To appreciate the full absurdity of this deal, it will help to bear in mind the following facts:

The United States is urgently looking for customers for our vast store of surplus wheat.

Brazil is an importer of wheat, to the extent of about 1 million tons a year. It has been buying most of this from the United States under our food-for-peace program with Brazilian cruzeiros. This doesn't contribute to our dollar receipts, to be sure, but it's better than paying to store the unwanted grain.

Although Russia once was a leading exporter of wheat and continues to export wheat to favored customers, it has recently been having trouble filling its own needs, and last year even had to import some Canadian wheat.

The State Department has just announced a new loan of $400 million to Brazil.

During the talks which led to this loan, Brazilian negotiators repeatedly belittled reports that Brazil was edging toward closer relations with the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, David Bell, foreign aid administrator, assured Congress that the Kennedy administration wants our foreign aid to be used, as much as possible, for the purchase of American products.

Now, if Russia had insisted that Brazil take Russian wheat as part of the price for helping to relieve Brazil of her own surpluses, we might have been able partly to understand, if not appreciate, Brazil's slap at us.

But as it is, we doubt that Mr. Khrushchev is begging anybody to take his wheat. We must, therefore, assume that it was largely Brazil's idea and that Russia considers the deal of such strategic importance that it is worth the wheat. What might have been explained as economic expediency thus becomes a gratuitous slap at the United States as well as deliberate complicity in Russia's penetration of Latin America.

When our overly generous foreign aid yields this sort of duplicity, it is time to reexamine the whole program instead of blindly turning the other cheek and shelling out more money.

IS PRESIDENT KENNEDY PREPARING US FOR ANOTHER BACKDOWN IN CUBA?

(Mr. ALGER (at the request of Mr. MACGREGOR) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, when the Kennedy administration announced we would begin protecting Castro from attack by Cuban freedom fighters, the fuzzy little dictator announced that the United States had accepted the first of his four-point ultimatum. Is the President now preparing the country for another backdown in Cuba?

A number of disturbing news items have appeared in papers across the country during the past few days regarding Guantánamo. In these feeler stories there seems to be the same old pattern of softening up the American people for abandonment of our base there. Remember the shocked denials that the President had made a deal with Khrushchev to remove our bases in Greece and Turkey? Yet, within less than a year that is exactly what we did. Congressional committees have been warning us that part of the Communist strategy intensified since Hungary, is to soften up the free world to the inevitability of the Communist takeover.

White House statements have declared that we would never abandon Guantánamo. Yet, within the past week we begin to hear about a strange case of a murdered Cuban spy who was given free run of our base. It will be interesting to learn all the facts about this case and how and why it only now has been leaked to the press.

Even now the House Armed Services Committee is studying the Defense Department proposal for an alternate base to Guantánamo to be set up in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen this pattern in operation and I think the President should assure the country now that he is not going to give in to Khrushchev and the Russian puppet, Castro, on this second point of the Communist ultimatum. The failure of President Kennedy to handle the Cuban situation should not be allowed to go any farther. We cannot continue to allow a weak administration to give in on point after point until the Communists are in a position to take over the Western Hemisphere and seriously challenge the security of this Nation.

Just how far is President Kennedy prepared to go to keep from ruffling the feelings of Khrushchev? What has the President to fear in a policy of strength and determination to protect the sovereignty of the United States? History has proved that the Communists gain ground only when we appear to be weak. They have backed down and the free world has chalked up victory whenever the United States was tough, strong, and let our enemy know in no uncertain terms that we have the means and the will to protect ourselves and our allies.

If the design is to soften us up for giving away Guantánamo, are we also prepared to give up the Panama Canal? Driving the United States out of the Canal is also on the Communist agenda. Will President Kennedy give in to their demands on that question?

Convinced that history in on their side the Communists patiently whittle away at freedom's foundations by using every means to convince the world that the rule of communism is inevitable and we must accept this. Have those close to President Kennedy convinced him of the inevitability of communism? Are we now being prepared, on that basis, to accept the demand that we give up Guantánamo?

Mr. Speaker, we can rid this hemisphere of Communist aggression and the threat it poses to this country. All that is needed is a courageous President who will assume the role of leadership expected of him, impose the Monroe Doctrine, refuse to make any further concessions to Khrushchev in Cuba and set a time limit for the complete removal of Communist troops and missiles from that island. The United States cannot stand many more Kennedy failures and giving up Guantánamo could be the final blow to send freedom reeling throughout Latin America and cause our allies to desert us everywhere in the world.

It could be that the news stories are not an indication of another backdown. If they are not, Mr. President, prove them wrong by demonstrating to Khrushchev and Castro that we will not give up Guantánamo and are prepared to defend our rights there.

WANT A $200 TAX CUT?

(Mr. ADAIR (at the request of Mr. MACGREGOR) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, having in mind the concern which virtually all Americans have over the possibility of a tax reduction and the need for a cut in Federal expenditures, I thought the attached editorial from the LaGrange Standard, LaGrange, Ind., was well written and illuminating:

WANT A $200 TAX CUT?

As of February of this year, there were only 47 workers in private employment to support each 10 workers for our various governments.

And make no mistake: Every American worker must pay about a fifth of the salary of a government worker, plus fringe benefits, office space, equipment, mimeograph paper, and all the things a government worker uses.

The average American makes between $5,000 and $6,000 a year and pays about a fourth of that in taxes. In a lifetime, the experts say, the average individual earns about a quarter of a million dollars—a rather princely sum—and pays out about $60,000 in taxes, at the current rate.

There are about 50 million families in the United States. All government expenses must be paid by them, and the businesses they own, on the local, State, and Federal levels.

A growing population almost automatically means larger local and State expenses, but the Federal Government does not meet population-connected needs of police, firemen, schools, sewers, and other local services in any great degree. Yet, Federal expenses have been growing much faster than our population has.

The administration's new budget of more than $107 billion in actual spending works out to over $2,100 for each American family.

Too much of this budget is made up of loans to prosperous groups, aid to prosperous communities, grants to often uncooperative and wasteful—and even corrupt—foreign governments, status projects for local areas, and many other items which could and in many instances should be either canceled or deferred to a time when we can afford them.

The reason the budget is so big is that small groups who want specific projects are very demanding, while taxpayers in general suffer in silence.

But relatively minor decreases in the Federal budget could mean very significant reductions in the burden on individual taxpayers.

For instance, a $1 billion reduction works out to a $20 tax break for the average family. A $10 billion reduction would mean lightening the average family tax load by $200.

Congress needs to hear from you. Your message to Congress could well be that your family needs $200 more than it needs new or expanded Federal projects.

The only sure way to cut taxes is to cut spending.

NATIONAL SHARECROPPERS FUND

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

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, recently I had occasion to study with care the annual report to the board of directors of the National Sharecroppers Fund, written by Fay Bennett, executive secretary.

It is an excellent report summarizing the plight of migrant farm workers and low income farm families in this country. Of particular interest are the paragraphs which deal with the application of Federal aid programs. Every Member of Congress will be interested in the fund's conclusion that applications for loans and other government aid are being processed in a discriminatory and therefore ineffective fashion. This is a point worth noting when Members come to the problem of considering fair opportunity requirements in Federal legislation.

I would urge every Member of the House to examine the fund's report for 1962, and for that reason I am, with the permission of the House, placing the report in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NATIONAL SHARECROPPERS FUND

THE YEAR IN BRIEF

Human waste, men displaced by machines, exploitation of the hungry, foreign workers competing for vanishing jobs—progress is coming too little and too late for many farm families of America.

The year 1962 saw several real changes for the better: action, in which National Sharecrappers Fund has played a role, toward bringing industry to the underemployed workers of the rural South and retraining those who must or wish to leave the land; increased union organizing and collective bargaining activities, particularly in California and Louisiana; a significant drop in the number of imported contract workers, because the Department of Labor enforced more diligently the provisions to prevent adverse effects on domestic wages and working conditions; a Federal health program for migrants; progress in implementing Federal aid programs for the rural families who need them most.

But these few restrained measures are pitted against an agricultural revolution which has forced millions of people off the land in the last 10 years. As one result, untrained workers are arriving in cities where jobs are already scarce and necessary skill levels are rising. This same agricultural revolution has concentrated economic power so that one-half of 1 percent of all our farms (those with annual sales of over $100,000) account for 20 percent of all farm products sold, while the workers those farms employ receive the lowest wages and have the highest unemployment rate of any group in our economy, and lack the cushion of social legislation which protects other workers.

CONCENTRATION OF CONTROL; WEALTH VERSUS POVERTY

There were 5.4 million farms in 1950. These were reduced to 4.8 million in 1954; to 3.7 million in 1959. Between 1959 and 1960 an estimated 370,000 more, involving over a million people, have given up. Two-thirds (about 2 million) of the families who stayed on their farms earned less than $1,000 a year from both farm and nonfarm work.

Only 21.5 percent of U.S. farms have sales of $10,000 or more, which the Department of Agriculture estimates will return a minimum family income of $2,500. But it takes $4,000 to place the multiperson family above poverty in the American context today, according to the Conference on Economic Progress and other authorities. At the other end, only 2.7 percent of the farms have sales of $40,000 or more. They control 20 percent of all farmland and 14 percent of all cropland harvested, and profit from more than 30 percent of all farm products sold.

GREATEST POVERTY IN THE SOUTH

About one out of every six southern farm operators is Negro. Less than one-third own or even rent their own farms; about 40 percent are sharecroppers, and the rest are tenant farmers.

The average size white-operated commercial farm in the South is about 382 acres; the average nonwhite commercial farm, 56 acres. The average value of land and buildings is $37,816 for whites, and $7,328 for nonwhites. The average value of products sold is $10,396 for whites and $3,029 for nonwhites. Displacement, greater in the South than elsewhere, is proportionately greater among Negro farmers. In the last decade the South has lost half its Negro-operated farms. The number of tenants, both Negro and white, dropped about 45 percent and the number of sharecroppers about 55 percent.

HIRED FARMWORKERS

Average annual earnings of farmworkers dropped from $1,125 in 1960 to $1,054 in 1961 because of increased unemployment in agriculture and the difficulty of finding supplementary nonfarm work; a slight rise in hourly wage rates was thus counterbalanced. Migrants fared even worse. Their 1960 average of $1,016 dropped to $902. Employment of seasonal workers declined for the third straight year in 1962.

