



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 109

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1963

No. 151

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOM,
September 23, 1963.

I hereby designate the Honorable JOHN E. MOSS to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend David O. Trauger, rector, Church of the Good Shepherd, Philadelphia, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, whom to know aright is life eternal, whose laws are perfect truth, we beseech Thee to send upon these Congressmen here assembled a portion of Thy wisdom and power and love so that they may enact laws which are pleasing in Thy sight and for the welfare of all of our people.

To this petition we add our unfeigned thanks for all the blessings that Thou hast bestowed upon us as a nation and individually. Give us grateful hearts and a firm resolve to serve Thee and our fellow men. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 19, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 5555) entitled "An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CANNON, Mr. ERVIN, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1576) entitled "An act to provide assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction and initial staffing of community mental health centers, and for other purposes," agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HILL, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. PELL, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. TOWER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 10, Public Law 474, 81st Congress, had appointed Mr. MECHEM to be a member of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARSON and Mr. JOHNSTON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 64-4.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 5888, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that this is the bill H.R. 5888, which, as enacted by the other body, contains an amendment known as amendment 25, to be found on page 25 of the amended bill. It provides that 150 supergrades, that is, grade 18's, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would be increased, if the amendment were adopted, from salaries of approximately \$20,000 a year to \$30,000. In other words, it would be approximately \$10,000 annual increases for these 150 supergrades.

I will say to the gentleman that this would disrupt the entire pay schedules of the Classification Act if it were to be adopted. It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Delaware, Mr. WILLIAMS, has obtained an agreement from the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with this bill in the other body that the amendment will be stricken in conference.

My question to the gentleman from Rhode Island is, Will this be concurred in or can the gentleman tell me whether this will be concurred in by the managers on the part of the House—the striking out of this amendment No. 25?

Mr. FOGARTY. It is my understanding that the Members of the other body have already agreed to strike it out and therefore it will not be a point in conference, because it was not in the House bill. As the gentleman from Iowa

16747

16748

knows the House has never tried to legislate in this way on an appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. The managers on the part of the House certainly would not insist upon an amendment of this nature that the House never even considered.

Mr. FOGARTY. No, it would not.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. One other question I should like to ask the gentleman. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the last amendment to the bill as it left the House was one which I had the privilege of introducing and which was adopted. It provided that none of the funds appropriated under the act could be used to promote such things as a Domestic Peace Corps or any similar organization. I note this amendment has been stricken from the bill by the other body. I would hope that the managers on the part of the House would exercise their power and put that amendment back in the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. As the gentleman knows, I did not oppose the gentleman's amendment at the time.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman did not oppose it at the time and therefore acquiesced in the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. It was accepted by a practically unanimous vote of the House at that time. Offhand I would be constrained to stay with the House's position on it. Of course, I would not want to tie the hands of all the conferees.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for the responses he has given. I am sure he understands that my objective has been to make legislative history and I appreciate his cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FOGARTY, DENTON, GIBBON, LAIRD, and MICHEL.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO CUBA AND U.S. ACTIVITY TO PREVENT IT

(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, news that four French ships have entered the Cuban trade clearly indicates how ineffectual the U.S. State Department has been in securing economic isolation of Cuba.

In April, six free world countries permitted their ships to go to Cuba. In May, seven were represented, and in June and July the total was eight. In August the number reached nine nations trading with Cuba. And now the addition of France.

During the period January-July, the number of trips to Cuba by these ships increased from 12 to 45. Total trips numbered 259 in the last Maritime Administration report.

The American people have been given assurances on the one hand, and excuses on the other. We were told this ship-

ping was not increasing, and that it would decrease further. It was on the increase at the time the State Department news release was being issued, and is still on the increase.

The report about France getting in on the profitable Cuban trade said that the State Department, "in a subdued, diplomatic way," had taken the matter up with the French Government.

The American people are impatient with subdued, diplomatic activity which does not produce results. They are tired of hearing that ships are under charter, or otherwise out of the control of the country whose flag they fly. We have been witnessing flags of convenience for years—now we have a new approach, contracts of convenience.

The State Department is either unwilling or unable to carry out the announced policy of this Government to isolate Castro economically.

U.S. maritime leaders have branded these State Department efforts a "failure" and have demanded tougher measures. Ralph Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute and Joseph Curran, head of the National Maritime Union, have joined together in a call for action. Joseph Curran, Jr., has suggested American picketing of all ships from countries permitting their ships to go to Cuba. I believe economic pressures such as this would be most effective, and express a grassroots American feeling to the foreign governments and shipowners which they fail to grasp through the "subdued" efforts of an ineffectual State Department policy.

