look out on the world from the eyes of the White House.

President Kennedy admittedly has made mistakes in Cuba, the prime example being the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion. That invasion was conceived by the previous administration but it was approved by Mr. Kennedy and he

courageously assumed the full blame. But to suggest now that the President is weak kneed because he does not involve us in another wild venture of this sort seems incomprehensible.

The President of the United States is charged with a higher obligation than to risk taking this great Nation into war and possibly trigger a nuclear Armageddon unless every other alternative has failed.

President Kennedy is no weakling or appeaser. He will carry to his grave painful injuries suffered in military combat. He carries in his heart the memory of his brother who died in aerial combat. He has on his shoulders the fate of 189 million Americans, and, indeed, all mankind.

He needs our help and our patience and our prayers—not the strictures of bombastic critics and careless partisans.

To reject the counsels of recklessness, however, is not to suggest that we sit on dead center relative to Castro's Cuba. There is an urgent need for constant evaluation and thoughtful, restrained criticism of American foreign policy, and especially our Cuban policy. Isolating Castro and refusing to talk to him may be a practical, temporary expedient. It is not a positive or permanent policy.

Our present position seems built on the doubtful assumption that Castro, shut off from hemispheric aid and political support, will wither away. But will he? And if he does, what then? Do we have in mind a positive political alternative to Castro? The exiles appear hopelessly divided, sharing only a hatred of Castro. Do they, or we, wish to restore the economic and political conditions that existed under Batista—the very conditions that insured the success of Castro's grab for power? If not, how much of Castro's changes will they, or we, accept? Do we accept the expropriation of the sugar and cattle lands? The seizure of the oil refineries? The land reforms? The educational reforms? Can we see beyond the Castro revolution to the conditions that would exist in a Cuba without Castro?

Aside from these longer range problems, we appear to be in a corner on the issue of Cuba even insofar as immediate goals are concerned. We will not negotiate; neither will we take aggressive action. We will not trade with Castro; yet, we resent each new trade arrangement he concludes with the Soviet bloc or other sources. We shield the exiles from Castro's tyranny, but will not suffer them to strike blows at their enemy. We resent the presence of Soviet forces in Cuba; yet, we cannot entirely deny Castro's claim that he invited them to come because of his fear of an American-assisted invasion of his island.

At home, our bipartisanship on foreign affairs is shattered as the administration comes under attack for the apparent stalemate of our Cuban policy. Our Cuban fever is bound to rise and fall with each succeeding event. We are at the mercy of every political opportunist both at home and abroad who exploits our lack of a dynamic, positive policy.

In view of these facts, would it not make sense in Prof. Roger Fisher's words

to "slice up the Cuban problem"? Can we define certain limited goals in Cuba that give some realistic hope of attainment?

I believe that we can. I trust that such feasible alternatives to our present policy are now under the most active and serious consideration by our policy planners.

At a later date, I hope to suggest certain constructive steps that might be taken to open the way to a more satisfactory relationship with Cuba. Perhaps some Senators and Congressmen more experienced than I in foreign affairs will join in that effort.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOPER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the Senate

adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Friday, June 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, June 27, 1963:

##### DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, U.S. Air Force, to be reappointed as Chief of Staff of the Air Force for a term of 1 year.

##### IN THE ARMY

The nominations for promotion to major beginning Peter A. Abbruzzese, and ending Frank C. Leitnaker, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 24, 1963.

June 27

A4112

6. The American people must throw off once and for all their deplorable desuetude and degenerating detachment from foreign trade and go about the job of proving to the world that we are still its best salesmen and best technicians and, more important, that we still have the power, the energy and the will to overcome temporary obstacles and build an export trade for this country to a volume undreamed of by this or previous generations.

Thank you.

*Clark MacGregor*  
Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF  
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR  
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, many of us in both Houses of the Congress have been pointing out for over 2 years that we must maintain maximum alertness regarding events in Cuba. Former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, in remarks recently made at Newberry College, again reminded the President that we must not allow Mr. Khrushchev to think that after we awoke last October, we turned over and went back to sleep.