DISPLACEMENT ACCELERATED BY MECHANIZATION

The need for new jobs in the rural South has been intensified by acceleration in cotton harvest mechanization. In 1950, only 8 percent of the cotton crop was machine harvested. By 1959, this had risen to 40 percent. The Department of Labor estimated that in 1961 the harvest was 57 percent mechanized. Between 1959 and 1961, peak employment declined by at least 250,000, while production dropped less than 3 percent.

Agricultural workers are even being displaced by geese. The Wall Street Journal has reported: "Growers here in the Southwest and in other cotton regions are finding that geese * * * can do weeding better and more cheaply than men with hoes * * *. Machines such as cotton pickers and cultivators, plus herbicides, had already slashed their employment opportunities, and now the increasing use of geese is further reducing jobs."

Each year sees new crops coming under mechanization as development of both machines and plants continues. For instance, in 1962, 95 percent of the Massachusetts cranberry crop (one of the largest on record) was harvested by picking machines.

MEXICAN CONTRACT WORKERS

By far the largest number of foreign workers came from Mexico, but total employment of Mexican contract workers (braceros) was down one-third, from 291,420 in 1961 to 194,978 in 1962. But with many apparently recontracted, some 244,000 braceros worked here for an average period of about 3 months in 1962. Less than 1 percent of American farms used braceros. A primary reason for the decrease was the U.S. Department of Labor's decision—bitterly protested by bracero employers—to set minimum wage rates for braceros in keeping with its statutory responsibility to prevent adverse effects on the wages and conditions of domestic workers. The minimum wages set ranged from 60 cents an hour in Arkansas to $1 in California and Michigan and were below State average farm wages in every case.

The National Sharecroppers Fund submitted testimony at all open hearings held by the Department of Labor in bracero-employing areas before the minimum rates were set; NSF asked that the minimum be not less than the average State or National farm wage, whichever was higher. NSF has also urged the Department of Labor to recommend to Congress that Public Law 78 (under which Mexicans are imported) be permitted to expire at the end of 1963.

Green-carders: Mexican workers are entering the United States as immigrants in greatly increasing numbers. Between 1951 and 1960, nearly 300,000 were admitted, a 395-percent rise over the 60,589 admitted in the previous decade. In fiscal 1961 alone, 41,632 were admitted.

The immigrant farm worker is free to move from job to job and does not pose so great a threat to labor standards as the contract worker. But, like the native worker, he lacks the protection of a minimum wage and other standards. Some growers in border areas pay such low wages that the immigrants cannot afford to live here, so they leave their families behind and cross the border daily.

Blue carders. A similar problem is caused by Mexicans who have border-crossing permits to visit or shop but not to work in the United States, and who nevertheless do work here. More than 135,000 of these permits were issued in fiscal 1962, but precise information is not available as to how many border crossers are working illegally. Completely unprotected and therefore exploited, these workers have contributed to undermining wage rates in the Southwest, which sometimes range from $2.50 to $3.75 a day. The Texas AFL–CIO is suing the Federal Government, demanding a halt to this illegal use of cheap labor.

PUERTO RICAN FARMWORKERS

In 1962, 13,526 Americans from Puerto Rico came under contract to work on mainland farms. Their guaranteed minimum wage was 90 cents an hour, an increase from the 80 cents minimum in 1961. In addition to a guarantee of 160 hours of work in each four-week period, the contract included workmen's compensation coverage, health insurance, and English classes for workers who wish to further their education.

OTHER FOREIGN WORKERS

Other specially imported foreign workers for American agriculture in 1962 included approximately 1,200 Japanese, 125 Filipinos, 13,000 British West Indians, and 8,700 Canadians. Peak employment of all foreign contract workers was the lowest since 1950.

FARMWORKER ORGANIZATION

The Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, AFL–CIO, centered in California, spent last year in strengthening its locals and registering eligible farmworkers as voters. Increased organizing and collective bargaining activities are predicted for 1963.

In Louisiana, the organizing drive of the Agricultural and Allied Workers Union No. 300 (formerly the National Agricultural Workers Union) made notable progress in 1962. Overcoming strong opposition, this affiliate of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America won recognition for some workers at Sweetlake Farms, a 6,000-acre rice, cattle, and poultry operation employing some 200 people, including 46 tenant farm families.

SUGAR ACT BENEFITS DENIED FARMWORKERS

During the 1962 congressional debate on extension of the Sugar Act, which guaran-

outstanding tribute and memorial to the late Allan B. Rogers who died suddenly last June after being elected president of the organization being honored in Washington today. It was Mr. Rogers who initiated the climactic stage of the chamber's now famous program.

Those who have followed the chamber's activities today recognize the outstanding work of President Robert M. Maguire, Executive Vice President Elbert G. Moulton, Jr., Walter Demers, Jr., and Albert B. Gordon, to mention just a few, as symbolic of the community's and organization's success. These officials of the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce are attending the 51st annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and will be presented the National Chamber's Award of Merit signifying the Greater-Lawrence Chamber's standing as one of the top 25 chambers in the Nation.

This is a proud moment for the Greater-Lawrence area community, as evidenced by the accomplishments of the Greater-Lawrence Chamber of Commerce.

Cloudy Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. MacGREGOR, Mr. Speaker, a great many Members of Congress, of the press, and a large segment of the general public have often questioned the discrepencies between various figures and claims made by the administration and certain Members of Congress in regard to the Cuban situation. The most recent example of these differences is whether the Russians are actually withdrawing troops from Cuba or are merely rotating them, bringing in new men as they take out some already there. Perhaps the following editorial from the April 29 New York Times gives at least part of the answer:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 29, 1963]

CLOUDY INTELLIGENCE

Are U.S. intelligence estimates being colored or distorted by policy?

The differences between President Kennedy and Senator KEATING about how many Soviet troops in Cuba could reflect a serious weakness in the elaborate apparatus the Nation maintains for collecting and evaluating the data on which policy must be built.

The problem is not new to this administration, nor did it originate with the Cuban crisis. But when intelligence becomes, as it has become today, the very cornerstone of policy, an almost superhuman objectivity is required on the part of our intelligence chiefs to avoid estimates and evaluations tailored to policy. Intelligence, if it is to be worth anything, must be completely nonpartisan.

A Senate subcommittee, which has been quietly investigating the Cuban crisis, has already found considerable evidence that the intelligence estimates of last summer and fall were keyed to the "it can't happen here" atmosphere, then prevalent in Washington. The belief of all the Nation's top Soviet experts that Premier Khrushchev would never risk installing Russian missiles in Cuba appears to have influenced most of the intelligence judgments that reached the President in that period. The awakening led to a concentration on missiles only, that caused us to downgrade the significance of the small Soviet force that had been sent to Cuba.

Today, the basic differences between the President and his critics concern the size of this force, and whether it is being reduced. Both Mr. Kennedy and Senator KEATING are getting their information from the same source—Government intelligence agencies. But, because Cuba has become a partisan issue, it is not easy for the top level estimates that reach the President to remain completely objective. The men who provide these judgments are appointees of the President's own administration. Given the present centralization of intelligence activities, it is especially hard for minority views, which might happen to be right, to reach the top.

This problem will not be helped by the appointment of Clark M. Clifford to replace Dr. James R. Killian, chairman of the board of directors of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as chairman of the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. The board was established as a result of a recommendation of the Hoover Commission in 1956 to monitor continuously CIA and other intelligence activities.

Mr. Clifford has a brilliant mind, but, as a long-time troubleshooter for the Democratic Party, he is inextricably associated with partisan politics. He replaces a skilled and objective scientist-administrator. The selection is at best unfortunate. It is bound to give the impression that our intelligence activities will now be monitored—not by a chairman who is an expert in the field—but by one who is essentially a politician.

Fifteenth Anniversary of Independence of Israel

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as Israelis celebrate their 15 years of independence, they can be proud of the progress which they have achieved since the declaration of independence was first proclaimed on May 14, 1948. From a fledgling nation with fed resources and little manufacturing, the people have built their country into the stronghold of democracy which the Western World recognizes as a friend and ally.

From the first, the Israelis were forced to persevere over almost insurmountable odds. The massed attacking Arab forces threatened the very existence of the newly established state. Yet unity and the desire to survive helped the Jews to throw back their enemies and to acquire needed additional territory. Out of war-torn factories were constructed modern oil refineries and phosphate plants. Crops were planted in irrigated desert land to provide for the ever-increasing number of immigrants who came to live in this promised land. Everywhere in Israel there has been some form of development—the harbor and recreational facilities of Eilat, the irrigated lands of the Negev, the shipyards of Haifa, and the schools of Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv.

The record of development is stupendous. Credit for this achievement lies with the Jews who founded the state, with those who came to settle and to prosper, and with the leaders of the government, such as David Ben-Gurion and the late Chaim Weizmann and Itzhak Ben-Zvi, who had the foresight to plan ahead for the future.

On the 15th anniversary the future has been reached, yet even newer goals must be set so that Israel will continue to prosper. On this their important occasion, we in the United States extend our congratulations on the progress of Israel and offer our continued friendship to the people of this dynamic nation.

Fifteenth Anniversary of the Independence of Israel

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES C. HEALEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, the gallant State of Israel marks its 15th anniversary.

I am filled with deep admiration for the tremendous accomplishments of this tiny country, in this incredibly short period of time, against almost insurmountable odds.

The people of Israel have opened their doors to their brethren from the displaced persons camps in Europe, from countries behind the Iron Curtain, from Asia, Africa, and the Arab lands. They have housed and given employment—and a chance to start a new life—to more than 1 million immigrants since 1948. They have conquered the desert and have created cities where not so long ago there was nothing but desolate wilderness. They have built hospitals and schools, increased their agricultural output and industrial production and have doubled their exports.

But even more important, Israel has not forgotten the debt it owes to nations of the free world. Just as the countries of the West came to Israel's aid when the new state needed technical, financial, and moral support, so Israel has come to the assistance of the new nations of Africa and Asia.