I have proposed legislation which would forbid interstate transportation of any goods imported into the United States on ships from countries in the Cuban trade. Today I have requested the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to begin hearings on this bill. It is my hope that we can display to the international shipowners, and to our own State Department, that we want action, not excuses.

NIKOLA PETKOV, BULGARIAN PATRIOT

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today we in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, pause in our legislative work to pay tribute to the memory of a gallant Bulgarian patriot who died a martyr to the cause of freedom 16 years ago this day.

The Bulgarian nation has had a devastatingly bleak history of subjugation and oppression with intermittent glimpses of freedom. They are a proud people, brave people, outstanding people who have given much to Europe and the world. On September 23, 1947, just 16 short years ago, their present oppressors—the Communists—killed the patriot, Nikola Petkov.

Before I pay tribute to this fine man, permit me, Mr. Speaker, to say just a word or two about the valiant, brave but oftentimes unfortunate efforts of the Bulgarian people to breathe the fresh air

of freedom. It was only 85 years ago, in 1887, that the Bulgarian people were freed by czarist Russia after 500 years of oppression. Less than 60 years later, on September 8, 1944, the Russian Army invaded and conquered Bulgaria. It is one of the sad ironies of history that the very country which had given this nation its freedom should in the following century become its oppressor.

Because Americans of all generations have been dedicated to freedom and justice, and because Americans always honor those who die for these same beliefs, it is fitting that we here in the U.S. Congress note Bulgarian National Day, 1963, and the role of the father of that day, Nikola Petkov.

Born in 1894 in Sofia, Nikola Petkov spent the later years of his life fighting for freedom for his country against the tyrannical Communist oppressors. Approximately a year after the Communist army subdued the country, the Communists temporarily relaxed their oppression, and allowed an opposition party to operate openly. As we know now, the Communists did this for three reasons: First, to deceive the Americans into thinking there was a true democracy in the country; second, to gain the diplomatic recognition by the Western Powers; and third, to get the U.S. Senate to ratify the pending peace treaty.

During the time the Communists tolerated the opposition Agrarian Party led by Petkov, the opposition party won the substantial support of the people. In October 1946, Petkov and 101 other Bulgarians took their seats in the Grand National Assembly. In the Assembly Petkov never relaxed his efforts to show to the world the godlessness of communism. On the day after the U.S. Senate ratified the treaty, the Communists disbanded the opposition party and arrested Petkov and others of the Agrarian Party. Eventually all those who were active in the opposition movement, which the Communists had allowed to exist as a show for the West, were liquidated in some way. Petkov was charged with high treason, to which he refused to confess, and on September 23, 1947, he was hanged in secret. Because he was so loved and admired by his people it took this act on the part of the Communists to make formal and final their mastery over the Bulgarian people.

By his death this great patriot joined a long list of Bulgarians who have died with hope that someday their country would be free. I consider it a privilege to say on behalf of all Americans that we share that same long hope. The Communists offered him his life if he would confess to treason, but he refused and made it clear to them and to his countrymen that he would gladly die if it meant eventual freedom for his people.

I think of the life of this great democrat as a manifestation of the spirit of the Bulgarian people throughout their history. He is a reminder not only to the people of Bulgaria, but to all Americans, that freedom must continually be won.

I happily join with all Americans and other members of the Congress in expressing the hope that someday the people of Bulgaria will live in the freedom for which Nikola Petkov died.

Castro after all other steps are taken; if it is essential in the Monroe Doctrine that this means kicking the Communists out of Cuba to preserve our security, that is the step we are going to have to take."

This, I submit, is the authentic voice of the American people. Sometime before November 1964, President Kennedy is going to listen to it—or else.

Soviet Plans in Latin America Set

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, our country is fortunate in having in Europe one of its most distinguished news analysts, Constantine Brown, who always writes with the objectivity of the trained observer.

The latest contribution of Mr. Brown, which deals with a subject of vital significance to the United States and, indeed, of the entire Western Hemisphere, follows:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Aug. 31, 1963]

SOVIET PLANS IN LATIN AMERICA SET: RED DEFECTOR SAYS CUBA IS SPEARHEAD, ORDERED TO USE "CARROT" TACTIC ON UNITED STATES
(By Constantine Brown)

MUNICH.—At a place "somewhere in Germany" where important Communist defectors are screened before being given permanent residence here, I met through German friends a Czech who had held a position of responsibility in the Prague hierarchy. He was a man in his late fifties, erudite and keen-minded. He had given up everything because "I could no longer stand the intrigues, the double-crossings and the lies of the regime which I had joined wholeheartedly. But," he added wistfully, "I am afraid I have now joined the losing side."