Yet the following articles by Columnists R. S. Allen and Paul Scott outlines what may be a coming "Cuba Policy Shift" by the Kennedy administration. In undertaking this shift, the administration will apparently attempt to normalize our relations with both Castro and Khrushchev by seeking accommodations with Russia and moderating tensions of the cold war. In order to make this drastic readjustment palatable to the American people, the change will take place over a period of time, probably to lull the American people into a slumber on Cuba deeper than that of the administration.

After the unanimous reports of the Seldon committee in the House, the Stennis committee in the Senate, the special eight-nation investigating committee of the Organization of American States, and the Task Force on Cuba and Subversion in the Western Hemisphere of the House Republican Policy Committee, it is clear beyond any doubt that such accommodation as that discussed below is contrary to both our national interest and security, and that of the entire hemisphere as well.

Excerpts of former Secretary Byrne's remarks from the June 13 Minneapolis Star and the Allen-Scott column from the June 21 St. Paul Pioneer Press follow:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, June 13, 1963]

OUR SLUMBER AND CUBA  
(By James F. Byrnes)

(Excerpts from an address by the former Secretary of State at Newberry College)

There is some justification for believing that ever since his first meeting with President Kennedy at Vienna, (Soviet Premier) Khrushchev has believed he could expect a softer attitude from us. There is no other way of explaining his unexpected action to make of Cuba a Communist Gibraltar.

As he proceeded for a year to establish a bastion of military power at our very door, with atomic power sufficient to destroy not only the United States but all of Latin America, he truly changed the balance of power in the world. Instead of consuming a year or two in building long-range missiles, which from bases in Russia could strike a target in the United States, now he could use short-range missiles from his Cuban bases.

Suddenly he was confronted by the President with a demand to remove his weapons. He yielded, to the gratification of every American. But what has happened since October does not justify gratification. It does cause some fears.

When Khrushchev agreed to the removal of the strategic weapons, he indicated agreement to on-site inspection by United Nations authorities. A few days later we were told that Castro refused to agree and the Soviets would have to support Castro's position.

I am confident the Soviets could force Castro to agree to the inspection at any time. That was only an excuse. However, we abandoned our demand and no one of us is certain of the number of Soviet weapons and combat forces in Cuba today.

In the presence of thousands of spectators Khrushchev (now has) pledged all-out support of his Communist brother, Castro, and of Cuba. This pledge has been heralded to the world. Upon it Castro is certain to rely and may act.

It is obvious that Latin American republics will conclude that we are unable to protect them. They will be subverted one by one until all of South America is lost and the Communist goal of isolating the United States has been attained.

Khrushchev knows that by his duplicity he put us to sleep for more than a year. He must not be allowed to think that when we awoke last October, we turned over and went back to sleep.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press, June 21, 1963]

CUBA POLICY SHIFT

(By R. S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy is deliberating a gradual shift in U.S. policy toward dictator Fidel Castro's Communist regime in Cuba.

For more than a month, the President and his top foreign policy advisers have been discussing a plan under which the United States would resume "contact" with Castro on both "an informal and formal basis."

Under this backstage scheme, New York attorney James Donovan, who negotiated the \$53-million ransom of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners, would fly to Havana and Moscow to seek the withdrawal of all Soviet combat forces from Cuba.

In exchange for their removal, the United States would agree to a step-by-step normalization of diplomatic and trade relations with the Red-ruled Castro dictatorship over a 2-year period.

As a first step, the United States would reopen its embassy in Havana by sending a charge d'affaires there. At present the Swiss Ambassador is handling U.S. affairs.

An exchange of ambassadors and lifting of the trade embargo against Castro would follow after sufficient time had elapsed to make such a drastic "readjustment" palatable to the people and Congress.

This far-reaching shift in Cuban relations is part of President Kennedy's policy of seeking accommodations with Russia and its satellite bloc for the avowed purpose of reducing the risk of nuclear war by moderating tensions.