Last year, more than 300 Israeli were providing expert knowledge in agriculture, education, health, construction, and economics to governments on four continents. Another 800 Israelis were at work on projects sponsored jointly by Israel interests and the foreign governments. And over 1,600 students from Africa, Asia, and Latin America came to Israel on scholarships. Although small and poor in material resources, Israel now has a technical assistance program in 83 states and territories. And the fact that its program empha-

Why Give Off Charitable Giving?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a great many thoughtful and responsible citizens of the 13th Congressional District of Illinois have expressed deep concern about the President's recommended tax revisions, particularly the proposal to place a 5-percent floor on itemized deductions.

To homeowners, and to many charitable institutions, community social and welfare agencies, educational institutions, and churches which rely to a great extent on voluntary contributions, the 5-percent floor will add to the burden of the homeowning taxpayer and severely curtail contributions to worthwhile causes.

The Skokie, Illinois Home Owner's Council, in an unprecedented action, went on record as opposing this tax proposal. The council's president, Mr. Harvey Schwartz, in the following press statement, points out how homeowners would be penalized if the 5-percent floor were in effect:

The Kennedy administration's controversial tax reform measure which will place a 5 percent floor on itemized income tax deductions came under attack by the Skokie Home Owners' Council this week.

In an unprecedented action the council, representing Skokie's 14 homeowner associations, went on record opposing the tax reform measure. Under the present tax law, taxpayers who itemize personal deductions receive 100 percent of their deductions for such items as real estate taxes, mortgage interest, and charitable contributions. In the future, taxpayers who itemize their deductions would have their personal deductions limited to an amount in excess of 5 percent of their adjusted gross income. A taxpayer with an adjusted gross income of $10,000 with $2,000 of itemized deductions would be allowed to take only $1,500 of these deductions from his income tax. "The council would be remiss if it did not speak out on this proposal," said Harvey Schwartz, council president. "We will be paying more taxes than ever if this so-called reform becomes a law. The Government is attempting to take away the only relief the homeowner has from the real estate tax burden he is carrying. A lot of middle income bracket taxpayers may not be able to continue owning their own homes if they don't get 100 percent credit for their personal deductions. Certainly, this proposal will adversely affect an already soft real estate market."

Schwartz called upon interested Skokie taxpayers to write to Congressman DONALD RUMSFELD and Senators PAUL DOUGLAS and EVERETT DIRKSEN in protest of this action.

Mr. Speaker, in voicing my opposition to the proposed 5 percent floor, I should also like to include in the RECORD the following editorials, relating to the 5 percent floor, which appeared in recent issues of Chicago area newspapers:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Apr. 22, 1963]

WHY KILL OFF CHARITABLE GIVING?

In protesting the proposed elimination of the unlimited charitable contributions deduction from the Federal income tax, the Chicago Catholic Charities organization says:

"The administration points out that wealthy individuals who can qualify for this provision have been able to reduce their income taxes substantially. But aren't the real beneficiaries the churches or charities who receive contributions from such individuals and devote them to worthy causes?"

The answer is obviously yes. But one may wonder whether this fact is the primary concern of the Government tax theorists.

Implicit in the administration argument is the viewpoint that the main purpose of taxes is disciplinary, and that any detour around taxes must be in some manner heinous. Witness the almost criminal overtone that attaches to words like "avoidance" and "loophole." Even phrases like "expense deduction" and "depletion allowance" have been given an acid flavor.

The fact is, of course, that an individual in the 91-percent bracket who elects to give $10,000 to his church is evading nothing. He is paying out every dollar he would have paid in taxes and 9 percent more.

The further fact is that a church must subsist either by the contributions of its private beneficiaries or by the bounty of the Government. The former arrangement was favored by the Founding Fathers and has been the accepted practice ever since.

We do not suggest that the administration holds a contrary view. But it does appear that some of its advisers get so carried away with the idea of socializing the economy that commonsense gets lost in the scramble.

[From Paddock Publications, Mar. 14, 1963]

TAX ON HOMEOWNING

Northwest area realtors have raised a cry over an aspect of President Kennedy's tax reform proposals which directly affects suburban homeowners.

Crux of the controversy is that taxpayers who now deduct such items as interest on mortgage, charitable contributions, and State and local taxes from the gross income on which they pay Federal taxes would be allowed to deduct only the sum of these items that exceeded five percent of their taxable income.

In other words, a taxpayer with an income of $8,000 who claims $1,400 in deductions will be permitted to deduct only $1,000. Under present law he can deduct the entire $1,400.

Homeowners in northwest suburban communities are usually heavily mortgaged and local taxes are high, so the proposed changes would have considerable impact on their budgets.

The question to ask then is whether the tax cuts the administration is proposing would offset this tightening up in the tax deduction area? The question, of course, is unanswerable at present. Only by implementation would one be able to discover what benefits, if any, would be accrued.

What it could amount to is taking money from one pocket and placing it in another in a kind of fiscal sleight of hand.

There is merit, however, in the realtor's contention that Congress can always increase taxes but once deductions are lost their is little chance of getting them back.

The realtors further seem to think that this tax reform will prove detrimental to the home selling market. Whatever effect passage of such a proposal would have on this market is difficult to forecast.

It seems that potential home buyers are rare who inquire about the number of items they could deduct from the fact of homeownership. Then, there always apepars to be a group of younger buyers graduating from the rental stage to the permanancy of homeownership.

The realtors score another point, though, when they note that the proposals would adversely affect renters. If apartment owners are not permitted to take the full mortgage deductions, they will undoubtedly pass on this added expense to their tenants.

What this amounts to is that the tax cuts would actually feed an inflationary trend.

The necessity of curtailing these modest tax breaks homeowners now enjoy is questionable. Most of this group of mortgaged homeowners, whose taxes have been soaring as a result of the increased number of children requiring an education, budget pretty close to the belt.

The Illinois Legislature hiked the State sales tax a few years ago and hurt those persons who could least afford it (the lower income groups which spent most of their income on groceries) rather than examine others areas of possible tax reform. The same can be said for the home deduction tax plan.

Lawmakers would be well advised to consider revision of the oil depletion allowances which favor the giant oil industrialists. They might also look for new sources of income by studying a Wall Street Journal report of February 20 which reported that the corporate profits in the final quarter of 1962 "probably reached a peacetime record."

Or they might reassess the whole Defense Establishment in which arms expenditures now represent more than half the Federal budget and more than 10 percent of the gross national product.

Not only could they weigh the posibilities of trimming traditional military wastes, but they mght also exert more pressure on the Defense Department to insure an adequate return on the tax dollar for defense expenditures.

The taxpayer's confidence is not bolstered by the knowledge that the contract for the TFX fighter plane went to the highest bidder. The fact that the contract was awarded to a company located in States heavily populated with voters rather than to a lower bidder whose firm was in a sparse population area is further grounds for discouragement.

The point is that there are many other areas where tax reforms could be undertaken before penalizing the homeowner.

Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce Receives Award of Merit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 29, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I call the attention of the House to the award to be given this evening to the Greater Lawrence, Mass., Chamber of Commerce. The Greater Lawrence Chamber has been named one of the top 25 chambers in America. This award is richly deserved.

The chamber has done an outstanding job of revitalizing the economic life of the Lawrence area. It has come up with exciting solutions to the serious economic problems facing our area of New England, and has worked closely with similar groups in surrounding communities to meet the challenges of the times through a program known as "Operation Bootstrap."

This award is a tribute to the chamber's leadership, to its membership and to the community. Similarly, it is an

down borrowing costs by supporting prices of Government bonds in the open market.

"We've got the most combat-ready committee on the Hill," sums up one member.

HOSTILE COLLEAGUES

All this, however, is causing less anxiety in the banking community than might be expected, mainly because of deepseated hostility among his fellow Congressmen toward PATMAN theories. There is, to be sure, uneasiness among some banking groups about bad publicity. But Mr. PATMAN would have to marshal more than expected support either to revamp the banking laws as he wants or to compel the Federal Reserve Board to be more obedient to its congressional critics.

Nevertheless, the chairman is sure to raise a fuss in keeping with the historic PATMAN penchant for legislative warfare. He was one of the eight House Members who voted to impeach Herbert Hoover in 1932. He quarreled bitterly with F.D.R. over a $2.4 billion bonus bill for World War I veterans. He has battled with bankers, labor unions, lobbyists, editors, fellow Congressmen and countless business groups—almost always under the chivalrous cloak of defending the small man against the big man.

From a personal standpoint, it is hard to imagine a more unlikely creature of controversy then the soft-spoken dean of the Lone Star State delegation. His warm, brown eyes, boyish grin, snips of gray hair and dark blue suit smack more of a country parson in his cotton-growing east Texas bailiwick than a congressional hell raiser. Even when questioning Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin, his No. 1 adversary, Mr. PATMAN jousts jovially and never raises his temper.

COMMITTEE'S BROAD POWERS

Although he has served as chairman of the Senate-House Economic Committee and the House Small Business Committee, neither of these units has the authority to originate legislation. But the banking unit, one of the most important committees in Congress, has broad jurisdiction over a wide variety of bills pertaining to banking, monetary, and housing matters. And as chairman, Mr. PATMAN possesses immense power over the activities of the 31-member committee as well as the legislation within its domain.

The liberal Democrat became chairman in January, succeeding Kentucky's retired 88-year-old Brent Spence. During Mr. Spence's 16 years at the helm, the Committee rarely ventured into storm fields, avoided dramatic investigations, maintained the smallest staff of any major congressional committee, and spent the least money.

Now, under PATMAN prodding, the committee has become one of the busiest in Congress. The chunky southerner already has pushed along several Kennedy administration bills, including ones to provide $50 million in subsidies to streamline metropolitan transit systems and to boost the Export-Import Bank's lending authority by $2 billion, and to OK more funds for aid to depressed areas. Mr. PATMAN personally shepherded through both the committee and the House the administration's package bill to overhaul the silver laws.

The installation of the soundproof siding was, of course, a manifestation of this spurt in activity. But there are others. To move more speedily, Mr. PATMAN summoned the committee into session at 9 o'clock one recent morning—an unheard of hour for transacting any kind of congressional business. While practically all of Washington officialdom relaxed at the American League's opening baseball game, Mr. PATMAN rebelliously held an afternoon hearing on the depressed areas bill; only 4 of the 31 Members showed up. "Business as usual with PATMAN means business all the time," cracks a close associate.