His explanation for this pessimistic viewpoint about the "losing side" (the West) was simple. The new generation of political men, particularly in the United States and Britain, does not want to believe the U.S.S.R. is planning for the conquest of the world.

Premier Khrushchev has confused and frightened the political men by his tactics of hot and cold showers, frowns and smiles, rattling of missiles and "deep concern for humanity." He is now certain, if his life span lasts for another 10 years, that he can hand over to his successor the socialist world promised by Lenin.

The signing of the Moscow pact and the subsequent steps are only a beginning. Mr. Khrushchev's aims go further, to the Western Hemisphere.

The Czech defector, who my German friends told me is trustworthy, emphasized the plan for a gigantic U.S.R.L.A. When asked what this meant, he explained, "the United Socialist Republics of Latin America."

During the 37-day visit of Fidel Castro to the Soviet Union, the blueprint of such an organization of states was discussed in all details by Mr. Khrushchev, the Cuban dictator and a number of top Soviet officials.

Mr. Khrushchev was confident that there will be no more than token opposition from the United States. Cuba will be, of course, the key point where all the propaganda and subversive moves will start.

The anxiety of the Western Powers, and particularly of the United States and Britain,

for accommodation is to be exploited intensively all over Latin America, together with the power element of the U.S.S.R. The first component group of the USRLA would be composed of Cuba, Venezuela, Mexico, Chile, and Brazil, as well as the former British Guiana and possibly Hispaniola after the Duvalier regime in Haiti has been liquidated. The target date is 1968.

According to my informant, Mr. Khrushchev has instructed Mr. Castro to take his time and lay the groundwork without haste. It is essential, he is reported to have said, that the chances of reelection of the present Washington administration, sympathetic to socialism and dedicated to a relaxation of tensions, should not be endangered. It is also important that the British Labor Party, headed by Harold Wilson—and described by Mr. Khrushchev as a man of great intelligence and insight toward world trends—should replace the wobbly, uncertain, and tired Conservatives.

Hence, there must be no hasty or rash moves by Fidel and his associates throughout Latin America. Quite the contrary, Mr. Castro must accept with good grace any indications for reconciliation with the United States—even at the price of some concessions regarding the confiscation of American properties.

The Czech defector added that there are already in course such negotiations which may lead to a resumption of diplomatic relations with Washington. But he expects nothing concrete before next year. The pot will be kept simmering until the American elections. After November 1964, however, the work of creating a USRLA will be started in earnest.

Asked about Europe's reaction to the gigantic Soviet plans, the answer was that Europe has relied too much on the United States to be able to successfully resist the trend. Anyhow, he added, the only strong opponents of Mr. Khrushchev are West German Chancellor Adenauer and French President de Gaulle. With Mr. Adenauer out of office Mr. Khrushchev does not worry about Mr. Erhard and Mr. Schroeder. Both are Anglo-Saxon minded and unsympathetic to the French-German alliance. General de Gaulle, if placed in a position of isolation after the departure of Mr. Adenauer, could withdraw his support from the Germans if Bonn breaks the spirit of the alliance and turns to Moscow for a renewal of the historic entente.

"There is not a single head of government anywhere in the world," said my informant, "who enjoys more prestige with the Kremlin gang than De Gaulle. He has been unyielding and that counts with those men more than the chase for relaxation."

Address of Guam's Speaker, Won Pat, at National Conference of Legislative Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the address of Hon. Won Pat, Speaker of the Legislature of Guam, at the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders at Boston on September 21. Forty-seven States of the Union and Guam were represented at the conference.

Speaker Won Pat's address follows:

OUTLINE OF FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS AS THEY APPLY TO THE TERRITORY OF GUAM

I. UNIQUE ASPECTS OF GUAM'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Guam is not a sovereign state; its government is not touched on in the Constitution except in article IV, section 3, which provides that the Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations for the territories—Guam has no vote in the national elections, and no seat in the Congress, either voting or otherwise. Accordingly, the unincorporated territory of Guam is not an independent entity, as is a State of the United States, and thus its relations with the Federal Government are similar to those what we might say between creator and creature rather than between equals. As an example, any bill passed by the Guam Legislature and signed by the Governor has to be submitted to Congress, which, for a period of 1 year after submission, reserves the right to repeal or annul the bill, and although Congress has never so abrogated any of our local legislation, the power to do so exists, and the net result is that our legislation does not become, in effect, final until 1 year after its submission to Congress. Our organic act, which serves as our state constitution, is Federal legislation which has been amended in the past and can be amended in the future without the people of Guam having any voice in the matter whatsoever. Although our Government has been self-supporting, operating its typical American governmental structure with tax funds locally collected, nevertheless the Congress can cut off our present sources of revenue at any time, and in any number of ways.