White House insiders say the proposed switch in Cuba policy fits squarely with strategy enunciated recently by the President in a speech that "any plan of action in the Caribbean has to take into account

conditions and potential developments between the United States and U.S.S.R."

The President favors 47-year-old Donovan for this highly explosive diplomatic mission for two reasons: his "acceptability" to Castro and Khrushchev, and his close ties with key administration officials, notably Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

After Donovan arranged the swap of Soviet spy Abel for U-2 pilot Francis Gary Powers, the President wrote him, "The type of negotiations you undertook, where diplomatic channels had been unavailing, is unique, and you conducted it with the greatest skill and courage."

Castro's enthusiasm for Donovan is about on a par with that of the President. In feelers through diplomatic channels to the State Department, the Cuban dictator has indicated he would accept Donovan as negotiator. Words to that effect have been conveyed on three separate occasions—March 8, May 12, and May 19.

A decision on this momentous scheme will not be made until after the President returns from his European trip.

By that time the White House staff hopes to know whether the House Foreign Affairs Committee will undertake an inquiry into Donovan's previous Cuban negotiations. Republican committeemen are vigorously pressing for such an investigation. They have strongly urged it in a joint letter to Representative THOMAS MORGAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

Intelligence reports that around 100,000 Cubans are in Castro's jails for refusing to accept communism. Also that some 250,000 Cubans have fled, and another 180,000 are awaiting approval and transportation to leave. Senator JOHN STENNIS' Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee is preparing a new report on Castro-Communist subversion, sabotage, and guerrilla warfare against Latin American countries. The report, slated for release next month, will warn that Castro has ordered an increase in these operations.

between Eximbank and FCIA, the bank carries the political risk in all policies, and the two agencies share equally in the credit risk in comprehensive policies. As the program progresses, the insurance association is expected to take more of the credit risk and ultimately 100 percent of it.

As my good friend George Moore, president of the First National City Bank of New York, once told us, "If private financial institutions are not willing to take the credit risks, they don't deserve to be called bankers." The same philosophy should, in my opinion, apply to these gigantic insurance companies.

Export credit insurance enables the exporter to extend credit to his overseas customers with assurance that unforeseen adverse developments abroad will not expose him to large losses, thus protecting him against impairment of his working capital. Of equal importance, exporters find it easier to obtain financing for their transactions from commercial banks or other financial institutions, to which the insurance policies or their proceeds may be assigned. From its inception in February 1962, through May 31, 1963, FCIA has issued some 1,500 comprehensive policies in an amount of well over \$500 million. Over 150 of these policies were issued to companies that never exported before. It is also interesting that 26 percent of these policies were assigned as collateral to U.S. financial institutions which assisted the exporters in financing the transactions.

**EXIMBANK PROGRAMS WITH PRIVATE BANKS**

In addition to the insurance programs, Export-Import Bank, in late 1961, enlarged and improved its commercial bank guarantee program. Nonrecourse financing of medium-term transactions is provided to exporters by commercial banks, the latter obtaining guarantees from Eximbank on a case-by-case basis. Eximbank provides the commercial bank with a political risk guarantee on the early maturities of a medium-term transaction in which the commercial bank assumes the credit risk, and a guarantee covering both political and commercial risks.

1. Eximbank will now rely on the credit judgment of the originating commercial bank in transactions involving an invoice value up to \$200,000 each. The former limit was only \$50,000.

2. Eximbank will now give advance approval of the political risk portion of its guarantee. This enables the commercial bank to negotiate transactions with its customers with the advance knowledge that Eximbank will or will not accept the political risk. Obviously, if the answer is negative, the private bank in most instances can dispense with the costly and time-consuming credit investigation of the foreign buyer.