In contrast to the Spartan Spence reign, the new regime is operating on a 1963 budget of $180,000, many times greater than amounts spent in bygone years. The pedagogic Mr. PATMAN is busily mapping cross country itineraries to take his committee "pupils" on educational trips to Federal Reserve banks. The number of subcommittees has jumped from four to six and new personnel are streaming in, including three doctorate professors of economics. "We haven't had a Ph. D. around here in 20 years," chortles a veteran staffer.

NEED PEP PILLS

The invigoration movement draws hurrahs from many of Mr. PATMAN's colleagues. "Some of us will need pep pills to keep up with WRIGHT, but his dynamism is going to make this one of the great committees of Congress," exults Ohio's Democratic Represenative VANIK.

But the VANIK view is by no means unanimous. Some Members believe Mr. PATMAN is roaming too far afield, undertaking too many projects and using the committee too much for his own designs. Critics contend Mr. PATMAN's prejudices against the Federal Reserve and "big banks" distort his judgment. By adopting what they regard as a rigid stance, they think the chairman is unable to see monetary and banking policies in the light of overall, modern-day needs. Even PATMAN defenders think he goes too far in his denunciations of the Reserve Board.

Democratic leaders are worried that some administration bills may go down to defeat under the PATMAN banner. This concern is based on the controversy that perpetually swirls about the old warrior and the suspicions that many rank-and-file Members have against his proposals. Even with the late Speaker Rayburn's support, the House twice overwhelmingly rejected PATMAN resolutions for full-scale monetary policy probes.

Administration masterminds, in fact, are looking to the Banking Committee's No. 2 Democrat, ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama, for plenty of help. "He'll have to carry lots of loads," says a Kennedy strategist. Mr. RAINS is being counted on to carry the ball during floor debate on the transit aid measure.

THE PATMAN RECORD

But the PATMAN record is far from blank despite the low opinion many Members hold of his monetary views. He was coauthor of the 1936 Robinson-Patman Act designed to protect small businesses against predatory pricecutting of merchandise. He helped guide through Congress legislation authorizing credit unions for Federal employees and was coauthor of the 1946 law decreeing full employment as a national policy. A few years ago he was a principal sponsor of the bill setting up a new Federal fund to encourage the creation of small business investment companies.

Years ago, too, Mr. PATMAN originated the first congressional newsletter, now a must for nearly all Members. To this day it remains a gem of crackerbarrel comment on a wide range of topics. A recent issue contained a prediction of the economic outlook (sluggish unless there's a tax cut) as well as a tip on a new miniature watermelon (called the Craybelle) developed by the Agriculture Department.

Certainly Mr. PATMAN is one of the most prodigious workers in Congress. As a 7-day-a-week man, he grinds out a steady stream of statements, magazine articles, and even books. He recently authored a 401-page tome designed to serve as a guide for economists and lawyers studying the Robinson-Patman Act.

Running through all of this work is the PATMAN philosophy of low-interest rates, more help for small business and suspicion of big business. Mr. PATMAN never hesitates to seek converts and once even tried to put across his liberal ideas in a serious speech before the conservative Daughters of the American Revolution.

Although many Members don't buy PATMAN philosophy, he is well liked among his conferees. He was a close friend of Mr. Rayburn and is held in equal esteem by the present Speaker, JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. Even critics concede Mr. PATMAN is a fair chairman who permits all sides their say.

Is the President Planning To Give up Guantanamo?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, today on the floor of the House I expressed concern that the President may be attempting to soften up the American public to accept a withdrawal from Guantanamo. Mr. Speaker, there is enough smoke on this issue to make us very suspicious that a fire, in the form of a deal, has already been kindled. I hope Congress and the American people will be sufficiently aroused to warn the President that no such deal can or will be tolerated.

The following editorial from the Dallas Morning News of April 27 states the feeling, I know, of the majority of the people from the Fifth District of Texas and, I am sure, of the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States.

The editorial follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 27, 1963]

GUANTANAMO

The report that the Pentagon is requesting $18 million to expand Navy facilities in Puerto Rico has touched off speculation that the United States may be preparing to withdraw from Guantanamo. It is claimed that President Kennedy may have agreed to pull U.S. forces out of the Cuban base in his correspondence with Soviet Premier Khrushchev last October, or that U.S. military authorities are merely preparing an alternative site in the event that Castro should force us out of Guantanamo.

Whatever the actual facts on the Cuban base, it does seem strange that such a large increase in our Puerto Rico naval facilities is being asked at this time. Several Members of Congress insist that there is no indicated need for this increase—unless we are preparing to move Navy and Marine forces from Guantanamo.

Legally, of course, the United States cannot be forced out of the Cuban base. In 1903—after the Spanish-American War—we were granted a 99-year lease on "Gitmo." The original treaty set an annual rent of only $2,000 for the base, an exceptionally low figure that was indicative of Cuban gratitude to the United States for its help in winning Cuba's independence from Spain.

In 1934, this treaty was renewed and expanded, granting the United States a perpetual lease on Guantanamo which could be nullified only by the consent of both Cuba and the United States or if we voluntarily abandoned the site.

made that more than 3,000 U.S. troops will join with allies for massive maneuvers in Thailand, next door to Laos, in June.

NO-NONSENSE STAND?

In Washington, emergency sessions of the National Security Council were held. Averell Harriman, Under Secretary of State, said in London on April 23: "It is very important that we make the Communists realize that we are not going to stand for any nonsense." President Kennedy sent him to Moscow for talks with the Russians.

Mr. Harriman earlier had been convinced that the deal with the Communists to "neutralize" Laos could be made to stick. He had negotiated a settlement with the Communists in mid-1962, only to see it violated in one form or another from the start. Suddenly Communist armed forces had taken the offensive and put themselves in a position to dominate that strategic area.

Talk quickly revived that another deal now might be needed in which Communists would be given outright control over the northern half of Laos as they had gained control of North Vietnam and North Korea. Military men, however, argued that Communists, if permitted a secure base in Northern Laos, would be in position both to step up their effort to take over Vietnam and to threaten Thailand increasingly.

War could spread gradually, involving a still larger American military effort.

Laos, in other words, is seen to be a very strategic area. The country by itself is without economic or political importance. Its geography is described as the important thing: It lies in the center of the southeastern part of Asia that Communist China covets and expects sooner or later to get.

On the other side of the world—7,500 and more miles to the east—Cuba also holds a strategic position.

THE CLOSER DANGER

In Communist hands, Cuba lies athwart major shipping lanes to South and Central America and to the Panama Canal. The location is pictured by naval officers as ideal for a clandestine base close to United States for Soviet submarines that otherwise must be supplied across thousands of miles of water when operating off the U.S. coast.

It is this potential as a secret supply base for missile-carrying submarines of the Russian fleet that most concerns U.S. defense officials. A point is made that Russians were able to sneak into Cuba, itself, and to put in place batteries of missiles before United States happened to detect them.

Cuba in Communist hands and under Russian control, however, is taking second place to far-off Asia in the calculations of American officials.

In southeast Asia, American military forces are directly involved. In Cuba, American power is being used to protect the Communists against interference by anti-Communist Cubans.

Castro recently praised the United States for its effort to keep his enemies under control.

A CONFUSING SWITCH

It's this contrast between war against Communists in Asia and a form of coexistence with Communists next door to the United States that has raised questions. There are beginning to be hints, however, that this contrast may not always exist to the same extent as now.

A point is made that sporadic raids from uninhabited islands in the Bahamas—with use of small boats—could have only a nuisance value without interfering seriously with the Communist hold on Cuba. But some American officials point out privately that Cuba is highly vulnerable to effectively organized infiltration, internal subversion, and sabotage—all weapons that the Communists use freely whenever they get a chance.

LEAF FROM CASTRO'S BOOK

Cuba is plagued by shortages of all kinds. Oil must come from Soviet sources to be refined in Cuban refineries that are close to the coast. Cuba pays her bills to Russia with sugar, and sugar mills are easily tampered with. There are opportunities to organize and to supply guerrilla bands in the mountainous areas of Cuba—just as Castro organized his bands and was supplied from the United States during his successful campaign to unseat the anti-Communist Batista regime.

The problem of upsetting communism in Cuba, however, is complicated, officials say, by the presence of large Russian military forces on the island. One mission of those forces is to make sure than anti-Castro Cubans do not generate a successful uprising.

SOONER OR LATER

There are some important U.S. officials who are convinced that in the end—regardless of present policies—it is going to be necessary to threaten to put American troops into action in Cuba. These officials question the logic of using U.S. troops to do a job in Asia while drawing back from involvement close to home.

Another factor is advanced by high officials of the U.S. Government to explain the contrast in policy toward Communists in Cuba and in Asia.

In Asia, these officials say, the rising danger is from Red China. The Communists running Red China are pictured as hard and willing to assume great risks. They are in a mood to expand, and they have their eyes on the riches of southeast Asia—in terms of food, minerals, and oil.

Cuba, on the other hand, can rather easily be crushed by United States if the decision is made.

A DOUBTFUL BALANCE

The position of Soviet Russia in each case is a controlling factor.

American officials appear to hope that the Russians will be able or willing to control the Red Chinese. It is to Russia that China must now look for much of her oil and her industrial products.

But Russians also are in Cuba. If the United States presses too hard to get the Russians out of Cuba, then the chance to get Russian help in Asia will be lost. Instead, the Russians will heat up trouble in southeast Asia. And, if that is not enough, there is always Berlin that Russia can heat up. So the reasoning goes.

In either case, currently it seems in the opinion of some officials to leave the United States behind the eightball.

The Warsaw Uprising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, before this month comes to a close, all of us should pause for a moment and pay tribute to those brave men, women, and children of the Warsaw Ghetto, who 20 years ago this month, rose in revolt against the ruthless oppression of Nazi tyranny. Theirs is a tragic, heartbreaking story, an all too vivid reminder of man's inhumanity to man.

