

A6694

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 28

Castro said. "If they kill the bracero program, you are going to face double welfare costs."

Castro, secretary-treasurer of Teamsters Local 788 in Hayward, said his national union is the only labor group he knows that favored an extension of the bracero program which he described as the lesser of two evils.

He said since he did not expect farm labor wages to become competitive with the pay in California industry, the harvest workers probably would be imported from other States and could pose a serious problem for California.

This is not a practical or fair answer. Importation of Cubans would not help agriculture. The displaced Cubans are not experienced farmworkers. They would be soon disappointed and disillusioned if they were sent to the farms for 2 or 3 months.

Use of Cubans would not help the domestic farm laborer. In fact, the Cuban worker would take jobs from the year-round domestic worker when harvests were finished. The year-round farm worker needs protection, too. He should not be forgotten.

The Legacy of Columbus and the American Heritage of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 28, 1963

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 12, I was privileged to participate at a Columbus Day celebration at the White House. After greeting the large audience there assembled, President Kennedy discussed the tremendous importance of the discovery of America by Columbus. Commenting upon the traits of character required to accomplish such a feat, the President said:

The first voyages are the hard ones and they require perseverance and character.

The President added that the lesson that was taught by Columbus is a good lesson for all of us today as we attempt new things.

Not only did President Kennedy refer to the contribution of Columbus, but he very eloquently referred to the contribution of Americans who are proud to share with Columbus a common heritage. I was privileged to have been asked by the President to say a few words on behalf of the House of Representatives.

One of the distinguished public officials who was present at the White House celebration was the Honorable Edward D. Re, the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. That very evening Dr. Re spoke at a Columbus Day banquet in Syracuse, N.Y., sponsored by the Syracuse lodges of the Order Sons of Italy. In his talk, Dr. Re noted that the historic discovery of the New World by Columbus was the very beginning of the events which made possible our American heritage of freedom.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Re also was the principal speaker in Utica the

following day at the Columbus celebration held in that city. Dr. Re, the first American of Italian origin to have been appointed Chairman of an independent Commission, only recently was reappointed by the President for an additional 3-year term as Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Dr. Re's speech entitled "The Legacy of Columbus and the American Heritage of Freedom," provides inspiration for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Dr. Re's address as a timely message for all Americans and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the Appendix of the Record:

THE LEGACY OF COLUMBUS AND THE AMERICAN HERITAGE OF FREEDOM

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, my fellow Americans, on this festive occasion as patriotic Americans we have assembled to commemorate and celebrate one of the greatest events of human history—the discovery of America. History, it may be truly said, is really biography since history is largely cast in the image and deeds of great men. Therefore, more specifically, we have joined together to pay tribute to the memory of a man whose faith and ideals made possible the discovery of the New World. That man, of course, is Christopher Columbus, the mariner, who, in the words of Morison, one of his biographers, "did more to chart the course of history than any other individual since Emperor Augustus."

It would be simple indeed to recount the story of Columbus. It is unquestionably a romantic story—one that captures the imagination of all—both young and old: the trials and tribulations of this great navigator, whose indomitable spirit, strength of conviction, and perseverance achieved the greatest discovery of all times, are extremely fascinating and even inspirational.

That story, particularly in its broad outlines, is well known to most Americans. What is perhaps less known and not appreciated is that Columbus' achievement was much more than a feat of navigation in sailing westward over uncharted seas. The pre-eminence of Columbus does not stem from his discovery alone but in hastening others along the same path by promise and example. Columbus was not just another explorer, but a man with a passion—a dreamer with an enthusiasm which swelled and carried the first generation of explorers to the New World.

To Americans, therefore, Columbus has a special significance for, in a sense, all Americans trace their origins to explorers—all immigrants to this great land. Americans are indebted to this first immigrant to our shores for the great influence that migration has exerted upon our Nation—an influence which has brought about a new concept in modern civilization and made possible the America of today.

Every schoolchild has heard of the story of the *Santa Maria*, the *Pinta*, and the *Nina*, and is familiar with the fact that, together with 86 men, Columbus sailed in search of a westward sea route to the Indies. We all know, too, that the course of world history was dramatically changed on October 12, 1492, when he first cast his eyes upon the American continent. Dressed in the uniform of an admiral of the Spanish Fleet, Columbus went ashore and in the name of his sponsors, Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, named the land San Salvador.

History also records that before the Spanish monarchs agreed to finance his voyage, many of his appeals were in vain. One of those appeals made to his native city of Genoa may be of particular interest. A committee was chosen of the finest academic minds of Genoa and its neighbors to

examine and make recommendations concerning the proposed voyage.

Although the committee that was selected applauded the plan, it rejected Columbus' plea for financial support. The committee report cautioned that certain preliminary steps had to be taken before plunging into the unexplored horizons. The depths and temperatures of the oceans, the tides, the weather, propulsion systems, the prevention of scurvy and other diseases that afflict the human body and spirit had to be studied, and presented problems that had to be resolved before such a voyage could be undertaken. Even the religious and political aspects of the project were discussed by representatives of church and state who also were on the committee.