On these new guarantee and insurance programs Eximbank is disseminating information through a variety of devices and organizations. The Credit Policy Committee and the Small Business Council Committee of the American Bankers Association published a booklet this past February entitled, "World Trade Is Banking's Business." This booklet described and heartily endorsed the above programs and stressed the opportunities that they afford to increase the export business of this country. The booklet was distributed by the ABA to 17,500 member banks and their branches, which represent approximately 95 percent of all bank units in this country. Other commercial and business associations are contemplating publishing a separate booklet for the benefit of U.S. exporters and prospective exporters.

**PROJECT LOANS—LONGER TERM**

In dollar magnitude, Eximbank's project loans have traditionally constituted the great bulk of the Bank's volume. These longer term loans will, of course, be continued. In facilitating the export of U.S. goods and services, the project loan accomplishes for large transactions what the exporter credit guarantee accomplishes for the smaller ones. The project loan made directly to a foreign borrower involves the many items of equipment and services which go into the creation or the major expansion of an industrial, mining, public utility or other enterprise. The exporter type of transaction, contrarily, generally involves one or more "shelf" items of equipment going to the end user, or to a distributor for resale.

As a basis for making a project loan, Eximbank satisfies itself (1) that there is reasonable assurance of repayment; (2) that adequate resources are available to complete the project; (3) that the project is technically sound; and (4) that the project will benefit the economy and, frequently, that it will strengthen the foreign exchange position of the borrowing country. One of your Pittsburgh banks participated with Eximbank in financing one such project in Mexico a year or two ago.

From the standpoint of American business, the major impact of Eximbank's project lending is upon literally thousands of U.S. manufacturers and suppliers who are enabled thereby to sell equipment, materials and services abroad and to receive prompt payment. Although the number of prime contractors associated with a particular project loan may be small, thousands of orders flow to U.S. industry through subcontractors.

Loans of this type made by Eximbank are dollar credits, placed in U.S. banks, to pay for actual purchases of U.S. merchandise and services. Eximbank's dollars do not leave this country, only the American equipment, services, etc., which are exported. By financing sound projects abroad, Eximbank has helped to make American equipment and skills known throughout the world and has established a basis for a continuing flow of spare parts and repeat orders. A good example of this occurred 2 or 3 years ago when Eximbank made a loan of \$115 million to a private copper mining venture in Peru. U.S. exporters received orders not only for all of the original \$115 million, but also repeat orders for all manner of spare parts and merchandise, even food for the

commissary, at the rate of \$1 million per month. These spares and supplies were paid for in cash by the Peruvian borrower. Your industry and labor in western Pennsylvania have benefited greatly from these project loans and it is safe to say that they have received orders running into several hundred million dollars over the past few years as a result of Eximbank's having provided the funds for the U.S. dollar costs.

**EMERGENCY TRADE CREDITS**

Occasionally Eximbank fulfills its basic purpose of facilitating the foreign trade of the United States by extending so-called emergency trade credits. This type of credit is made when a friendly country, normally a good customer of the United States, experiences temporary exchange difficulties which threaten to impede or even cut off its customary level of imports from the United States. As in all of its other activities, the dollars loaned by Eximbank under such credits are tied to U.S. purchases.

**LINE OF CREDIT**

Another important facility offered by Eximbank for the benefit of U.S. business is the "line of credit" which Eximbank extends from time to time to foreign governments or the agencies thereof, and also to privately owned finance companies or banks abroad. Under these credits the borrowing bank or finance company renews Eximbank's funds to a very large number of small- and medium-sized concerns in the host country which could not possibly afford to deal directly with Eximbank. All of the money under these lines is credited to the account of the borrower in a U.S. commercial bank which, in turn, disburses the money to the U.S. suppliers which have received orders from the borrower. This device enables Eximbank to loan to and collect from one reliable borrower, who may be located 10,000 miles away, but who knows his customer's needs and capabilities. On one credit of this type, extended by Eximbank 2 or 3 years ago, over 900 U.S. suppliers in 37 States received orders and, incidentally, were paid in cash from the proceeds of Eximbank's credit.