In outlining our rather precarious position in our relationship with Congress, let me emphasize that it is only in examining the legal and constitutional relationship between our territory and the Federal Government that our position appears so precarious, since, in point of fact, Congress, following the Second World War, has been generous to the people and to the territory of Guam and our relations have been generally amiable. The same holds true generally speaking with the executive branch of the Federal Government, also. However, since our territory's principal function is to provide logistic support for the Air Force and naval establishments on the island, the Department of Defense plays the most important role of any Federal department in determining our future, and this despite the fact that the Department of the Interior is the executive agency charged with the responsibility of supervising our activities and our relationship with the Federal Government. We have noted with interest that when there is a showdown between the two departments over some matter affecting Guam, the Department of Defense invariably wins, and over these power struggles between agencies in the Federal Government, the territory of Guam has practically no influence, whatsoever, since we have no one in Washington who can protect our interests and we have no political pressure that we can bring to bear.

Guam also comes under the cognizance of the State Department under the Office of Dependent Areas by virtue of the U.S. relationship with the United Nations. Thus, the Department of State takes a rather condescending interest in our territory. The United Nations classifies Guam as a non-self-governing dependency of the United States, in other words, a colony, and therefore the State Department, as the agency charged with the responsibility of representing the United States in the United Nations, feels that it must make sure that nothing happens on Guam that can be later used against the United States in the United Nations. The people of Guam are traditionally

1963

average. His 94 tons of corn produced about 33 cases per ton, or 3,100 cases, making nearly 75,000 cans of famous Green Giant Niblets available to homemakers across the country.

Looking ahead at kitchen-ready foods, David pointed out that he and Green Giant had saved housewives nearly 25,000 hours of kitchen preparation work on his production alone. Incidentally, he netted \$713.15 on that crop of corn and won a gold wrist-watch, an official jacket, a gold pin and purple ribbon from the National Junior Vegetable Growers Association. The Green Giant Co. gave him an all-expense trip to the 28th annual convention of the Junior Vegetable Growers in Miami last December.

David was graduated from the Hector Community High School, class of 1962. He played saxophone in the senior band, was president of the student council school-paper reporter, served on the staff of the yearbook, was a cross country runner. He played basketball and was in the senior class play, served as president of the FFA and won the degree of State Farmer.

This year he is president of the freshman class at South Dakota State College in Brookings.

The family attends the Lutheran church. His father has been an outstanding vegetable and Hampshire farmer for many years.

Scientific minded, his Green Giant Fieldman Jilek says, Davy became Minnesota's top sweet corn farmer because he kept good records, ran a detailed fertilizer program and followed accepted production practices and close supervision to win over 425 other contestants.

The Vegetable Growers Messenger in recognizing a "Young Man on the March," David Anderson, also pays tribute to the Green Giant Fieldman John Jilek, William A. Free, Sr., president of the National Cannery's Association, Drs. Charles H. Mahoney and Edwin A. Crosby, who held up the Raw Products Research Bureau of NCA, and to NJVGA chairman, Grant Snyder.

Man helps himself most when he lifts a youngster.

Cuba
Cuba Still a Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, following the good, Madison Avenue style of the New Frontier, the people seem to have forgotten about Cuba and the tremendous danger that lurks there.

The following articles, one by Robert G. Spivack, a Liberal, which appeared in the August 25 issue of the New York Herald Tribune, and the other by Edgar Ansel Mowrer, in the September 17 issue of the Long Island Press, remind us how fraught with danger Cuba still is: [From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 25, 1963]

CASTRO'S KIDNAPERS

(By Robert G. Spivack)

The U.S. Government looked pathetic when a State Department spokesman announced that a Cuban air and naval force had seized 19 anti-Castro refugees off a British islet in the Caribbean while our jets and a Coast Guard patrol plane helplessly circled overhead.

The description of the incident as one of international "kidnaping" supposedly con-

stituted a severe rebuke to Castro's bad boys. Actually, it made our position look even worse. It is not in keeping with American tradition to stand by and allow refugees, or freedom fighters, to be taken by force of arms to the country from which they have sought to escape.

When such incidents have taken place at the Berlin Wall the excuse for our inaction has been that it might touch off a world conflagration, with the Soviet Union and East German armed forces so near at hand.

But if we have become so spineless that such incidents can go unpunished within an area that is not even 100 miles from our shores, how can we expect the rest of the American Republics to take seriously our oft-expressed determination to keep the hemisphere safe from communism?