A letter written by a member of the Genoa committee indicates that a member of that committee was in full sympathy with Columbus and thought that the project should have been supported. This member was referred to as "a rather rash and impetuous young mechanical engineer, lately of Florence who, though highly recommended, showed his immaturity and poor judgment by advocating the voyage itself be initiated immediately." The letter went on to say that this Florentine was "quite eccentric * * * talks of flying machines and fancies himself an artist." The man that has just been described was Leonardo da Vinci.

A superb mariner, Columbus was not one to be easily discouraged. Having learned the art of seamanship at an early age, Columbus conceived a great idea—that it would be possible to sail due west to the Orient and establish a western trade route to Asia. Even he, however, could not have imagined that what he made possible was not merely trade and commerce, but a community where people of all races, creeds, and national origin would be able to bring not only the products of their labors, but their culture and civilization, and in the process, build a land where they might live in peace, harmony, and prosperity.

It is no wonder then that Columbus has been called by Morison "the sign and symbol of a new age of hope and glory". It is no wonder that his discovery is said to have marked "the end of the Middle Ages and the beginning of one of man's most enlightening eras." The achievement is of such magnitude that it can truly be said that all Americans are the beneficiaries of his faith and perseverance. "I thank God," said Columbus, "that He selected me to be the one to discover a new world where the oppressed and persecuted people of Europe can find new hope and faith for a better life."

A great deal has been written about that momentous voyage. However, I do not believe that this is the reason why we have assembled here. Rather, I am of the firm conviction that we are assembled to commemorate that historic discovery, and to appreciate, in our own modest way, the far-reaching implications of that great event. All of us, therefore, are aware of the fact that although we celebrate the tremendous achievement of Columbus, we are really commemorating, in view of its special significance to us today, the first and perhaps the greatest chapter of American history.

No American, however, must be misled by the fact that such a celebration is sponsored by any particular organization. Whether that celebration is sponsored by Americans of Italian heritage, or by Americans of Spanish heritage, or of any other national origin, the celebration retains its distinctively American character. And for this reason all Americans should be grateful to the sponsoring organization for its leadership and initiative in making the necessary arrangements that have assured the success of this important and highly significant occasion. For there can be no denial that the fruits of the efforts of Columbus have been

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6

He quoted the official further: "Now, that is going to make our voice in Vietnam sound like nonsense, when we say that the American people are deeply disturbed, upset and appalled by the beating up of newsmen."

Manning then asked, "Does Mr. Knight really think these remarks are not fair comment?"

The State Department official accused Knight of "the amateurish error of equating off-the-record discussions with background discussions."

He pointed out that "off-the-record" meant nothing could be printed, while "background" meant what was said could be printed without attribution. The background conference is a long-standing practice here.

Manning was especially irritated by Knight's reference to "these faceless men" in the State Department and the suggestion that they arrange such conferences "to deceive or misinform the people."

The Department official, who worked for news magazines and newspapers before coming to his present post in April 1962, said of this type of charge:

"I do not understand why decent Americans who serve their country in the foreign policy field should have to accept this kind of abuse.

"I do not understand why a legitimate effort to bring Washington legitimate newspapermen with a legitimate interest in seeing and hearing from top Government officials should be maligned as some treacherous plot to subvert the Republic.

"Fortunately the many letters of praise from newsmen who did bother to attend would seem to suggest that most of them did not see it that way."

Manning said that while others in Government—"many cool heads," he called them—had learned to ignore such attacks, he has been here "too briefly to acquire that stoicism" and a newspaperman too long to "believe that the public deserves or wants the kind of journalism represented in the "Notebook" (Knight's column) of last weekend to go unanswered."

Mr. Speaker, the full text of Secretary Manning's letter to the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte News, Chicago Daily News, Detroit Free Press, and the Miami Herald follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, October 16, 1963.

John S. Knight's "Notebook" of last weekend is astonishing for its bitterness, its opinions-in-absentia and its inaccuracies. It is unfortunate that Mr. Knight did not attend the State Department briefing conference he so thunderously, and unfairly, condemns.

A few particulars:

1. He repeats the old false charge that the U.S. Government deliberately lied to newsmen at a similar briefing conference in October of 1962.

On October 15, 1962, a U.S. official told a similar background conference that the United States did not know of the existence of offensive Soviet missiles in Cuba. That night, U.S. intelligence processed films that provided the first solid evidence of the existence of Soviet offensive missile bases and missiles. The briefing conference continued for a second day on October 16 and the subject of Cuba did not come up. The Government could have revealed on that day the dramatic new turn in events, at the expense of alerting Russia to our discovery before we had planned our counteraction. To have done so would have risked disaster. I have heard no responsible American suggest that in this critical moment the Government should have done other than it did.