**CONCLUSIONS**

In summing up my remarks today, I would like to emphasize the following points:

1. Neither Government nor industry can afford the peril of continuing large deficits in our country's international balance of payments. As a nation we must become much more "export minded" to insure a continuing and increasing ref flow of U.S. dollars back to the United States.

2. American business, banking, labor, and governmental agencies must cooperate with each other far more closely than they have in the past. It is more true today than it was 100 years ago when Abraham Lincoln said, "We must all hang together or we will all hang separately."

3. Government, labor, industry, and agriculture must bury their ancient myths about each other and unite in a common cause. These myths, as durable as those of Karl Marx and Adam Smith about capitalism, have survived wars, depressions, and even prosperous eras, but they are about as useful in running the complex machinery of the modern world as a sledge hammer.

4. We shall have to improve and refine programs which will harness the economic power of industry, finance, and agriculture with the political power of Government. As equal partners we have a reasonable chance of surviving the explosive forces which face us around the world.

5. Ignorance is the archenemy of progress. Our educational institutions as a whole, indeed starting at the high school level, will have to do a much better job in preparing our young men and women for the field of foreign trade, which offers such tremendous opportunities for interesting lives and profitable careers.

like to submit this report of the comments of Police Chief Rolland J. Gainsley, of Ann Arbor, Mich.:

**POLICE CHIEF PLEADS FOR YOUTH BILL**

Ann Arbor Police Chief Rolland J. Gainsley today issued an appeal for local support of President Kennedy's youth employment and conservation bill.

The bill, sponsored by U.S. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, has been passed by the Senate and is expected to go before the House shortly.

Gainsley said, "Common sense and justice compel establishment of this program which will give many thousands of currently unemployed young persons a chance to find employment, to be paid for their services, and to acquire skills and work experience that will give them a solid start in their working lives.

"Provisions in this legislation provide a practical means of attacking the high school dropout problem and the juvenile delinquency associated with that problem.

"Young men and women no longer in school constitute already 18 percent of our total unemployment, although they comprise only 7 percent of the labor force. These figures reflect a serious national situation. Idle youth on our city streets create a host of problems.

"During the 1960's an estimated 7½ million youths will enter the job market with less than a high school education. Unless something is done to help equip them to live in a skilled economy, they will pile up helplessly against the rising barriers to unskilled labor.

"In the last decade, juvenile delinquency cases brought before the courts have more than doubled, and arrests of youth increased 86 percent, until they numbered almost one million arrests a year in 1960—15 percent of all arrests.

"Favorable House action on the Youth employment and conservation bill will provide work and training for youths from the age of 16 through 21.

"Members of the Youth Conservation Corps will receive \$60 a month in wages. They will be given lodging, board, work clothes, tools and equipment, medical, and other necessities.

"The corpsmen will be under the direct supervision of adult conservationists, foresters, rangers, and others. They will work on and receive training in various jobs and projects involving general areas as erosion, stream control, reforestation, and construction of outdoor recreation and camp facilities.

"In addition, the corpsmen will be given technical training and educational skills through classroom periods after work hours. The need for this new youth program is evident. It was designed to reduce unemployment and train more young workers who would otherwise be idle. They must be given a chance to work before they may take to crime instead," Gainsley said.

**Rev. Francis P. Donnelly, S.J.,  
Memorial Conference**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on the 26th and 27th of next month the University of Scranton will pay a singularly appropriate tribute to the late Reverend

Francis P. Donnelly, S.J., who, from a humble beginning in Pittston, Pa., in my congressional district, became one of the Nation's leading educators prior to his death in 1959. The university will hold this 2-day conference on the modern trends in the teaching of English. To better understand the immense stature of Father Donnelly, I quote the New York Times upon his death in April 1959. The Times referred to him as "one of the foremost Jesuit teachers, writers, and educators of this century." In the "Personal and Pertinent" column of the Scranton Times of June 8, 1963, the writer of that column, Mr. Neil Whitney, capsuled Father Donnelly's illustrious career very well, and it gives me great pleasure to make the aforementioned column a part of my remarks today.

