

1 PARENT ONLY

| Total annual income | | Monthly rate |
|---------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| More than— | But equal to or less than— | |
| | \$750..... | \$75 (#85) |
| \$750..... | \$1,000..... | 60 (66) |
| \$1,000..... | \$1,250..... | 45 (50) |
| \$1,250..... | \$1,500..... | 30 (33) |
| \$1,500..... | \$1,750..... | 15 (17) |
| \$1,750..... | | 0 |

2 PARENTS LIVING TOGETHER *

| Combined annual income | | Monthly rate to each |
|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| More than— | But equal to or less than— | |
| | \$1,000..... | \$50 (#55) |
| \$1,000..... | \$1,350..... | 40 (44) |
| \$1,350..... | \$1,700..... | 30 (33) |
| \$1,700..... | \$2,050..... | 20 (22) |
| \$2,050..... | \$2,400..... | 10 (11) |
| \$2,400..... | | 0 |

2 PARENTS NOT LIVING TOGETHER

| Total annual income of parent | | Individual rate |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| More than— | But equal to or less than— | |
| | \$750..... | \$50 (#55) |
| \$750..... | \$1,000..... | 40 (44) |
| \$1,000..... | \$1,250..... | 30 (33) |
| \$1,250..... | \$1,500..... | 20 (22) |
| \$1,500..... | \$1,750..... | 10 (11) |
| \$1,750..... | | 0 |

* Persons eligible for death compensation based on death occurring before Jan. 1, 1957, may, under certain conditions, apply for and receive dependency and indemnity compensation.

† Except in certain missing persons cases the dependents of veterans who die on or after May 1, 1957, while their life-insurance premiums are waived pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 724 (formerly sec. 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended) are not eligible to receive dependency and indemnity compensation but may be paid death compensation notwithstanding the fact the death occurred after Dec. 31, 1956.

‡ The term "widow" includes the widower of any female veteran if such widower is incapable of self-maintenance and was permanently incapable of self-support due to physical or mental disability at the time of the veteran's death.

§ Applies also to remarried parent living with spouse, with income of spouse counted.

The VA estimates that the bill would benefit the first year 44,900 children at a cost of \$3,082,000—sections 2 and 3—and 30,900 parents at a cost of \$1,743,000—section 4. Data on which to base the first year's estimate of cost of section 1 of the bill are not readily available but it is estimated it would not exceed \$209,000. The total first year's additional cost of the bill would thus be approximately \$5 million. It is believed that the additional cost will decrease slightly for the next 4 years.

The VA favors the bill. There has been no increase for this group since January 1, 1957.

APRIL 1, 1963.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Disabled American Veterans support the provisions of H.R. 211 which will provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans. We urge early passage of this measure by the House of Representatives.

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director for Legislation,
Disabled American Veterans.

Washington, D.C.,
April 1, 1963.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chief, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Veterans of Foreign Wars urges favorable consideration of H.R. 211, which will increase rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans. Estimated 45,000 children and 31,000 parents have not received compensation increase since 1957, although cost of living has increased more than 11 percent. This group is long overdue for this increase. Urge immediate passage of H.R. 211.

FRANCES W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 211. This bill will increase the monthly rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable for parents and children of veterans dying from service-connected causes. Dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows is geared to basic active service pay. Whenever military pay is increased the rate of dependency and indemnity for widows is automatically increased. This is based upon the formula of \$112 plus 12 percent of the basic pay of the deceased husband. Other classes of survivors, specifically children and parents, do not participate in this automatic adjustment. Instead, they receive a flat payment established by law.

Military pay was last increased on June 1, 1958. The widows' rates, of course, were adjusted at that time. The Armed Services Committee, as I understand it, is presently considering legislation to increase the basic pay of the military. Widows of veterans dying from service-connected causes will, of course, participate in any increase enacted into law.

Parents and children of deceased service-connected veterans, however, are not so fortunate. If their rate of compensation is to be increased, it must be accomplished directly by congressional action. H.R. 211 proposes to do exactly that. The rate of payment for these groups has remained constant since the Serviceman's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act became effective on January 1, 1957. The Consumer Price Index, reflecting the increased cost of living, has risen 11.3 percent since the Survivor Benefits Act became law. This bill will increase by 10 percent the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for these groups not geared to military pay. The Veterans' Administration has estimated the first year cost of the bill at approximately \$5 million with a slight decrease in this figure for each of the next 4 years. I believe this legislation is justified and urge that it be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 211?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CUBAN LIBERATION MOVEMENT

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

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today sent the following telegram to the President of the United States:

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

We must end the harassment, which this Government has carried on, of liberty-loving anti-Castro forces in Cuba and in other lands. While we cannot violate international law, we must recognize that these exiles and rebels represent the real voice of Cuba, and should not be constantly handicapped by our Immigration and Justice Department authorities.