And why should Castro himself take us seriously when we back down at every confrontation?

The kidnaping incident forces us once again to take a look at our Cuban policy, or nonpolicy. During July, Castro announced expropriation of the American Embassy in Havana; on July 26 he called for violent revolution throughout Latin America. His adherents have carried on ceaseless guerrilla warfare against the democratic regime of Venezuela's President Betancourt.

We still talk grandiosely about the Alliance of Progress, a laudable but long-range objective. But as far as dealing with day-by-day incidents, it seems clear we have no plan for coping with Castro.

As a result, our prestige in Latin America sinks lower and lower.

I base this not on conjecture, or even on what might be considered logical reaction to our indecisiveness, but on what responsible Latin American leaders have told me. The liberal moderates, the conservatives and the ultraleftists all find American conduct incomprehensible.

"Just imagine," one told me, "how Khrushchev would react if such things were happening within 100 miles of his borders."

Again the question naturally arises: What can we do about Castro's conduct? In the case of the Caribbean "kidnaping," I would think the answer was fairly obvious. Our planes should have fired warning shots at the kidnapers, and if they did not back off then, we should have engaged them in the kind of aerial diversionary activity that would have driven them away, or at least given the refugees sufficient time in which to escape.

The argument is made that we needed British permission to act within their territorial waters. This is not a legal quibble, but in a case so flagrant in its violation of international law our forces should have been able to draw the Castroites into open waters; or if not, then we should have provided a shield for the refugees.

Such action, of course, would be an improvisation, but it might drive home the point which, I hope, our Government intends to make; namely, that we do not intend to sit by and allow Castro a free hand in the Caribbean, or in the hemisphere.

Aside from such action, however, Castro is forcing us to do what the Kennedy administration clearly does not want to do: give greater encouragement to the anti-Communist democratic Cubans to engage in guerrilla warfare against the Havana regime.

The longer we delay—the longer we tolerate the presence of Soviet troops on Cuban soil—the more costly such operations are going to be.

It is regrettable that the administration has allowed itself to become so alienated from the Cuban refugees, after so much big talk about what he hoped to do. But if we do not want to lose all of Latin America, we are going to have to come to grips with the problems Castro poses and that includes working with the refugees.

[From the Long Island (N.Y.) Press, Sept. 17, 1963]

CUBA COULD BOIL OVER AT ALMOST ANY TIME

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The Cuban pot is heating up faster than could have been foreseen and could boil over at almost any time.

The best proof is that Castro is scared. Havana Radio's frantic insistence that the Soviet Union has "warned" the United States that any more raids by Cuban exiles will "push the world to the brink of a thermo-nuclear war" sounds like Mr. K. all right. But it is a cinch that Castro begged Nikita to permit his to make this announcement.

Nikita may even have said something of the sort in one of the private billets doux which he exchanges with President Kennedy. But most Americans have learned by this time that when it comes to brinkmanship Soviet Russia is a Teddy bear and shrinks from direct confrontation with the United States, that "paper tiger" (to quote Red China) "with nuclear teeth" (to quote Khrushchev).

Castro has reason to be scared. For the exile raids are beginning to hurt. Smashing Cuba's largest sugarmill hits Castro just where it hurts the most, on the economic nerve. True, like all police states Red Cuba can for a time terrorize and starve its people into submission. But Cuban tempers are hotter than Russian.

Moreover, as first announced here, several underground groups in Cuba have pooled their resources and concerted their liberation efforts and are securing the cooperation of a steady trickle of deserters from the Soviet forces on Cuba.

Still another sign that the Cuban pot is heating up is the increased haste with which the Russians in Cuba are converting the entire province of Pinar Del Rio, with the biggest naval base of Mariel, into a single Soviet military camp.

Furthermore, according to the Free Cuba News published by the invaluable Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, at the site of the Soviet Military GHQ in the La Gobernadora Hills near Mariel, Soviet and Cuban workers have dug tunnels 6 miles into the ground. (No more offensive missiles in Cuba, Mr. Kennedy?)

Everything points to a hurried Cuban-Soviet attempt to make the island virtually invulnerable against military attack.

Meanwhile, still according to the Free Cuba News, Castro has been rushing his subversive efforts throughout Latin America, and chiefly in Venezuela. There the Government recently seized from Communist terrorists a "Plan M" which set forth instructions for successful guerrilla warfare including, naturally, the assassination and kidnaping of leading anti-Communists. "The policy of extermination is the one we must follow."

Again, naturally.

The mere existence of such a Castro-made plan raises the question, What is the U.S. Government doing about Cuba? And the answer is, Nothing of any importance—so far.