The University of Scranton is planning a singularly appropriate tribute to the late Rev. Francis P. Donnelly, S.J., who, from a humble beginning in Pittston, became one of the Nation's leading educators prior to his death in 1959. The university, according to an announcement from the office of its president, Rev. John J. Long, S.J., will hold the Francis P. Donnelly, S.J., Memorial Conference on July 26 and 27. The conference will be concerned with modern trends in the teaching of English. It will emphasize, in an introductory manner, the recent discoveries in the field of language study. Among these discoveries is the linguistic method of language teaching. Linguistics is a scientific investigation of the structure and development of the structure and development of language. The program for the July memorial conference is being arranged by Dr. Robert Lodge, chairman of the university's English department; Rev. Richard Grady, S.J., cochairman and author of the movie hit "Angels in the Outfield," and Alfred Rotondaro, faculty member in the English department. Conference lectures will be given on fundamentals of linguistics, analysis of texts, use of the new methods in literature courses and other associated topics. The speakers will include Professors Frank L. Ryan and John J. Murray of the university faculty; Prof. Robert Minshall of Bucknell University, and Prof. Edward James of Catholic University of America. All of these educators are familiar with the work of Father Donnelly, who was a nationally known teacher of rhetoric. He was associated at various times during his 50-year teaching career with Holy Cross, Gonzaga, and Boston Colleges, and Fordham University. His books on the teaching of English, "Model English I" (1902), "Model English II" (1919), "Persuasive Speech" (1931) among many others, are still being used in schools all over the country.

In an article about Father Donnelly which appeared in this space on March 11, I reprinted his famous poem, "What an Irishman Means by Machree." I have since learned from Charles A. McCarthy, the well-known Pittston historian, that Father Donnelly received his early inspiration and encouragement as a poet from T. A. Daly, the popular Philadelphia poet. Mr. Daly, for many years before his death, wrote a syndicated poem entitled "The Daly Ditty." It was generally written in the Italian vernacular and appeared in this newspaper as a daily feature back in the twenties. Father Donnelly first saw the light of day on the second floor of the building at 79 South Main Street, Pittston, on December 10, 1869. His father, the late Cornelius Donnelly, was engaged in the undertaking and furniture business at that address. The priest's early studies were at St. John's Academy of Pittston. In 1884 he attended classes at Pittston

Borough School, at which time the late Thaddeus M. Conniff of Plains township was the principal. In later years Mr. Conniff recalled that Father Donnelly and the late Thomas A. Grace, who served for many years as a member of the Luzerne County Board of Assessors, were his first Latin students in Pittston. As a boy Father Donnelly, with many companions from his neighborhood, was fond of swimming in the Susquehanna River in the summertime. These occasions were the inspiration for his poem, "The Susquehanna," in which he described "the days that are no more" and mentioned swimming at the old, "Sandy Bottom," near the foot of Dock Street, in Pittston. After completing 50 years as a teacher, the last 23 of them at Fordham, Father Donnelly retired in 1952 because of ill health. When he passed away on April 18, 1959, the New York Times referred to him as "one of the foremost Jesuit teachers, writers, and educators of this century."

*Cuba*  
**Red Spies Via Cuba**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. CLARK MacGREGOR**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, two congressional committees, the Organization of American States, numerous Members of Congress, and private individuals have warned of the explosive situation resulting from Communist subversive activity throughout Latin America now being directed from Soviet Cuba. We may be facing the possibility that Moscow-trained agents are entering the United States under the guise of Cuban "refugees," as described in the following Allen-Scott column in the June 26 St. Paul Pioneer Press:

**RED SPIES VIA CUBA**

WASHINGTON.—Hundreds of Moscow-trained agents are entering the United States as-Cuban refugees.

These Spanish-speaking Communists, some of them veterans of the Spanish Civil War, have come in with the thousands of Cuban refugees who have been admitted to the United States since last fall's missile crisis.

According to sworn testimony before the Senate internal security subcommittee by reliable, anti-Castro refugees, the Red agents are concentrating on infiltrating the splintered refugee groups and are a principal reason for the seething dissension among them.