Congressman AUGUST E. JOHANSEN.

If my message actually reaches the President's desk I hope he will give it the thoughtful and respectful consideration its authorship deserves.

I say this because my telegram, in its entirety, is a verbatim quotation of a public statement made in Johnstown, Pa., October 15, 1960, by Democratic Presidential Nominee John F. Kennedy.

Now that the Kennedy administration has, over the past weekend, imposed completely unprecedented restrictions on the Cuban exiles, where do we—or they—go from here?

Will the next logical step be imposition by the United States of a total blockade of Cuban exile forces and a complete ban on any Cuban liberation activities "launched, manned or equipped" from any Western Hemisphere base?

Are we preparing to enforce the Communist "peace" of Castro and the Soviet Union in Cuba—by armed might, if necessary?

Where is our "peace at any price" policy leading us?

Is the President's statement of September 13, 1962, "We shall continue to work with Cuban refugee leaders who are dedicated as we are to that Nation's future return to freedom," now a dead letter?

I call attention of the House to the irony of an Associated Press report from Havana appearing in the morning newspapers. It quotes Castro as saying that it will take only "a few more weeks" to wipe out remaining rebels operating on Cuban territory.

And I also include, without comment, the following page 1 editorial from the March 24, 1963, issue of the Worker, official organ of the Communist Party U.S.A.

that this disparity in the law can be corrected at an annual cost of \$225,000 for the first 5 years. I believe the bill has merit and urge its passage.

H.R. 248

H.R. 248 will amend that portion of the law which authorizes a \$10,000 grant for severely disabled veterans in acquiring specially equipped homes made necessary because of the nature of their disability.

At the present time, veterans with service-connected disabilities are eligible for this grant if they are permanently and totally disabled due to the loss or loss of use of both lower extremities so as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or wheelchairs, or are blind in both eyes and have lost or lost the use of one lower extremity and are in such condition to preclude locomotion without the aid of a wheelchair.

H.R. 248 would delete the requirement that blind veterans who have lost a lower extremity be confined to a wheelchair to qualify for this benefit. This group has suffered severe disabilities, and they encounter difficulty in the manipulation of their artificial limbs beyond that encountered by sighted veterans, because they are not able to direct their steps with the accuracy which vision permits. The Veterans' Administration estimates there are less than 50 veterans now on the compensation rolls who have sustained this peculiar combination of disabilities. An unknown number of these are confined to wheelchairs and have been granted or are eligible for assistance

under existing law. The cost estimate is substantially less than \$500,000 the first year. The cost later would be quite small, because new cases with this combination of disabilities would be rare. I urge its favorable consideration.

INCREASED PAYMENTS FOR PARENTS AND CHILDREN OF CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 211) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 411(b) (2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "\$25" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$28".

Sec. 2. Section 413 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) by striking out "\$70" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$77";
- (2) by striking out "\$100" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$110";
- (3) by striking out "\$130" in paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$143"; and
- (4) by striking out "25" in paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$28".

Sec. 3. Section 414 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) by striking out "\$25" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$28";
- (2) by striking out "\$70" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$77"; and
- (3) by striking out "\$35" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$39".

Sec. 4. (a) Column II of the table contained in subsection (b) of section 415 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "\$75" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$83"; by striking out "\$60" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$66"; by striking out "\$45" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$50"; by striking out "\$30" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$33"; and by striking out "\$15" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$17".

(b) Column II of the tables contained in subsections (c) and (d) of such section 415 are each amended by striking out "\$50" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$55"; by striking out "\$40" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$44"; by striking out "\$30" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$33"; by striking out "\$20" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$22"; and by striking out "\$10" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$11".

Sec. 5. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is a second demanded?

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill increases by 10 percent—with fractions rounded off to next higher dollar—the monthly rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable for eligible parents and children of veterans dying of service-connected causes.

The President in his budget message indicated general support for legislation of this type.