What could it do? Readers who believe that Kennedy's present passivity is dangerously inept would do well to study the magnificent debate on Cuba in the U.S. House of Representatives (published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 29, 1963). There they will find proposals by any number of patriotic Congressmen weary of the administration's doubletalk and urging immediate American action.

At the end, Congressman WEAVER, of Pennsylvania, summed up eight proposals short of war. And when goaded by that faithful administration supporter, Congressman PUCINSKI, of Illinois, to say whether he advocated war, Congressman CRAMER, of Florida, a Democrat of another stamp, replied: "If military action is the only way to get rid of

September 24

Mr. J. Edmund Kelly, labor reporter for the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., with respect to this bargaining agreement. Mr. Kelly has been cited frequently by both labor and management for his outstanding, incisive writing on labor matters. Most recently, he was cited by the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College for his consistently excellent and unbiased reporting on labor and labor-management relations.

The article follows:

LABOR COMMENT

(By Ed Kelly)

There's welcome news for everyone in the new bargaining agreement between the Bell Aerosystems Co. and the United Auto Workers (AFL-CIO).

Welcome news for the more than 1,200 employes affected, because it improves their wages and fringe benefits, bolsters their job security and removes any worry of a work stoppage for nearly 3 years.

Welcome news for the company, because it insures stability of labor relations until mid-1966—a precious commodity when it comes to projecting plans, figuring costs, bidding intelligently and assuring on-time deliveries, all of which gain new business.

Welcome news for the community, because it improves the Niagara frontier's image as a place to work and do business, proves that managements and unions in some sectors of our economy can act responsibly, and offers hope that the local employment picture may brighten.

The pact which accomplishes all this was announced last week by Pete Wacks, Bell's vice president for industrial relations, and by Harold Troldl, UAW subregional director here.

It covers nearly 1000 production and maintenance workers represented by the union's local 501 and more than 200 inspectors, accounting employes, timekeepers and fire captains who are members of the union's local 516.

Local 501 negotiators were headed by President Bob Meredith and Acting Bargaining Chairman Jack Kirisits local 516's by President Greg Pope and Bargaining Chairman Leroy Miller. Assisting them were Harold Troldl and UAW International Representatives Joe Yantomasi, Joe Ferraro and Jay Watkins.

Bell's negotiating team headed by Pete Wacks included Art Skerritt, Joe Bellonte and Bill Fuller.

The parties were assisted by Federal Mediator Bill Buch.

The significance of the new agreement they produced can't be overestimated.

It proves that Bell and the UAW really meant it 2 years ago when they said they'd recognized that their mutual interests and those of the community—could best be served by improving their relationships.

They began the task at that time by negotiating a 3-year agreement whose restraint in economic provisions permitted the company to improve its competitive position.

As the months went by, employer-employee relations and the overall labor-management climate in the Bell plant improved, helping to make possible the dramatic bargaining news of next week.

The only matter legally open for Bell-UAW negotiations this year was their pension agreement which was to expire last July 7.

When the parties got talking early in the year, it quickly became clear that the UAW members were greatly perturbed about their insurance program. Insurance is separate from pensions and is covered in the general labor agreement, the one negotiated in 1961 and which wasn't due to expire until May 1, 1964—8 months from now.

Both sides expressed willingness to negotiate changes in the general labor agreement,

there and then, if the new pact which finally emerged provided advantages to each.

In the words of local 501's final report to its members: "It was recognized by all of our members that to get a comprehensive insurance program the union had to give the company the only thing we could offer—stable labor relations through an extended contract."

So Bell and the UAW, in a spirit of compromise representing the best traditions of true collective bargaining, not only negotiated a new pension program but also negotiated an extension of their general labor agreement to June 5, 1966—insuring almost another 3 years of company-union harmony.

By so doing they showed what can be done by an enlightened management and union if both have the will. They showed, too, the advantage of negotiating outside a crisis atmosphere.

And, by turning their backs on the traditional and rigid notion that new agreements are negotiated only when old ones expire, they showed a bargaining flexibility which is refreshing.

This was labor-management statesmanship of the highest order. It does credit to Bell Aerosystems, to the United Auto Workers and to the Niagara frontier.

Jaycees Oppose National Service Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, proposals have been made to initiate various Government youth and service corps—financed, of course, by the taxpayer. I have received a significant letter from the president of a national organization that is both youthful and devoted to service, yet needs no Government payments and wants none.

The 4,800 chapters of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce are meeting community needs across the Nation. Jaycees have always been ready, willing, and able to do all sorts of community improvement projects. They can do the job. They want to do the job.