A highly regarded attorney in Miami, representing a number of these Cuban organizations, has turned over to the Senators detailed evidence that Dictator Castro and his Russian henchmen personally selected about half of the passenger list of one Red Cross ship that recently brought approximately 1,000 refugees to the United States.

This startling information is supported by intelligence reports that the Kremlin is using the Cuban refugee traffic as a means of infiltrating Moscow-trained agents into the United States and Latin American countries.

The Miami attorney, who requested that his identification be kept secret because of the classified nature of his activities, bluntly blamed this extraordinary situation on the lax screening of refugees by immigration authorities.

He flatly charged that policies of the Kennedy administration, as formulated by the State and Justice Departments, are permit-

A4102

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 27

ting hundreds of Red agents easy access to the United States while barge anti-Castro raids on Cuba.

The Senate committee, headed by Senator JAMES EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, plans to ask FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover for his expert views on the number of Russian agents who have entered from Cuba and the danger they present to the country's internal security.

The Kennedy administration has no "hard intelligence" to support the State Department's curious claim that Russia does not have sufficient troops in Cuba to exert control there.

According to the latest estimate of the Central Intelligence Agency, Russia still has "between 12,500 and 17,500" troops in Cuba. The most recent report of the Defense Intelligence Agency places the number as high as 32,000.

Neither the CIA nor DIA estimates support the State Department's disclaimer on the control of Cuba. Instead, both intelligence Agencies have considerable evidence that Cuba's foreign policy is laid down by Moscow, and Castro is administering it with the "advice and consent" of five Russian generals stationed in Cuba.

It is definitely known that Secretary Rusk was all set to announce that Russian combat forces had been withdrawn from there when this column revealed that CIA and military intelligence authorities were refusing to back such a declaration.

Administration insiders are saying privately the White House "advised" Rusk to change his statement to the effect that "there is a thinning out of Soviet troops."

This carefully worded explanation was slipped to a hand-picked group of newsmen at a dinner given by Rusk ostensibly to brief them on the President's European trip.

This intelligence dispute has been raging inside the administration since early this month when the White House mysteriously ordered the first low-level reconnaissance flight over Cuba since last February. Until this flight was personally approved by the President, at least a half-dozen requests for such missions by military and intelligence authorities had been turned down.

Aerial photos of this low-level flight revealed that two Soviet camps had been evacuated and that Russian combat units had left these areas. The photos also showed new Soviet military depots, indicating the Russians were apparently trying to secrete their equipment.

On the basis of this information, CIA and military intelligence are strongly inclined to the view that Soviet combat units are still on the island. This belief is further supported by the fact that there is no positive information that the troops have been withdrawn, although their exact whereabouts are unknown.

### Mason County, W. Va., Was Intended To Be a New Colony

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ROBERT C. BYRD**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the town of Point Pleasant, located in what is now Mason County, W. Va., was designated by royal decree in 1771 to be the capital of a new western colony, according to an article in the

June 16, 1963, issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail.

The article tells how plans for forming the new colony at the juncture of the Ohio and Kanawha Rivers were stymied by the outbreak of the Revolutionary War. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

#### POINT PLEASANT, SITE OF BLOODY CONFLICT

The capital of the new colony was to be where two great rivers, the Ohio and the Great Kanawha, met. The name of the colony would be Vandalla.

Gov. Robert Dinwiddie, of Virginia, had proposed the idea as early as 1756. In 1771 Thomas Walpole and Benjamin Franklin submitted a petition to the king, asking for the new colony, and it met with royal approval.

But the Revolutionary War arrived, and everyone lost sight of the new colony. Point Pleasant, though rich in history, didn't become the capital of anything except Mason County.

La Salle had been to the area earlier for the French—about 1669. Christopher Gist arrived in 1760, and George Washington slept there in 1770. Permanent settlement at Point Pleasant began with occupation of the site by the Virginia troops of Gen. Andrew Lewis on October 6, 1774, on lands owned by Thomas Lewis.