The effect of this legislation is as shown in the tables below—italic indicates rates in H.R. 211:

Rates of dependency and indemnity compensation to widows, children, and parents for service-connected death occurring on or after Jan 1, 1967^{1 2}

| Widows ¹ and children | Children, no widow |
|--|---|
| Widow alone: \$112 per month, plus 12 per centum of basic pay of deceased husband, with total amount adjusted to next highest dollar. Rates range from \$122 in an E-1 case with less than 2 years' service to \$316 in case of an O-10 with over 30 years' service. If deceased was serving as Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, regardless of cumulative years of service the widow's rate is \$337. | Children under age 18: 1 child, \$70 (\$77). 2 children, \$100 (\$110) (equally divided). 3 children, \$130 (\$143) (equally divided), plus \$25 (\$28) for each child in excess of 3 (equally divided). |
| Widow and 1 child under age 18: Same as amount payable to widow alone. | Child age 18 or above who became permanently incapable of self-support prior to that age: \$95 (\$105) (basic \$70 (\$77) rate increased by \$25 (\$28); total rate with \$25 (\$28) supplement variable where there are other children). |
| Widow and 2 or more children under age 18: Same rate as that payable to widow alone with following exception: Where total amount payable under the Railroad Retirement Act or Social Security Act, or under sec. 412 of title 38, U.S.C. (veterans' benefits), based upon an assumed fully and currently insured status, is less than \$128, the compensation payable to widow by VA increased by \$25 (\$28) for each child in excess of 1, but the total increase may not exceed the difference between the amounts payable under the above and \$128. | Child or children ages 18 to 21 attending school: Same as basic rate payable to children under age 18 where there is no widow. (Payment barred if child commences program of war orphans' educational assistance.) |
| Widow and child or children age 18 and above permanently incapable of self-support where incapacity began under age 18: Regular widow's rate payable to widow, plus \$70 (\$77) for each such child payable to child. | |
| Widow and child or children age 18 but under 21 attending school: Regular widow's rate payable to widow, plus \$35 (\$39) payable to each such child. (Payment barred if child commences program of war orphans' educational assistance.) | |

Footnotes at end of table.

KILLERS ON THE LOOSE

The outlaws responsible for the murderous hit-and-run attacks on Cuba see such forays as paving the way for invasion of U.S. Armed Forces.

In such a war the corpses of American boys would pave the road to restoring exploitation in Cuba.

The State Department has repudiated the attacks as "irresponsible" and "ineffective." But there is reason to believe that there are forces within the Pentagon who are supporting such incursions.

There is only one way to end once and for all the threat of war in the Caribbean. That is for the President to declare unequivocally that, whatever the official view of the Government of the United States is with respect to socialism, it desires to live in peace with Cuba. The Cuban Government has often declared that it wants peaceful relations with the United States.

Such a declaration by the Kennedy administration, and its enforcement within the Pentagon and the CIA, would have the overwhelming support of the American people.

It would expose the war hawks as betrayers of our lives and our security, and would prevent our land being used as the base for Batista-type killers who want to drown the new Cuba in blood, and to restore the old exploitation.

THE WHEAT FARMERS' REFERENDUM

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker. An apparent, and unfortunate, misunderstanding of a major action by the 87th Congress has recently come to my attention. A deliberate effort is being made to lead farmers to believe the Congress was not serious when it passed the wheat program as part of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. It is being implied that the Congress will enact new legislation on wheat in the event the wheat referendum is turned down.

It was the intent and purpose of the 87th Congress to make the 1964 wheat program a permanent and continuing program. It was passed on that basis. The law provides for a referendum again in 1964, and in subsequent years.

In any referendum, there is always the possibility that one-third or more of the voting farmers will vote against production restrictions, even at the expense of assured higher prices. For 25 years Congress has recognized this possibility and has always provided for a stopgap program to prevent complete price and production disaster.

In the case of the 1964 wheat program, this stopgap is 50 percent of parity price supports—\$1.25 per bushel—providing the individual farmer complies with the same acreage restrictions that he would have under the original program.

If one-third or more of the voting farmers vote "no" on May 21, then this alternative stopgap provision automatically goes into effect for 1964. A rejection does not mean the program has been repealed.

Another national wheat referendum will then be called in 1964 to decide what the program will be for 1965.

In all the discussion and deliberation

in committees and on the floor of both Houses prior to the passage of this program in the 87th Congress, it was clearly and unmistakably the intent and purpose of Congress that this program shall remain in continuing effect and that no further legislation would be needed and that none should be expected. The decision from here on out would be left entirely to wheatgrowers.

The 1964 wheat program provides wheat growers with clear and unmistakable economic choices in this referendum. They should make their decision on this basis, and no other. They could be sorely disappointed if they went to the referendum polls on May 21 with unfounded hopes that Congress would or could pass new wheat legislation in time for the 1964 crop year if they vote "no" on the attractive income and production stabilization provisions of this program.