The outstanding bravery of these Polish Jews and their 6 million brethren who died in Nazi horror camps, cannot and should not be forgotten. As others the world over have, let us join in reverence for the memory of these brave people.

Wall Street Journal Article on the Honorable Wright Patman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 24, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the leading article by Paul Duke in the Wall Street Journal on the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee. The article describes the unique qualities of integrity, knowledge, and dedication of WRIGHT PATMAN.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

BANKING BATTLER: REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN STIRS UP KEY HOUSE COMMITTEE TO TEST DISPUTED IDEAS—NEW CHAIRMAN INVESTIGATES BANK REGULATORY POLICIES, DRAWS NEW BEAD ON FRB—THE BUSY EASY MONEY MAN

(By Paul Duke)

WASHINGTON.—One recent morning a construction crew filed into a congressional office building and began hammering up acoustical siding in a third-floor suite. Until a few weeks ago the rooms were graveyard quiet, but lately the din and clatter had become so loud, that in the words of one harassed employee, "you just couldn't hear yourself think."

The sound-softening step is symbolic of the great goings on these days in the House Banking Committee. Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, the controversial crusader from Texas, is transforming one of Capitol Hill's sleepiest panels into a bustling battleground for his disputed ideas. As the new committee chairman, the self-styled champion of small business is striking swiftly along a broad front against old enemies in the monetary and banking field.

Mr. PATMAN already is deep into plans for a scrutiny of bank ownership, ostensibly to determine whether monopolies exist and whether the antimerger laws need tightening to prevent big banks from gobbling up small banks. He is set to take a searching look at the bank regulatory policies of U.S. Comptroller James Saxon, under fire from many small bankers; hearings will start today.

Too, the new committee chairman plans extensive hearings on this month's report, by a group under Presidential Economic Adviser Walter Heller, suggesting major changes in Federal regulation of financial institutions. Mr. PATMAN feels the recommendations didn't go far enough. He and other Democrats are hoping to build steam for a major overhaul of the Nation's banking laws next year.

On one subject or another, this tireless investigator expects to hold hearings every working day in May. Come summer and Mr. PATMAN will top things off by fulfilling a lifetime dream: His own full-scale investigation of the money-regulating Federal Reserve Board. As one of the country's foremost champions of easy money, the 69-year-old zealot for years has waged a one-man fight with Federal Reserve officials on various issues, notably interest rate policies and the board's reluctance to help the Treasury hold

Considering the value of the base and its strategic location, it would be sheer stupidity to abandon it. An old installation, Guantanamo today is one of the most modern American naval bases in the world. Its facilities are valued at approximately $76 million. It is regarded as an ideal fair weather training center for the Atlantic fleet. Its harbor is well fortified and extensive enough to accommodate 50 of this country's largest warships. The mere presence of American forces on Cuban soil, of course, is of important psychological value and a tremendous embarrassment to Castro.

That is why Fidel listed U.S. withdrawal from Guantanamo as one of his five major demands last October 28. The ultimatum, however, was primarily a face-saving maneuver and designed for local consumption in Cuba. There is good reason to suspect that Castro is not really that anxious to see the United States pull out of "Gitmo."

Castro badly needs the American dollars he receives for our occupation of the base. Every year Fidel makes a big point of refusing to cash the annual rent checks—now about $3,400. But he never fails to cash the much larger check we give him for our water supply—amounting to about $178,000. Much more important to him, of course, are the dollars he receives from the 3,400 Cubans employed on the base. The annual payroll comes to about $7,500,000.

If it were not for his desperate need of these dollars, Castro naturally would be anxious to see us leave Guantanamo. He may, in fact, feel that our departure would be more valuable than this revenue. And we can be sure of one thing. If and when we do leave the base, Castro will blow up the move into one of the biggest propaganda victories in history.

That is why we cannot, under any circumstances, even entertain the idea of allowing our forces to be pushed off the base, much less giving up the facility voluntarily.

Small Firm Versus Industry Giant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point two articles which appeared in the Boston Globe on April 4 and April 5 of this year concerning the Airtechnology Corp., of Cambridge, Mass., of which my good friend, William H. McMorrow is president. I am more than proud of the tremendous courage shown by this small business outfit in my home city in making the decision to go forward against this giant of industry and of the great victory which they have achieved. It is my belief that it will cheer and strengthen other small business firms and I commend the articles for the attention of my colleagues in the House.

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 4, 1963]

DAVID VERSUS GOLIATH: SMALL FIRM SUES INDUSTRY GIANT

(By Peter B. Greenough)

A Cambridge industrial mouse has roared back at the lion—mighty General Electric Co.

Airtechnology Corp., a smallish electronics concern, has just won two legal rounds against GE. If Airtech eventually succeeds in court (the case is being appealed), it stands to gain a penalty award of $128,734.

Nothing phenomenal, but the principle at stake is very great indeed for Airtech. And for almost all small businesses, too.

Involved is a civil suit which lawyers hereabouts term one of the most unusual ever seen. It comes out of the jungle of current defense contracting, where little outfits must fight for every small crumb.

This David versus Goliath tale dates back a couple of years when AirTech and G.E. got together on what the Cambridge firm believed (and the court agrees) was a team effort for the Air Force.

Under the so-called 477L NUDETS project, the Air Force sought a nuclear detection system for its many continental bases. The idea: locate a nuclear blast, assess the damage and feed it to a computer for evaluation. The resulting information would automatically be relayed to Air Force's headquarters at Colorado Springs.

In this system, as proposed by General Electric, AirTech would supply a key electromagnetic sensor under subcontract.

Briefly, things went well for a while between the two companies. Then it became apparent to AirTech people that something strange was afoot.

"It became reasonably clear to us that G.E. (through its Defense Systems Division at Syracuse, N.Y.) planned to go ahead and do things 'in house,'" says William H. McMorrow, president and treasurer, of AirTech.

"One of our men went up there, and they told him that we couldn't meet the delivery schedules," McMorrow adds.

From then on things deteriorated rather rapidly.

"We had certain misgivings about starting legal action against G.E. We're small business. But we felt so strongly about this that we had no other recourse," McMorrow continues.

Sue they did.

Last summer lengthy court hearings went on here, which tied up AirTech's scientific people and just about stopped the company in its tracks.

The testimony of both companies was taken under consideration by a special master appointed by the court: Theodor Chase of Palmer, Dodge, Gardner & Bradford.

Chase's report was submitted in January to Judge Reuben L. Lurie of Suffolk County Superior Court.

Within the last 10 days Judge Lurie issued an interlocutory degree sustaining Chase's report, with all exceptions made by defense counsel overruled.

Highlights of Chase's study show this:

General Electric "did not fully perform its part of the undertaking."

A General Electric engineer, W. J. Hynes, told Owen Cunningham, AirTech representative, upon receipt of the preliminary Air Force contract:

"We feel pretty good about it here, and I want you to know that your people (AirTech) had a heck of a lot to do with our getting it."

Then, according to AirTech, the runaround began.

Chase's report touches on the feeling among AirTech personnel that "GE had picked their brains and was now trying to get rid of them."

A certain amount of candor was exhibited by GE people on the stand. One acknowledged that the whole matter was "one of the most fouled-up procurement efforts ever seen at GE."

Mixed up, and also heated. At the Battle Green Motel in Lexington personnel from both companies met and apparently fought the Second Battle of Lexington. Chase merely describes the gathering as "a stormy session."

The master's report further shows that one GE official (Hynes) later told AirTech it "would be taken care of if it didn't create a fuss."

Although GE still contests it, Chase has recognized (and Judge Lurie, too) that there was a bona fide joint venture effort involved here. Therefore:

"Participation in this joint venture imposed an obligation upon each of the parties to do nothing inconsistent with the interests of the other in the common undertaking."

By a complicated mathematical formula Chase arrived at the $128,734 damages for AirTech. Conceivably it could be revised downward by Judge Lurie in his final decree.

Since the matter is still under litigation, General Electric officers decline to discuss it. Walter Ferris of GE's legal department at Syracuse acknowledges that it is a "very interesting case."

To Ferris' knowledge, there never has been similar litigation based on the "team bidding approach."

Here there exists an almost gray area of law and practice, yet one in very real need of proper definition.

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 5, 1963]

EVEN LAWYERS PUZZLED: TEAM EFFORTS DEFY DEFINITION

(By Peter B. Greenough)

"Well, how—. Gee, I don't know. It's a normal definition where two or more companies agree to work on a project, isn't it?"

Lest you get the impression that the foregoing quotation comes from a bumbling idiot, let me set things straight.

This was an answer I got from an astute Air Force colonel in procurement at Hanscom Field, Bedford, in response to a relatively simple sounding question:

"How does the Air Force or the Department of Defense define the term 'team' in defense production?"

I wouldn't have blamed the colonel if he had suggested that I consult a good lawyer, not that it could have accomplished much, either.

Lawyers are equally in a tizzy when it comes to spelling out things in this area.

Considering the tremendous amount of cooperative effort between companies and varied industries in the complex area of systems development, the fact that a legal void does exist at all is somewhat astonishing.

This area of confusion bears further consideration in light of current litigation between AirTechnology Corp., Cambridge, and General Electric Co. In a column yesterday I described how AirTech had sued G.E., all because of the uncertainties involved in team relationships.

Small businesses are having a rough enough time, as is, in getting their share of major defense work. This is just another pitfall, but one that has received little, if any, public attention.

Lawyers themselves are at a loss for words in this field (this is possible?).

Even at General Electric's legal department within their electronics systems headquarters at Syracuse, there is confusion here. Through nobody's fault I talked to Walter Ferris, G.E., lawyer involved in the AirTech case. Here's what he said:

"What the heck is a team? Team bidding is not defined anywhere in armed services literature. There's no official designation * * * it is a very difficult area."

Warren F. Farr, attorney with Ropes & Gray, Boston, has also represented G.E. in this case. While he naturally will make no comment about the litigation with AirTech since it has not been concluded, Farr does admit this:

"If anyone knows what a team relationship is * * * procurement regulations and

people say they don't know anything. It is a very elusive type of concept. A very interesting case."

William H. McMorrow, president of AirTech, doesn't set himself up as any crusader against G.E. But regardless if his company wins or loses, it still will serve a useful purpose by helping to bring into the open a thoroughly confused situation.