Presidents of local Jaycee chapters have voted overwhelmingly—2 to 1—against the idea of a national service corps. The following letter, stating Jaycee position, is from Richard H. Headlee, president:

U.S. JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Tulsa, Okla., September 20, 1963.

HON. PAUL FINDLEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FINDLEY: In the coming weeks, you and other Members of Congress will be giving serious consideration to tax legislation.

The Junior Chamber of Commerce feels strongly that tax rate reform is vital to the economic growth of our country. The tax rate schedule contained in the bill passed by the House Ways and Means Committee, however, does not reflect this need in its entirety.

The steep graduation of rates through the middle income brackets was not eliminated by the committee. These rates must be reduced, as they are a major source of investment capital for economic expansion. This

has been the guiding principle of the tax rate reform program conducted by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce over the past 5 years.

I urge you to do all that is possible to achieve meaningful tax rate reform in these middle income tax brackets.

As you consider the saving of taxpayers' money, we would appreciate your recognition of the vast manpower of civic organizations, such as ours. Why not utilize this reserve of manpower in meeting community needs rather than resorting to a national service corps?

Volunteer groups are already doing a tremendous job in their own communities. If the feeling prevails that more effort is required to solve local problems, Congress should call upon local people to do the work. I am confident citizens living in their own community know their problems best. At the same time, American taxpayers would not have another financial burden.

In a recent referendum, presidents of our 4,800 chapters across the Nation voted by a margin of 2 to 1 against the concepts of the Domestic Peace Corps.

Your attention to these important matters will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

RICHARD H. HEADLEE,
President.

Madden Dam Project, Canal Zone: Purchase or Expropriation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as all students of Panama Canal problems know, Isthmian newspapers feature significant stories about movements in Panama likely to affect the maintenance, operation, sanitation or protection of the canal. Such publicity is in sharp contrast with the treatment of silence usually given these matters by the press of the United States.

Recent information from Panama, published in the September 12, 1963, issue of the Star and Herald, the well-known English language Latin American newspaper, is to the effect that Juan Alberto Morales, director of the Institute of Hydroelectric Resources of Panama, in a letter to President Roberto F. Chiari, has urged that the Madden Dam and Power Project be acquired from the United States through purchase or expropriation. This, Mr. Speaker, he advocates on the alleged ground that the water of the Chagres River is a natural resource of Panama. He fails, however, to mention article IV of the 1903 treaty under which Panama granted to the United States "in perpetuity" the "supply of water" as may be "necessary and convenient" for canal purposes and that Madden Dam and Lake are in the Canal Zone.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that Madden Dam was named by the Congress in honor of former Chairman Martin B. Madden of the House Committee on Appropriations, who, from 1904 until his death in 1928, was a champion of the Panama Canal in

1963

THE FEDERAL DIARY: HHFA'S JOB QUERY SHOWS MANY FILLED THROUGH FRIENDS

(NOTE.—Mike Causey writes the Federal Diary today. Jerry Kluttz is touring the Pacific area to report on the activities of Federal employees in outlying stations. His reports will appear as they are received.)

Housing & Home Finance Agency's Community Facilities Office made what it admits is a "highly unscientific" study to find out how its recently hired employees found out about job openings.

Less than 5 percent of them were referred to HHFA by Civil Service Commission. About half said they heard about jobs directly through the personnel office or recruiting and the remainder said friends in the agency and former employees alerted them to vacancies.

HHFA officials concluded that the practice of employees bringing their friends is one reason why some offices have hired to few Negroes and other minority group members in the past.

Republican Position on Tax Bill Distorted**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. JOHN W. BYRNES**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that misleading information is being used by the news media in regards to the Republican position on the current tax bill. This information has even been included in a publication supposedly for use by sophisticated taxmen and businessmen. I refer to the Kiplinger Tax Letter of September 20, 1963. In this newsletter, the following appears:

The maneuvering over the tax bill is reaching fever pitch here. Most of the concern is over what will happen when it gets to Senate. House approval within the next few days is pretty much taken for granted. Republicans are not expected to succeed in getting the bill sent back to the Ways and Means Committee, which would assure a quiet death for it.

I am indeed surprised that the business community will pay for this type of reporting. As we all know, passage of a motion to recommit with instructions does not "kill" a bill. Under such circumstances the bill is not sent back to committee. To the contrary, it is passed on the floor with the changes as proposed in the recommittal motion at the conclusion of debate.

It would appear to me that anyone purporting to give an accurate accounting of the legislative process would be familiar with this vital fact. Therefore, I can only assume that such misinformation is being generated specifically to create panic and fear with regard to the ultimate passage of the tax bill. Such misinformation undoubtedly could encourage some to oppose my motion to recommit because of their strong desire for a tax reduction. I, too, want a tax reduction and I am not proposing this motion to kill the bill.