Wheatgrowers should understand that no individual—in or out of Congress—has the power or authority to deliver on irresponsible statements. The wheat farmers have a choice under the law, and in my judgment the Congress will take them at their word. I am convinced that there will be no new wheat legislation this year.

WHEAT LEGISLATION

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

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to hear the statement just made by the distinguished majority leader which has sort of political connotations, let me say. I want to predict right here and now that if and when the wheat referendum is voted down, the Members of the majority party in the Congress and its leadership will fall all over themselves to enact wheat legislation before this session of the Congress adjourns.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I trust the gentleman is not referring to the majority leader as the House of Representatives in his last statement?

Mr. HOEVEN. That remains to be seen. I have heard a lot of talk about what will happen if the wheat referendum is voted down. This is nothing but a lot of political propaganda to force a favorable vote in the referendum. I still stand by my prediction that the majority leadership in this House and the majority party in general are not going to permit Congress to adjourn without enacting suitable and necessary wheat legislation, if the referendum fails. The Democrats are too smart politicians to let this happen. Let us be honest about it and not fool the wheat farmers.

(Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

A REGIONAL RESERVE CENTER FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(Mr. BURTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the establishment of a regional research center for rural development. My bill proposes that the center be established at Richfield, Utah. Our rural areas need attention and we need some scientific, objective information, concerning rural problems if we are to provide 20th century answers for them.

The center would conduct studies of unemployment and underemployment in rural communities. One of the important functions of this center would be to prepare and analyze data on manpower, agricultural, natural, and other resources in selected rural communities to determine the extent to which these resources are being utilized. The entire program would be geared to the search for new economic opportunities for rural America.

We need to study and evaluate the migration from farm to city. Today more than 36 percent of all farm families have incomes of less than \$2,000 per year, and 75 percent of them have less than \$5,000.

In Utah for example, 13 of our 29 counties have lost population in the last 10 years while the State's population as a whole has increased more than 30 percent. These 13 counties are all rural and together comprise nearly half the land area of Utah.

Important resources are often overlooked—that is the low-production farm areas often have underdeveloped recreational resources and tourism which have a potential for employing large numbers of persons within the area.

An inventory must be made of the present and potential labor force in an area. The search for new industrial and service opportunities must be geared to the composition of the local labor force.

Richfield, Utah, is an ideal location for such a center. This city of 4,412 population is located in the heart of central Utah, being near the geographical center of the State. But, also, this is the approximate center of the 11 western continental States of the United States.

In addition to the geographical location of Richfield, it is also within easy reach of four colleges in southern and central Utah—Carbon College at Price; Snow College at Ephraim; the College of Southern Utah at Cedar City; and Dixie College at St. George. And not far distant is Brigham Young University, the largest university in the intermountain West.

The details of staffing such a research center can be worked out in consultation with the Extension Service and with the Office of Rural Areas Development of the Department of Agriculture.

It is my conviction that a research center for rural development would serve a vital purpose in ascertaining the specific causes in a scientific manner of the decline of our rural counties. But, more important, it would serve to discover means for reinvigorating our rural communities, which are the backbone of our Nation.

A center could be established by the Secretary of Agriculture, under broad

powers given him for administration of research programs. Or it could be established by congressional action. I am introducing my bill so as to open up both possible avenues of approach.

ENLARGING KINGS CANYON NATIONAL PARK

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to add the Cedar Grove and Tehipite Valley areas to Kings Canyon National Park.

The two areas now are portions of the Sequoia and the Sierra National Forests extending like fingers into Kings Canyon Park. Cedar Grove is on the South Fork of the Kings River in the main Kings Canyon. Tehipite Valley lies on the Middle Fork of the Kings River.

Although the areas have outstanding scenic and recreational value, worthy of preservation as portions of the park, they were excluded when Kings Canyon National Park was created in 1940 because at that time the Kings River had not been developed for control of floods and conservation of irrigation water and Cedar Grove and Tehipite Valley were considered potential reservoir sites.

I think it was entirely proper in 1940 to exclude these areas from the park, because they should be devoted to their highest beneficial use and, as it then appeared, this could well have been flood control and water storage reservoirs.

However, construction of Pine Flat Dam was authorized in 1944 and it has been built and is in operation. In recent years additional water storage has been provided by reservoirs constructed by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. We also have Millerton and power reservoirs on the San Joaquin River and Terminus and Success Dams on the Kaweah and Tule Rivers, all contributing to a solution of the flood problem in the valley areas where their waters intermingle.