On October 10, one of the bloodiest battles ever fought by the red men and the white latecomers became the chief event of Lord Dunmore's war. The confederated tribes led by Chief Cornstalk were beaten, and the Virginia border was advanced from the Allegheny crest to the broad Ohio.

Mason County was formed in 1804 from the western portion of Kanawha. It took its name from George Mason, author of the Virginia Constitution and member of the convention that framed the Constitution of the United States.

The bottom lands of the Ohio and Kanawha valleys were attractive to settlers. Farms and herds from earliest times constituted a sizable segment of the county's wealth. Coal, oil, gas, and salt brines, were plentiful. Great stands of timber covered the hills, but like the woodland of other counties became depleted later.

Even before 1860, as today, Mason County was building boats and sending them to sea, and part of the timber depletion resulted from use of fine oak in the vessels.

The *Sumpter*, a Mason-built ship, was used during the Mexican War.

As one of the counties in the Ohio Valley, Mason faces the future with optimism.

Among its attractions are Tuendle-wel Park in Point Pleasant, commemorating the famous battle; and a large State public hunting area.

### Is the Trip Necessary?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1963

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of controversy appears to exist regarding the present trip of the Chief Executive to Europe.

The following editorial from the *Gazette and Daily*, York, Pa., is submitted without comment:

A LEMON

President Kennedy's trip to Europe would seem to have been undertaken at the poorest of times. The political situation in the major nations of West Europe and in Great Britain is in a state of flux, to say the least. New governments and new heads of government will soon be in power, meaning that the people with whom the President is talking officially are lame ducks. At home the civil rights crisis in Washington and elsewhere ought to require the President's persistent, close attention. Friends at home and abroad advised him to postpone his planned trip. But off he went anyway. Why?

Mr. Kennedy is really on a campaign tour. He is attempting to sell the Europeans on something which at first glance they did not want. The item is the so-called multilateral seaborne nuclear force, established within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which is to say under the effective control of the United States. This is quite a scheme. It envisages ships equipped with nuclear weapons, manned by personnel from a number of nations, including West Germany, cruising the Mediterranean and Baltic Seas and the Atlantic coastal waters of Western Europe.

Policymakers in Washington have confided that the complicated notion was developed as a means of keeping nuclear weapons from the independent possession and command of West Germany. Not that there is apparently any great U.S. objection to this. It is just that the Soviet Union has let it be known that a nuclear-armed West Germany is completely unacceptable. "The Soviet Union is pathological on that score," a high State Department official told a group of newsmen not long ago. So the problem arose: How to relate West Germany and nuclear weapons without upsetting the apple cart, which is to say, without beginning world war III. Some bizarre brainstorming then produced this multilateral concoction.

Thus Mr. Kennedy's trip. At least it surely looks that way. An international politics campaign trip, studded with private talks, public speeches, appearances before vast throngs. Just like 1960, here in his own country, all over again. Complete with doubletalk also, as is customary in campaign oratory. The President tells the West Germans we will never let them down, that he is prepared to risk U.S. cities in defense of Western Europe—basically he is pleading for agreement to permit the United States to manage the area's military operations—and at the same time he throws a curve, you might say, over the Berlin wall in the direction of the Soviet Union by remarking that this Western alliance, founded to deter a new war, "must now find a way to a new peace."

Who knows what all this means? Is it plain old politics? Well, sure. But more besides. It is almost desperate politics simply because the President's platform is so weak. The multilateral nuclear seaborne idea is a lemon. What a product for a President to travel thousands of miles to sell. We suspect that Mr. Kennedy conceives of it as a creature of strength which may help him to negotiate a German settlement with the Soviet Union, preferably before the domestic presidential campaign of 1964. But the point is that playing politics with nuclear weapons and West Germany combined is playing with fire. Isn't any one of us puzzled and unsettled at the spectacle of hundreds of thousands of massed Germans shouting over and over the name of the President of the United States?