Mr. Knight must by now know the facts about this one; they have been discussed re-

peatedly and at length. If he chooses to misrepresent them, it is perhaps his privilege and, alas, his decision.

2. He jerks out of context a remark made at the latest conference by a high State Department official concerning Madame Nhu of Vietnam, and he also seriously misquotes that same official to suggest that he was trying to charge the American press with "a responsibility to aid and abet (U.S. Government) schemes to put pressures upon the leaders of South Vietnam". The official neither said nor implied any such thing.

What the official (not myself) did was to remind his audience of editors and reporters that their agencies and organizations were in effect serving as the prime hosts for the visit to this country of a Vietnamese personage who was closely connected with the repressive steps that have been mounted against American newsmen in Vietnam. He referred to the strongly expressed desire of the American press for effective U.S. protection of American newsmen in Vietnam, and said:

"The press, both in its competitive media aspects and its organized associations, is giving Madame Nhu the most triumphal reception that any foreigner in this country has received in many years—29 major engagements. Now, that is going to make our voice in Vietnam sound like nonsense, when we say that the American people are deeply disturbed, upset, and appalled by the beating up of newsmen."

Does Mr. Knight really think these remarks are not fair comment?

3. He makes the amateurish error of equating off-the-record discussions with background discussions, though newsmen have maintained and practiced for years a sharp distinction between the two. "Off-the-record" means you can't print it. "Background" means you can print it but cannot attribute by name to the official who said it. A newspaper editor's surprise at this practice is difficult to understand.

4. He asks, "Why didn't one single editor or broadcaster break the rules and tell the story?" Presumably he has by now asked the same question of four of his own Knight newspaper correspondents, who registered to attend the conference. And presumably they, by now, have told him that (a) this is a practice of long-standing, desired at least as much by newsmen as by government officials; (b) they were able to write in full whatever the story seemed to them to be and (c) nobody at the conference had to attend, believe, print or otherwise dispose of a single word or phrase he heard at the 2-day conference.

5. He suggests that no "self-respecting newsmen" would or should agree to such no-attribution rules. Where has Mr. Knight been? Most interviews conducted by newsmen in Washington and other national capitals are "background" interviews in which the newsmen do not name their sources. Courts and police usually cannot persuade newsmen to divulge their sources, though the courts sometimes try; but newsmen insist on the right to protect their sources, as they should.

As for the use of the "background" rules at this particular State Department meeting, the reason is dramatically simple: at a previous State Department conference, at which a mixture of on-the-record and background information was provided, the newsmen and broadcasters in attendance were asked to stipulate the rules under which they preferred the next meeting to be held. The vote, which determined the rules used at the recent conference in question, was four to one in favor of "background." They could have chosen full on-the-record talks or no conference at all. They preferred "background" because they felt it produced more and sharper guidance on current government thinking.

The Notebook of last weekend is vulnerable in many other respects but space, like patience, runs out. The more than 500 editors, writers and broadcasters who attended the Department of State briefing, and whose integrity and acumen Mr. Knight so bitterly attacks, can, I am sure, speak for themselves if they choose.

A few final words, however, on behalf of the Department of State and "the faceless men" who devise to "deceive or misinform the people." I do not understand why decent Americans who serve their country in the foreign policy field should have to accept this kind of abuse. I do not understand why a legitimate effort to bring to Washington legitimate newspapermen with a legitimate interest in seeing and hearing from top government officials should be maligned as some treacherous plot to subvert the Republic. Fortunately, the many letters of praise from newsmen who did bother to attend would seem to suggest what most of them did not see it that way.

There are many cool heads in Washington, men who have learned to let this sort of thing fade away unanswered and whose final satisfaction will come from the way they have been served. I have been in Government too briefly to acquire that stoicism, however, and in newspapering too long to believe that the public deserves or wants the kind of journalism represented in the Notebook of last weekend to go unanswered.

This, incidentally, is not off-the-record, not background, and not otherwise faceless or anonymous.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT MANNING.

Cuba file
Cubans To Replace Braceros?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 23, 1963

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in the scurrying to propose suggestions for the replacement of braceros, the opponents are unable to propose a reasonable or practical alternative. If the bracero program is terminated, many rural agricultural areas will be subjected to unbelievable chaos.

There is insufficient domestic labor with the proper skills and desire at the right place at the right time to handle the harvests.

One suggestion is for Cubans to replace braceros, as outlined in the following article from the Oakland Tribune:

California faces a massive increase in welfare costs if the bracero farm labor program is abandoned.

In sounding this warning Wednesday, Manuel R. Castro urged fellow members of the Alameda County Welfare Commission to give serious attention to prospective farm labor law legislation.

The bracero program, under which Mexican nationals enter California under special work permits to harvest crops, is due to expire December 31.

Castro said he has heard reports that there are groups who want to bring in 200,000 or 300,000 Cubans from Florida and Miami to harvest our crops for 3 months a year if the bracero program ends on schedule.

NINE MONTHS

"What are they going to do the other 9 months? * * * They're going to be on relief,"