The time has come when we should take a new look at the present and future use of the Cedar Grove and Tehipite Valley areas in light of river development since 1940 and greatly increased national park and recreation needs and my bill would bring the subject into the open for full discussion and decision.

I feel there is a great deal of evidence supporting the view that more water storage on the Kings River is not economically justified for irrigation needs. While it is true some electric power could be generated, such use could well be incompatible with primary operation of the river to provide maximum satisfaction of irrigation requirements. In any event, there are alternate sources of electric power, so that we do not need to sacrifice the scenic and recreational values of these areas because of power requirements which could not be otherwise met. All of these considerations have led me to the view that the highest use of Te-

hipite and Cedar Grove lies in now adding them to the national park of which they are logical, natural and essential parts.

Our population increase and explosive demand for outdoor recreation in California have generated two difficult problems in the conservation field. We must protect and preserve adequate wilderness areas and regions which, because of their scenic grandeur, have been set aside as national parks. At the same time, we must provide safe roads and sufficient public facilities for the millions of citizens who want to enjoy our parks and the more limited number able to reach wilderness areas.

Cedar Grove is the actual heart of Kings Canyon National Park. It is the only portion of the great canyon which can be reached by highway and it lies surrounded by the majestic ramparts, peaks and cliffs which inspired creation of the park. It is so inescapably a part of the park and so artificially a part of the Sequoia National Forest that the National Park Service and the Forest Service long since agreed that even under its present forest status, it would be administered by the park service. Similarly, the magnificent Tehipite Valley, under forest jurisdiction, is a relatively unprotected "sore thumb" projected into the grand sweep of high ranges, peaks and domes justifying the northern portion of the park.

It is the uncertainty of ultimate jurisdiction over these valleys that is preventing their urgently needed development for public use. The National Park Service cannot inaugurate any program for permanent protection and regulated use of Cedar Grove until it is a part of the park. Thus, visitors now traverse the long and beautiful road into Kings Canyon to find virtually no provision for their accommodation when they reach what they believe to be the heart of the park. Tehipite Valley is neither fish nor fowl, kept in suspended animation by indecision. It is my belief, we need to take earliest action to protect and provide permissible use of these scenic and recreational national resources.

I well realize there are sincere persons with dedicated interest in the welfare and problems of our valley and mountains who may disagree with my views. Establishing the highest use of our natural resources is always a matter of judgment and is properly a matter of discussion, for we must weigh the facts and the relative values involved. In a sense, all these values are "selfish" because one use, such as that embraced in preservation of our parks for the enjoyment and inspiration of present and future generations, may well be incompatible with other possible uses to provide essential services to the public, such as water to provide food, power for our people, lumber for housing or minerals we need. I have little patience with those who dismiss as "selfish" all interests except their own.

It is my intention to ask for committee hearings on my proposal as early as necessary reports and recommendations can be obtained. All interested persons

should be provided opportunity to present their views, and it will be up to the committee and the Congress to arrive at a considered judgment. Naturally, I hope this will provide for the addition of these beautiful and essential areas to Kings Canyon National Park.

AMEND HIGHWAY-USE TAX

(Mr. NELSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the highway-use tax provisions of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956. This act of 1956 imposed a tax on the use of certain highway motor vehicles having a taxable gross weight in excess of 26,000 pounds. The tax levied is at the rate of \$1.50 a year for each 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight. The Internal Revenue Code Amendments of 1961 increased this rate to \$3 a year for each 1,000 pounds gross weight. Consequently, the owner of a truck with a gross weight of 26,000 pounds or more must pay a minimum of \$78 in taxes per year. This tax liability is incurred even though the owner of the vehicle does not use it as an indispensable part of his primary business and it also applies to those who may seldom operate the vehicle on a federally aided highway on such primary hauls as from farm to market or from logging camp to sawmill.

The bill which I am introducing, Mr. Speaker, would provide for the abatement of certain penalties and interest otherwise payable with respect to the highway-use tax in the case of a motor vehicle used primarily for hauling unprocessed farm and forest products from place of production to a market or processing point.

Many of the small truckers have brought to my attention the heavy burden which falls upon them when they find that now they must pay highway-use back taxes from July 1, 1956, to the present. Many of these small operators were unaware that this highway-use tax existed. Small operators that they are, they usually do not hold memberships in an association which would bring this information to their attention. Furthermore, the Internal Revenue Service in the past had no direct contact with these operators so that they might bring this tax liability to their attention. The result is that many of these small loggers and farmers are faced with delinquent tax claims plus penalty and interest for a tax they knew nothing about. It is true that ignorance of the law is no excuse, but in this case, the sufficiency of the public information apparently can be questioned.