"One of the repercussions that should come from this is a tightening up of the relationship between a prime and the subcontractor," says Henry W. Ekstrom, manager of AirTech's contract department.

If the Department of Defense will now insist on such a definition (and also perhaps draw one up), then other little outfits will not be placed in a similar bind.

AirTech by no means is the sole victim of such a situation. It merely got mad enough to sue.

One lawyer entirely independent of the case told me this: "This is fairly typical of how many big companies treat little ones."

Thus a change of rules becomes imperative.

Forty-one Million Americans in the Lower Brackets Are Paying for Kennedy's Spending Spree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy can make a heartrending appeal to the low-income groups in encouraging them to think that all his social welfare programs are a gift to them paid for by the filthy rich. At last, the facts do not support the President. It is those in the lowest income brackets who pay for the President's wild spending sprees. Even in his loudly touted tax cut, it will be minor for those in the lower brackets and an actual increase for the middle income group.

The Kennedy welfare programs are no gift. Somebody pays and it is the people the President is seemingly worried most about who pay the bill. The Kennedy administration is conducting the greatest shell game in history and the people are the victims. Let us wise up and bring about a return to fiscal sanity by living within our means as a nation and let the Kennedy family finance their own works of charity.

The following editorial from the Fort Lauderdale News of April 26, shows who pays and the facts may startle some:

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, Apr. 26, 1963]

WAIT A MINUTE, CITIZEN: STOP AND PONDER HOW DEEPLY YOU ARE IN DEBT

We wonder today how many people in this country who are clamoring for more and more Federal spending regardless of what it will do to our national debt realize that it now takes all the income tax payments of 41 million Americans earning up to $6,000 a year just to pay the annual interest on the current national debt.

Think about that statistic for a moment. It takes the labor and the full income taxes of 41 million Americans just to pay the interest on our national debt which now amounts to $10 billion a year.

This is a frightening thing because it demonstrates the hellbent pace at which we are rushing toward financial disaster. Yet, despite the implication inherent in all this, there is no inclination to call a halt to Federal spending. Instead it grows apace and the few men in Congress who are trying to stop it and return the country to fiscal sanity are called stodgy old fogies who don't want to get the country moving again.

Moving where, we might ask? To complete serfdom of our people to a progressive income tax structure that even the spenders admit is crippling our incentive and destroying our initiative to work and to produce? To the mythical "Random Village" that President Kennedy pictured the other day where everybody lives the good life through the splendid generosity of our Federal bureaucrats? To a dream existence where everybody gets from these same bureaucrats while nobody pays the piper?

It would be nice if somebody didn't eventually have to pay for all the favors and all the aid that Government dispenses. But as somebody once said, "There's no such thing as a free lunch," and our Government has been living off the cuff for so long a time now that the idea has spread there is no limit whatsoever to the amount of debt we can pile up and put on the backs of present and future generations of taxpayers.

To those who might think this present administration isn't being as deceptive as regards our spending and debt situation as it has been in regards to the Cuban situation we recommend the reading of an article in the May issue of the Reader's Digest.

Entitled "The Real Truth About the Federal Budget," this article strips the deception away from President Kennedy's proposed $98.8 billion budget and reveals the truth about the phony economy claims being advanced by the administration. It reveals how the budget, itself, is an almost meaningless document as it fails to include "backdoor spending" which doesn't have to be approved by Congress and which is merely tacked on to our soaring national debt.

How many of us, for instance, know that whereas Mr. Kennedy's budget pegs spending at the aforementioned $98.8 billion figure, actual spending will come closer to $128 billion? And how many of us know that since President Kennedy took office defense spending has increased by 17 percent while nondefense spending has increased by some 27 percent?

Yet, in the face of these figures, administration apologists keep on bleating that nondefense spending is being held down and that desirable programs are being curtailed or postponed.

This is a crock of baloney. No President in this Nation's history has ever proposed such a wild-eyed spending program as President Kennedy has presented to the Congress. It is so fantastic in its present and future scope that when Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, who has been scanning Presidential budgets since some of the younger Members of the House were in diapers, first saw it, he threw it on the floor with the exclamation:

"I've never seen a budget like this in all my 40 years in Congress nor has anybody else."

Men like Representative CANNON and Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, another budget opponent, are apparently in a minority, however. A few days ago we saw the House backtrack on a previous decision and add another $450 million to a gigantic Federal aid make-work program for State and local governments. Acting in the same spending mood this week, the House approved a $205.7 million spending program to provide construction grants and student loans for medical and dental schools.

It can be argued that these are desirable programs and perhaps they are. But few of us in life can afford to satisfy all our desires as the facts of economic life dictate that we use caution and prudence in determining what desires we can satisfy without spending ourselves into bankruptcy.

But prudence and caution seem to be unknown words in Washington these days as regards Federal Government spending. We have a breed in office that actually believes the people do not know how to spend their money for their own good and who think it is the Government's duty and prerogative to take it away from the people and spend it for them.

To these officeholders and bureaucrats a huge debt is nothing to worry about as we only owe it to ourselves and if it takes the annual tax payments of 41 million Americans just to pay the interest on this debt, who cares?

We happen to care and we think it is time millions of other Americans started to worry about where we are heading. We have got a bloated Federal Government that is beginning to eat us out of house and home, and unless its spending appetite is curbed we won't have to wait for the Russians to bury us, as we'll do the planting job all by our apathetic and happy little selves.

Israel's Rebirth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1963

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we observed the 15th anniversary of Israel's independence. Jacob Landy, a constituent of mine, has written a poem which should remind all of us of the strength of Israel. The poem follows:

ISRAEL'S REBIRTH

Hail to thee, eternal light
Which cruel oppression and armed might
Vainly striving for three thousand years,
Could never extinguish.

All hail thy deathless spirit,
Of freedom and independence,
Which has and still survives,
Indomitable.

Like anvil of best forged steel,
Thou hast withstood all hammers,
Nor been split asunder, by blows
Most vicious.

Scattered like dust by winds of long ago,
Are thy traducers and sometime conquerors;
Yet thou livest on; they were of an age;
Thou, immortal.

Whence came thy strength and courage,
Thy boundless hope under dire adversity,
That at long last, all would be well
With thee?

Yea, despite the wrangle and strife
Of covetous men and envious nations,
Thou surely wilt and must endure.
Verily thou art a troubled world's necessity,
For Israel's mission is peace.

—*Jacob Landy.*

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

tees subsidies and import quotas to American sugargrowers, Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY proposed that the minimum wage set under the Fair Labor Standards Act be substituted for the present vague "fair and reasonable wage." His proposal failed. In 1962, minimum hourly wages for sugarworkers in this highly protected industry ranged from 60 cents in Louisiana to 95 cents in sugarbeet fields. In Hawaii, where sugar workers are members of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, the lowest paid receive $1.46 an hour, plus valuable fringe benefits.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Farmers Home Administration: FHA has greatly increased its activities and liberalized its criteria in the past 2 years. In 1962, FHA granted $754 million in loans to rural families, the largest amount in any 12-month period in its history. Of the 214,000 families who used FHA facilities in the last fiscal year, 10,000 were Negro borrowers. This represents an increase of about 40 percent over fiscal 1960.

Rural Areas Development: The Office of Rural Areas Development in the Department of Agriculture implements the Commerce Department's Area Redevelopment Administration projects to help depressed rural areas. Some 2,700 economic development projects were submitted to Rural Areas Development in the past 18 months; 317 projects were approved, involving an estimated $90 million and 45,000 new jobs. About 950 industrial or commercial projects were reported in the planning stage or "underway" in the rural South.

Retraining: The training programs of the Area Redevelopment Administration and the even broader program of the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training in the U.S. Department of Labor, include provisions to raise the skill levels of unemployed and underemployed farm workers so that they can qualify for better paying jobs in agriculture or industry. They also provide for training farm youth between the ages of 16 and 22 years. The U.S. Department of Labor reports a need for year-round hired farm laborers able to perform a wide variety of tasks: operating and maintaining farm machinery, pruning and cultivating, and making safe use of chemical insecticides and weed killers.

FEDERAL AID PROGRAMS NOT APPLIED EQUALLY

Most of the southern rural counties eligible for Rural Area Development and Area Redevelopment Administration aid meet the criteria of need because of the abject poverty of their Negro families, but most of the aid goes to the white families. There are about 1 million rural Negro families (1960), at least 85 percent of them in the South and most of these in the coastal plain between southern Virginia and eastern Texas. Fifty-seven percent of them have incomes of less than $2,000 a year, while only 19 percent of the white population are in this bracket.

The discrepancy is increasing. The median income of Negro farm families was 52 percent of that of white southern farm families in 1950 but only 45 percent by 1960. In 1950 the proportion of white southern farm families who had hot and cold piped water inside their homes was only seven percentage points higher than the proportion among Negroes; by 1960 it was 50 percentage points higher. The proportion of young people obtaining a high school education has increased among both groups, but not nearly so rapidly among rural Negroes as among rural whites.

The distribution of FHA loans (1959–61) in nine counties of South Carolina, reported in a Southern Regional Council study, is revealing. In five counties, more than half the farmers were Negroes, and Negroes made up at least 39 percent of the farmers in the other four counties. Only 29 percent of Negro applications for farm ownership loans were approved, while 42 percent of the applications by whites were granted. Of the money advanced for farm ownership loans, Negroes received only 4.5 percent; of the money lent for farm housing, only 6.1 percent.

In this and other Government programs, the policy of the Federal Government to have local control has created the problem. Applications for loans and other Government aid are processed by appointed committees of local farmers, who function without definite guidelines and with little Federal supervision or administrative review. Negroes are almost never represented and play no part in the decisionmaking of the committees, which are ostensibly intended to represent and safeguard the interests of the whole community. This is, of course, typical of the local power structure throughout the South, but its extension to the implementation of Federal policy frustrates the intention of the Congress to aid the very people who are most disadvantaged.

LEGISLATION

The Migrant Health Act: The 1962 Health Services Act authorizes up to $3 million annually for 3 years for health projects in areas with a sizable influx of migrant workers. This can be used for such services as family clinics which are convenient to migrants and regularly scheduled visits by public health nurses to migrant camps.