I am proposing this motion because I feel that it is incumbent on us to impose some positive restraint on spending

if we are to enact a tax cut in the amount of \$11 billion. If I wanted to kill the bill, as the Kiplinger Tax Letter seems to feel is my intent, I would not be offering a motion to recommit, which in my opinion will make it a better bill, but instead I would be urging my colleagues to simply vote against the bill on final passage. This I am not doing. In fact, when I appeared before the Rules Committee in their public hearings on this bill, I expressly stated that if the recommittal motion passed, I would take the floor and strongly urge passage of the bill.

I do not feel that the Congress or the American people should tolerate this type of news reporting. If there are those in the news field who are opposed to spending control, let them come out and so state.

Will History Record a Hungarian Cuba?**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. JAMES D. WEAVER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 24, 1963

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, Cuba continues to remain a threat in the Western Hemisphere because of this country's failure to take stronger action to eliminate Castroism.

While this Nation sits idly by, Cuba, now a Soviet satellite, is embarking on a large-scale program of subversion, which threatens the stability of the nations in the Latin American bloc.

The administration has a number of courses of action—outside of direct intervention—to bring about the downfall of Castro. But procrastination and indecisiveness is permitting communism to spread its atheistic philosophy in this hemisphere.

It was because of this situation that a bipartisan group of Congressmen presented solutions for the Cuban problem in a 4-hour discussion in the House.

An editorial by Larie Pinteá entitled "Will History Record a 'Hungarian' Cuba?" poses some interesting questions as to this Nation's intentions if a revolt developed in the island country. The editorial appeared September 17, 1963, in the Erie Morning News, Erie, Pa.

The text is as follows:

WILL HISTORY RECORD A "HUNGARIAN" CUBA?

There no longer is any question but that the Kennedy administration is making every effort, following every Soviet hint thrown their way, to accommodate the Soviet Union.

This is especially true in light of the events that have occurred in our dealings with the Sovietized Island of Cuba since the Cuban confrontation.

Obviously the American people are not at this time going to learn of the full commitments made by the President during the Cuban crisis of last year, and perhaps will not learn what agreements were made by the President until he is no longer faced with the prospect of going before the electorate for their votes.

But in view of the soft-shoe dance being performed by the White House it becomes even more imperative that the American people be appraised of a situation which could

destroy forever the very principles on which this country was founded, and wipe out every vestige of our historical traditions to support those who are willing to sacrifice their lives for freedom.

The question we are confronted with is this:

What will the White House do if tomorrow, or next week, or next month, the people of Cuba rise up and attempt to destroy the tyrants who have suppressed them with the most vicious jail state since Hungary of 1956?

Such an uprising—without the benefit of weapons, and with little hope of sustaining the revolt for more than 1 or 2 days—would represent the final heart-cry of a brutally subjugated people.

There could be no hope of winning the revolt by themselves.

Their only possible hope would be that another people, stronger than their oppressors, would come to their aid with arms, food, and finally troops.

There can be no doubt to whom the Cuban people would turn for this help.

Only the United States and its American people represent the difference between an infinity of slavery or freedom.

In this instance let's forget the bungled Bay of Pigs invasion and the chance that it would have had in succeeding if the Cuban liberators had been given the proper support of the United States.

But an uprising by the people of Cuba would be an entirely different matter, especially in view of what happened to the gallant people of Hungary who rose against the same oppressors.

Keeping in mind the accommodations which the Kennedy administration has made with the Soviet Union, what support do you believe the Cuban people would receive from the United States if they revolt tomorrow?

Fearfully, shamefully, apprehensively we believe there is every reason to believe that such a Cuban revolt would place a blot on the honor and integrity of this country which would be indelible—a stain which would smear every freedom we enjoy.

Do you believe this country—now—would go to the aid of the Cuban people if they, in their agony, cried for help?

Labor and Management**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 23, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as one of the larger manufacturing centers in the Nation, our Niagara frontier area in western New York State has had its share of labor-management problems. Many of them, happily, have been resolved to the mutual satisfaction of both employer and employee.

Just recently the United Auto Workers, AFL-CIO, and the Bell Aerosystems Co., of Niagara Falls and Buffalo, entered into a bargaining agreement that has received favorable reaction from everyone concerned. In contrast to the forced arbitration of the railroad labor dispute, this shows that when mutual trust and understanding are joined with a willingness to compromise and negotiate, labor and management can work together for the benefit of all.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article written by