For the past year or so, the Internal Revenue Service has been conducting a broad-scale enforcement check and instances have arisen where a small trucker has been assessed a total of over \$3,000 in back taxes together with 25-percent penalties and 6-percent interest. Waiving the penalty and interest on these assessments where ignorance and lack of sufficient notification by the Internal

Mr. RYAN of New York. I thank the gentleman for his very eloquent contribution on this occasion.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for calling the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEAFNESS IN BOTH EARS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 199) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "having only light perception," each place it appears therein the following: "or deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second month which begins after the date of its enactment.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has long maintained a system of statutory awards for compensating veterans who have specified service-connected disabilities, the award being in addition to the basic rate of compensation. For example, a veteran who has lost an arm above the elbow could be rated at 80 percent resulting in the monthly payment of basic compensation in the amount of \$170. In addition to this amount he would receive as a result of the statutory award law \$47, making his total monthly compensation \$217.

Under the current schedule for rating disabilities total deafness is ratable at 80-percent disabling, which results in compensation for wartime cases of \$170 monthly. This present 80-percent rate is a reduction ordered by the Administrator from the previous 100-percent rating. This action was taken some months ago. The passage of this legislation would result in the veteran who suffers from total deafness receiving \$170 monthly for his wartime disability plus \$47 to make a total of \$217.

The committee believes total deafness should be rated as totally disabling and takes this means of at least partially

rectifying what it considers to be an error.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that there are approximately 1,200 cases who would be eligible for this statutory award at a minimum additional cost of \$666,000 the first year. There would be a slight increase each year for the succeeding 4 years.

An identical purpose bill passed the House in the 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses but failed of approval in the other body.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 1, 1963.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.:

There are some 1,200 veterans suffering from total deafness of both ears as a result of their service-incurred disabilities, but are rated less than total. H.R. 199 will correct this inequity. Veterans of Foreign Wars urges favorable consideration and approval by House of H.R. 199.

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

APRIL 1, 1963.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs
Committee
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Disabled American Veterans support the provisions of H.R. 199 which will provide a statutory award of \$47 monthly to veterans for the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears. This bill has been one of our legislative objectives for several years. We urge early passage of this measure by the House of Representatives.

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director for Legislation,
Disabled American Veterans.

(Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 199. This bill, reported unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, would provide an additional payment of \$47 monthly for veterans having the service-incurred disability of deafness of both ears. Monthly rates of compensation for service connected disabilities are paid in accordance with a fixed schedule. The fixed rating schedule is based on 10 levels of disability ranging from 10 to 100 percent. In addition, the Congress has provided special statutory awards of certain seriously disabling conditions, usually involving loss of use of an extremity or a body function. For example, an amputation in the upper third of the thigh enjoys a rating of 80 percent under the basic schedule. This entitles the veteran to payments of \$170 monthly. In such cases, however, a special statutory award entitles veterans so disabled to an additional \$47 monthly.

Heretofore the veteran who was afflicted with a complete loss of hearing in both ears received only the compensation payment resulting from 80-percent disability. This bill will provide an additional statutory award of \$47 monthly for veterans who are thus disabled. Because this is a serious disability and be-

cause it imposes a severe handicap both economically and socially upon those afflicted, it merits the favorable consideration of this body. The Veterans' Administration has estimated that there are 1,200 cases at a minimum additional cost of \$666,000 the first fiscal year.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATUTORY AWARD FOR APHONIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 214) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on the previous bill as well as on this proposed legislation I wish to call to the attention of the House that the President's Bureau of the Budget specifically recommended against the enactment of both proposals. These two bills have been on the Consent Calendar for a number of weeks. They have been passed over heretofore in 1963. I have on several occasions asked that they be passed over.

I feel that the House should know that if these bills are permitted to go through and be enacted by the House that they are being considered and approved contrary to the recommendation of the President and his Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Veterans' Affairs Committee constantly finds itself between the Bureau of the Budget and veterans' organizations. The request of the Veterans' Administration is generally for nothing in the way of legislation which involves any substantial cost, be it under a Republican administration or a Democratic administration. On the other hand the requests of veterans' groups run into billions. Our committee makes a very serious and honest attempt to screen these bills and bring to the floor only those bills that a great majority of the House will consider to be deserving. Our committee tries desperately not to bring politics into the veterans' programs; and I would say further, Mr. Speaker, that I do not consider it necessarily the duty of the committee either to rubberstamp or to disagree with what the executive branch says it wants in the way of legislation. I think further our committee has made an honest and sincere attempt to bring only meritorious legislation to the floor of the House.