Other legislation: A bill to limit child labor in agriculture passed the Senate and went to the floor of the House for action but never came to a vote. Three other bills passed the Senate but were stopped in the House by the Rules Committee. These would have provided aid to States to improve educational opportunities for migrant children, set up an Advisory Council on Migratory Labor, and required registration of labor contractors. New bills to help farmworkers in these and other areas (such as minimum wage) have been introduced in the 88th Congress.

NATIONAL SHARECROPPER FUND FIELD SERVICE PROGRAM

The National Sharecropper Fund analysis of a steadily deteriorating economic situation in the rural South has resulted in a new emphasis and expansion of effort.

National Sharecropper Fund is stepping up its program of providing information, guidance, and organizing help to local groups throughout the South, to enable them to take advantage of these Federal aid programs before they are deprived of their land and homes, or to make alternatives available to those already dispossessed. The National Sharecropper Fund staff works to insure that applications for aid that originate outside the established local power structure receive the same consideration as any others. When Negro sharecroppers in Mississippi were denied Federal surplus commodities in the winter of 1962, after participating in voter registration drives, National Sharecropper Fund joined with other groups in protesting this attempt by local power structures to use denial of Government food as a means of intimidation, and the Department of Agriculture responded by seeing that the commodities were distributed in some of the affected counties. The executive secretary of the National Sharecropper Fund serves as a member of the National Advisory Committee on Rural Areas Development of the Department of Agriculture.

A second field representative was added to the NSF staff at the turn of the year. He is Mr. L. S. James, who will work in his home State of South Carolina to help low-income farmers and farmworkers qualify for Federal aid programs. Mr. James is cosponsored by the South Carolina Council on Human Relations. Like NSF's Tennessee field representative, Mr. Allen Yancey, Jr., Mr. James will help farmers apply for FHA loans, assist communities in qualifying for RAD and ARA projects, and cooperate in organizing retraining projects to teach new skills to underemployed and unemployed farmers, farmworkers, and youth.

A BETTER LIFE FOR FARM FAMILIES

That such work needs to be done and that additional staff representatives are needed to answer increasing requests from other States was made clear by enthusiastic response to the National Sharecropper Fund Southern Rural Conference at Bricks, N.C., in November 1962. More than 160 people attended this pioneering conference, called to inform low-income southern farmers about the new Federal programs and to discuss how to go about obtaining their benefits locally. Participants ranged from an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture to sharecroppers from Mississippi. Others came from Louisiana, Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia. Those in official positions were brought face to face with people who live daily with poverty and frustration. Proceedings of the conference, entitled "A Better Life for Farm Families," have been published and are being widely circulated.

Fayette County, Tenn.: With the help of USDA and ARA officials, residents of Fayette County, where hundreds of tenant farmers and sharecroppers were evicted 2 years ago after registering to vote have formed a corporation to attract new industry into the area. The West Tennessee Development Co. grew out of a local, biracial committee formed by National Sharecroppers Fund field representative Yancey to provide industrial jobs on a nondiscriminatory basis for persons who are no longer able to make a living in agriculture but who nevertheless want to remain in the area.

CONCLUSION

At the present time, a major part of National Sharecropper Fund goes toward its Southern program. As funds permit, the staff will be enlarged to include representatives in other States, with Mississippi probably next in line. Other National Sharecropper Fund grants in 1962 were made for: A survey of Louisiana sugarcane workers; the pension fund for members of the old Southern Tenant Farmers Union; the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor; the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor; and the Migrant Children's Fund.

The National Sharecroppers Fund reports and releases are sent to a large number of newspapers and magazines, libraries, public officials, and concerned citizens. National Sharecropper Fund will continue its efforts to improve the conditions of seasonal and migratory farm workers across the country by backing needed legislation, supporting union organizing efforts, and providing literature and speakers for a growing audience. It must also look ahead to a steadily declining demand for seasonal workers; to the virtual end of sharecropping; and to the dispossession of the marginal farmer. Alternatives planned now can secure a better future for these workers of the land.

WHEN IS THIS ADMINISTRATION GOING TO DO SOMETHING BESIDES TALK?

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the April 24, 1963, issue of the Fort Lauderdale News. I am doing so because it directly and forcefully puts into words what many Americans have been thinking privately:

"When is this administration going to do something besides talk on Cuba?"

For all those who, like myself, have deep reservations about the administration's policy toward Communist Cuba, I recommend the reading of the following editorial:

WASHINGTON SAYS ONE THING, DOES ANOTHER, AND CITIZENS GET BEWILDERED, CONFUSED

In all the long history of this country we don't think there has ever been a time when our people have been more confused, bewildered, and perhaps just plain disgusted over the actions of their Government than they are right now.

We are not a devious kind of people. We like forthright action and blunt talk. Yet, what we are witnessing today is anything but forthright action, and the talk we are hearing from our Government officials is like something taken right out of Alice in Wonderland.

One can understand President Kennedy's reluctance to do anything which even remotely might get this Nation involved in a nuclear war with Soviet Russia. One can also understand well enough why the Cuban situation has to be viewed as just one part of a global picture.

Yet, if we are going to do nothing about getting Russian troops out of Cuba, and if we have decided on a policy of peaceful coexistence with a Communist satellite in our backyard, as now appears to be the case, then why in heaven's name do Mr. Kennedy, Secretary of State Dean Rusk and other administration bigwigs keep on mouthing phrases and cliches that conflict completely with their own actions.

For instance, we have been told time and again this Nation cannot accept the presence of Russian troops in Cuba. Presumably, this means the troops must go or we are going to do something to force the issue.

But when are we going to do something besides talk? Admittedly, this is a touchy subject for the administration. But one reason it is so touchy is that so many administration officials from the President right on down the line have declared the Russian troops must go, that they are verbally committed to doing something that actually they are afraid to do. In truth, they have been caught up by their own tongues, but instead of admitting this has happened they go on talking in the vain hope that if they talk long enough everybody will forget a lot of what has been said or who said it.

Unfortunately for Mr. Kennedy and some of his bumbling advisers this is not happening. Our people still remember being told right from the White House that communism in this hemisphere was not negotiable. Yet, it has not only been negotiated but it is now even being protected by our own Navy and our own Coast Guard on direct orders from this same White House.

And what about the fairy story of our Government having nothing to do with the ransom payments to Fidel Castro? Can anybody in their right mind believe that New York lawyer James B. Donovan has not been representing our Government in his dealings with Castro? For Government officials to deny this is absolutely preposterous, yet they do it with a straight face and then wonder why people think they are lying through their teeth.

We can understand why our Government wants to deny any responsibility for this shameful deal and particularly when it was reported a short time ago that Castro got a cool million dollars in cash out of it for his own pocket. But why carry on with such a patent falsehood? Do our officials believe one deception merits another? Do they think the American people are such stupid idiots they can no longer put two and two together and come up with four?

We hope not, but the more we hear out of Washington these days the more we become convinced this is the prevalent attitude and particularly among the shiny domes in the State Department who have made such an incredible mess of things that most Americans now have to pinch themselves to realize it all isn't just a horrible dream.

Perhaps we are overly bitter, but we think it is about time the American people did get bitter over what is happening to this great country because their leaders are too fearful to do what needs to be done.

Words can never substitute for deeds no matter how brave, how noble and how resonant the words sound. And the trouble with us today is that we have too many men in high places who are so charmed with the sound of their own words that they are even deceiving themselves on what the words mean.

We don't think there is a person in this country who isn't fearful of what another war might bring. But there are times when fear of war can be carried to the point where it is just as destructive to a nation's interests as war itself and we may well be reaching that point in this Nation right now.

We have talked big and we have acted mighty small. Call that restraint if you will but to many, many Americans there is another word for it and it is not a nice one. The people know this only too well and that is the reason they are as confused, bewildered and disgusted as they are right now.

BRAZIL AGREEMENT TO TRADE WITH RUSSIA FOLLOWS U.S. AID

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, I discussed on the floor of this body the administration's policy concerning Brazil and specifically the multimillion dollar U.S. loan for which the Brazilian Finance Minister, San Tiago Dantas, was at that time negotiating.

In my remarks, I quoted the following United Press International story from Rio de Janeiro:

RIO DE JANEIRO.—Brazil is about to sign a long-term $160 million a year trade agreement with the Russians as part of a 3-year plan the United States will be asked to help finance, it was reported today.

Government sources said they do not expect the United States to press for curbs on Iron Curtain trade which will be approximately doubled by the new agreement and may increase to as much as $300 million a year by 1965.

A mission headed by Finance Minister San Tiago Dantas is to leave soon for Washington to seek liberalized terms on existing loans and $1.5 billion in new U.S. loans and investments over the 3-year period.

Likewise, in the Evening Star of March 11, as a result of an interview with Finance Minister Dantas this was reported:

"Brazil's Finance Minister said today that part of the financial help he is seeking here would be used to develop trade with all countries—including Russia.

"Francisco San Tiago Dantas made that statement to newsmen after conferring at the White House with President Kennedy.

"Mr. Dantas, a former Foreign Minister for his government who voted against the expulsion of Cuba from the Organization of American States, said of his talk with Mr. Kennedy:

" 'I think it was a very interesting conversation and I hope that my visit will be helpful for the mutual understanding between our countries. We had a general picture of the situation and before I leave for Brazil we will have a new talk.'

"A reporter asked whether 'some of this loan you are seeking from the United States' would be used to help develop trade with Russia. No, Mr. Dantas replied, 'with all the countries.'

" 'Including Russia?' he was asked.

" 'Including Russia,' he replied.

"Mr. Dantas is reported to be hoping to persuade the United States to add some $84 million to the $553 million in U.S. aid given Brazil since 1951, and to obtain a postponement of the $450 million Brazil is due to pay to the United States this year on its debts.

"He said that in his talk with Mr. Kennedy there was mention of a visit to Brazil. No date has been fixed he said, but Mr. Kennedy confirmed that it would be this year."

On March 16, I made a request through Mr. Moscoso's office that I be informed concerning the requests that had been made by Brazil as to loans and aid and also what was being discussed with regard to trade between Russia and Brazil. I was denied any information other than that negotiations were underway.