(Mr. AYRES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the current Veterans' Administration schedule for rating disabilities provides that complete organic aphonia—loss of speech—with constant inability to communicate by speech will be rated as totally disabling with compensation payable in the total



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 109

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 1, 1963

No. 47

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Isaiah 50: 7: *The Lord God will help us, therefore we shall not be confounded.*

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, we rejoice that Thou art always willing and able to aid the vast multitudes who feel that they are victims in the relentless grip of a conspiracy of wicked circumstances.

We earnestly beseech Thee to give Thy strength to those who are bearing heavy burdens and Thy sympathy to hearts that are throbbing with an aching loneliness.

Grant that we also may help mankind cultivate faith and fortitude in order that the strain and stress of life may be more tolerable for them.

May we aspire to make a worthy contribution to the moral and spiritual welfare of our beloved country, enabling it to be triumphant in these days of trouble and confusion.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 28, 1963, was read and approved.

SANCTUARY FOR CUBAN PATRIOTS

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

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is disturbing to me that the United States is taking measures to prevent Cuban patriots from taking sanctuary in any area of the Caribbean after launching attacks upon the Communist regime in Cuba.

Are we to be in the fantastic position of not only eliminating the possibility of invading Cuba ourselves, but also of insuring that the Cuban patriots will not be allowed to liberate themselves?

Are we to abandon permanently the freedom-craving people of Cuba?

The United States accepted the principle of sanctuary when we allowed the Red Chinese to attack us from across the Yalu River in Korea. We accept the

principle of sanctuary in South Vietnam when we allow the Communists to escape across the border into North Vietnam. The aggressors in Angola were permitted to escape across the Congo River into the Congo Republic. When France was locked in conflict in Algeria, they permitted the revolutionaries sanctuary in Tunisia. And, finally, Cuba has been established as the Communist sanctuary from which to subvert all of South and Central America.

What a double standard we have.

JUDICIAL REFORM

(Mr. BETTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, in the 87th Congress there was enacted as section 29 of the Revenue Act of 1962 a provision permitting a deduction under section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code for contributions made after December 31, 1961, to nonprofit organizations supporting or opposing the reorganization of the State judiciary in referendums to be held during the calendar year 1962. The purpose of the legislation was to permit the deduction of contributions to nonprofit organizations which had been established in Illinois and other States seeking to reorganize and improve their judicial systems. Since it was not deemed necessary for the provision to be made a permanent part of the Internal Revenue Code, its effect was limited to referendums taking place in the calendar year 1962.

A similar organization, known as the Ohio Citizens Better Courts Committee, Inc., has been incorporated to promote a program of judicial reform in the State of Ohio. Insofar as I know, the situation is in all respects similar to that which led to the enactment of the provision last year. In order that the judicial reform movement might have the same treatment in the State of Ohio, I am introducing a bill to extend the amendment embodied in section 29 of the Revenue Act of 1962, to referendums occurring during the calendar year 1963. I am advised that in addition to Ohio, there are also several other States where

similar programs are under consideration. The amendment would likewise be helpful to the movement in those States.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks paying tribute to Mrs. Roosevelt in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28, page 4696, corrected to have Mr. RYAN's remarks removed from the middle of my remarks, where they were incorrectly placed, and put at the end of my remarks, and that the remarks as corrected be reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The remarks referred to follow:

Mr. Sisk. Mr. Speaker, I am glad of this opportunity to join with my colleagues today to pay tribute to a very great lady, a lady whose name will remain in our hearts and memories as a true friend and benefactor of all mankind. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt passed away after devoting her life to work in all the spheres that honor man in order to advance our world to a better understanding of its great social problems.

She was a great champion of human rights and of all that is true and good and noble in human nature and in human relations regardless of race or color or nationality or of poverty or richness. Women, in particular, have reason to be grateful to her for, as no other American woman has done, she epitomized the women who have made the United States a society in which the rights and needs of the young, the weak, the poor, the tired, the aspiring, must be met.

She was not only a worthy companion of a great President of the United States, she was a great human being in her own right. I know that none of us who knew her will ever forget her enthusiasm and devotion to all mankind. And, happily for us all, she could communicate her devotion, her enthusiasm, to others. She saw clearly; she spoke simply. The power of her words came from the depth of her conviction. Knowing her, it is easy to understand why the following was her favorite Bible passage:

"Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal."