Although the State Department would not admit it at the time for fear of rightful indignation by the American taxpayer, they obviously knew that even while negotiating this loan negotiations were underway to increase Brazil's trade with Russia. No one can deny that the U.S. loan will be used, partially at least, to enable Brazil to carry out its end of the deal, witness subsequent events.

On April 21, 1963, the following very revealing Associated Press story confirming my charges appeared in the St. Petersburg Times.

At this point, I am inserting this article in the RECORD:

BRAZIL SIGNS TRADE PACT WITH RUSSIA

RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL.—Brazil signed a new 5-year trade agreement with the Soviet Union yesterday. A Brazilian official indicated it might be expanded into an economic and technical assistance program with the Russians.

The trade agreement calls for an exchange of more than $600 million worth of goods in the next 3 years. Trade for this year will amount to $160 million—more than double that of last year. It will increase to $200 million next year and $225 million in 1965.

Ironically, the terms were spelled out in U.S. dollars.

Brazil will export coffee, cacao, and cotton to Russia. The Russians will send petroleum and wheat, two chief Brazilian imports, plus manufactured goods and goods of production.

The Brazilians tacked onto the agreement a guarantee that the Russians would not resell any of the Brazilian products to other countries. There had been local newspaper reports the Russians would sell the coffee to Cuba.

Brazil began trading with the Soviet Union in 1959 on a small scale. The exchange of goods since then has amounted to about $145 million.

United States-Brazilian trade for 1962 alone amounted to $1.15 billion worth of goods.

But Finance Minister Francisco San Tiago Dantas gave every indication Brazil wanted to expand economic ties with the Soviet Union.

"Brazil finds in the Soviet Union a market of unforeseeable potentiality not only for coffee and other tropical products, but even for consumer goods manufactured in our country," San Tiago Dantas said.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 55: 6: *Seek ye the Lord while He may be found, call ye upon Him while He is near.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, we thank Thee for this new day, calling upon us to be grateful for the joys which cheer us and for the trials which teach us to put our trust in Thee.

We humbly acknowledge that life often seems to be full of hardships but may we never allow their hardness to get into our hearts and fill them with weariness and wretchedness.

May we be numbered among the seekers and finders of God in order that we may learn the meaning and value of life and know the secret of carrying on faithfully and courageously.

Gird us with strength and sturdiness of faith for we know that if our faith holds then the way of life before us will brighten but if we lose our faith then we will stumble and stagger.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 31 I am recorded as being absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 31 I am recorded as being absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

SHAME

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

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, sooner or later the United States must move on Cuba. There is no use waiting for a trumped-up excuse.

Castro's Moscow reception is an insult to every American citizen. Our people cry for an end to the Communist military buildup in Cuba.

The other day in London, on his way to Moscow to cringe and beg once again, Averell Harriman said:

It is very important that we make the Communists realize that we are not going to stand for any nonsense.

The only thing Mr. Harriman did not take with him was his umbrella.

If there is any combination of words that the Communists do understand it is that this kind of gentlemanly nicety means once again that we are unwilling to stand up and be counted for freedom. To say we will stand for no nonsense in Laos and do nothing about Communist military operations in Cuba is worse than the language of Munich, because it deceives the American people. I suppose we should come to expect this from the Kennedy administration because it has happened so often.

While Kennedy pussyfoots Communist ships continue to dock in Havana. Communist personnel and goods of war and potentials of war continue to be accumulated in our own backyard by the Godless punks who plot our destruction.

Mr. Speaker, whatever the Senate does or does not do, whatever the President does or does not do, I say shame on this House of Representatives for failure to urge the Executive to run the Communists out of Cuba with the full force and authority of the United States of America. Let us put politics aside long enough to tell the White House, as that branch of the Government closest to the people, our people want communism out of Cuba. Every day that we delay now in ending Communist preparations in Cuba will eventually cost untold added numbers of American lives.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 34]

Alger	Forrester	Miller, N.Y.
Anderson	Gary	Nedzi
Ashley	Gavin	Osmers
Aspinall	Hagan, Ga.	Pillion
Beermann	Hardy	Powell
Buckley	Healey	Rich
Cameron	Hébert	Rivers, Alaska
Celler	Henderson	Rivers, S.C.
Chelf	Hoffman	Rogers, Tex.
Clancy	Jensen	Roosevelt
Clark	Johansen	Shelley
Colmer	Lennon	Staebler
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Taft
Dawson	McDade	Walter
Dent	Macdonald	Willis
Fino	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 384 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING HIGHWAYS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee Investigating Highways, of the Committee on Public Works, have permission to sit this afternoon and the rest of the week during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALLS

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 20 I am not recorded. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 31 I am recorded as not present. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 30 I am recorded as voting "nay." I was not present and did not vote. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have permission to sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

tion of the criminal law which is not affected by preoccupation with economy of money and economy of human feeling. That our wealthy society approaches its responsibilities in forma pauperis, as it were, is a national scandal. It daily contradicts the democratic humanism under which we profess to live.

While we debate how and whether to attack the roots of the problem, what measures do we and should we take against those who endanger us by violent crimes? No one would deny that we need vigorous law enforcement. But should this entail, for example, the use of terror evoked by the threat of setting beasts against human beings?

I refer, of course, to the use of police dogs. Although I am not aware that this use has reduced the crime rate, the police assert that it is effective. Assume for the moment that it is. A full-scale reign of terror might be effective, too. But could we respect ourselves if we instituted one? Can we pretend that resort to such tactics will foster respect for the law and not merely respect for brute force? By measures such as these, perhaps you can force even the most unsocialized and antisocial people into a kind of submission—and not have to bother to look for the reasons for their plight. But at what a price. As a practical matter, the head of one municipal police force has explained to me, only respect for the law can insure public safety upon the thousands of city blocks of a large metropolis. It isn't feasible to maintain a policeman on each block 24 hours a day, even if that were thought desirable.

Many people persist in thinking that withdrawal of legal rights and safeguards from those accused of crime would have a beneficial effect. We are told that crimes cannot adequately be solved if the police are not permitted to make arrests for investigation. And we hear that the rules established in the Mallory and Durham decisions increase our crime rate by enticing offenders into the District of Columbia from outlying areas. I doubt that the perpetrators of crime calculate nicely the length of time during which they may be interrogated by the police before deciding where to snatch a purse, or consider that, if caught, the chance of being sent to a mental hospital instead of a prison may be greater here than it would be elsewhere.

I suspect that the causes of aberrant behavior run a good bit deeper than this, and that the factors which trigger it are less subject to rationalization. But suppose I am wrong. Suppose, for instance, it could be shown that the Durham rule increases the crime rate. Then we should have to weigh the morality of punishing mentally ill people by prison or by death. Perhaps we would even go so far as to abolish the insanity defense. But, as Justice Cardozo remarked: "If insanity is not to be a defense, let us say so frankly and even brutally, but let us not mock ourselves with a definition that palters with reality. Such a method is neither good morals nor good science nor good law."

Some of the measures which are advocated to deal with the problem of crime raise serious issues under our Bill of Rights. We have generally assumed that we are not subject to arrest unless the police have probable cause to think we have committed a crime. But the police tell us they need to make arrests without probable cause and solely for investigation in order to solve crime. Such experience as we have had since the District Commissioners' courageous action to halt arrests for investigation does not bear them out. But even if the position of the police should later prove to be factually correct, we should have to decide whether such arrests violate the fourth amendment, as the local bar is convinced that they do; and if so, then whether the fourth amendment must be abandoned in an attempt to stem the crime-wave. But we should heed the warning of Justice Douglas in *Jones* v. *United States* that "though the police are honest and their aims are worthy, history shows they are not appropriate guardians of the privacy which the fourth amendment guarantees."

I urge that we face the constitutional issues which lurk in some of the proposed solutions to the crime problem. I do not mean that we should see if the words of the Constitution can be juggled so as to reach a desired end, but whether what is planned would in fact offend the letter and the spirit of the Constitution. I suspect that sub rosa infringements of constitutional guarantees are more dangerous than frontal attacks. With the latter we can see just how far our basic principles are being surrendered: with the former, the erosion may go a long way before we understand what is happening.

We should be aware that if the protections of the Bill of Rights are restricted we shall, in practice, be affecting directly the rights of only one section of our population.

When we talk about arrests for investigation, lengthy police interrogation prior to arraignment, and the like, the subject under discussion is not you or me. We don't get arrested without probable cause because, to put it plainly, we don't look as if we would commit acts of violence and we do look as if it might not pay to trifle with our rights. Nor would you or I be subjected to long interrogation by the police without the benefit of counsel. Nor do you and I live in neighborhoods where the police dragnet is used, and where suspects are subjected to wholesale arrest.

So the issue really comes down to whether we should further whittle away the protections of the very people who most need them—the people who are too ignorant, too poor, too ill educated to defend themselves. On Law Day it is appropriate to inquire whether we can expect to induce a spirit of respect for law in the people who constitute our crime problem by treating them as beyond the pale of the Constitution.

Though the direct effect of restricting constitutional guarantees would at first be limited in this way, indirectly and eventually we should all be affected. Initially the tentacles of incipient totalitarianism seize only the scapegoats of society, but over time they may weaken the moral fiber of society to the point where none of us will remain secure.

A debate earlier this month at a meeting of the District of Columbia Bar Association showed the healthy concern of the legal profession with the perennial and inevitable conflict between police demands and constitutional mandates. The overwhelming vote which followed that debate demonstrated that lawyers are still in their rightful place at the forefront of the movement to protect civil rights. There could have been no better prelude to Law Day than that.

Our attitude toward crime reflects our view of the value of the individual in society. In our deepest democratic and national commitments, we are a society of individuals. It is for the protection of individuals and of society that one who is accused of crime is deemed innocent until proved guilty and is afforded all the other legal safeguards. In protecting him, we protect ourselves. In a sense the entire system of criminal jurisprudence is symbolic, since every part of it stands for something more than itself; namely, the preservation of the worth of each individual in the society of individuals. We must deter not only crime, but also the debasement of the individual.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, in accordance with the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 1, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.