Eleanor Roosevelt has not left us; she will remain in our hearts forever.

4879

their valiant efforts to free their beloved homeland and their enslaved fellow citizens.

The tortuous logic employed by the President and the State Department relies heavily on the President's contention that these armed attacks do not weaken Castro and communism's stranglehold on Cuba, but on the contrary, strengthen them. This reasoning, of course, is fallacious but by taking this position we are now in the position of doing these things. First, siding with Castro against the exiled Cuban patriots; second, alining ourselves with Castro-Khrushchev policies to the detriment of the enslaved people and the exiles, so much so that our policy may indeed be manipulated in the future by Khrushchev's dictation to Castro whose wishes are then relayed to us; third, a slow-down in our demands for demilitarization of Cuba, including the return of Russian soldiers and military arms; fourth, the recognition, if not invitation, for Russia to provide armed escorts for its vessels for shipping to Cuba.

In short, we are not only condoning the presence of internationally dominated communism under Khrushchev to maintain its beachhead in Cuba but are giving military protection to this base for subversion of the rest of Latin and South America. In all of this, we are crushing the hopes of the Cuban patriots without and within Cuba who seek to throw off the Communist tyrants, the puppet Castro and Big Boss Khrushchev.

This shameful and unbelievable situation is the result of watchful waiting, drifting, and a refusal to uphold the Monroe Doctrine, to blockade Cuba, and to free Cuba from the Communists, as the last and present administrations have promised to do.

How far the United States has fallen in its leadership, and uncompromising dedication to the preservation of liberty for all people.

The course of victory, freedom, preservation of U.S. sovereignty, and strengthening of the free world is not easy but is a course we must chart and follow now or surely fall under Communist domination. We must reimpose the Monroe Doctrine. We must blockade Cuba. We must encourage Cuban patriots within and without Cuba to throw off their Communist leaders. We must do this now or Latin and South America will fall, country by country, until the United States stands alone in the Western Hemisphere. If the subversion of Latin and South America continues, God forbid, through our supine inactivity the day of fait accompli will be at hand and the ultimatum of Khrushchev leading world communism will be delivered when we stand alone in our Hemisphere. We dare not continue the present drift and lack of a firm aggressive policy. Time is short, but prompt action can save us and the other nations of this hemisphere.

CAPITALISM VERSUS SOCIALISM- COMMUNISM

(Mr. ALGER (at the request of Mr. HARRISON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the clash between capitalism and socialism will be resolved with only one system winning. The systems are incompatible. Fuzzy intellectuals as would-be scholars, do-gooders, one-worlders lose sight of basic principles, as does Khrushchev and fellow Communists. The Socialists and Communists lose sight of the most fundamental proposition—we are dealing with human beings, not animals or slaves, all philosophies to the contrary notwithstanding.

Human beings work best with incentives, for themselves, and their loved ones. This is happiness, and all men yearn for it. The ones who refuse to recognize this are the power-seeking would-be dictators, social planners, manipulators, tyrants, czars, and others wishing to control the masses. Capitalism will win because men and women will work harder for themselves and their loved ones than they will for government.

The United States has proven this. Other societies in other times have proved this. Socialistic experiments have all failed. Yet many in our enlightened era have not learned the obvious truths of a free society, whose economic system must be capitalism, the essence of freedom and accompanying human happiness. Freedom, happiness, prosperity, self-achievement, high standard of living, cultural development, all are inextricably interwoven and go together in the capitalistic system. The profit motive is good; it is human. Profits are the reward for effort in capitalism, and the profitmaker is happy in his success and freedom to achieve. The only achievement in socialism to be equated with happiness is the absence of punishment when one does as told to do by government order.

The simple truths of capitalism—freedom, the reward for effort, ingenuity, hustle, and sweat, are forgotten as social planners conceive more ideal societies. Their mistakes are in forgetting human nature and in trying to prescribe the activities of their fellow mortals as though in planning they are endowed with godlike wisdom, and that others will happily accept their orders instead of resenting them and refusing to perform as planned.

It is simple when viewed objectively. Human beings want to be free, want to do what they want, and resent being dictated to or forced to work for others not by their choice.

So the battle, still joined, will be solved, with or without many people knowing the nature of the struggle. It is my hope that my colleagues and our constituents will see the nature of the struggle and help assure the successful victory of capitalism instead of losing by default as Federal planners put it over on them. In this vein I want to include the study of "Capitalism and Communism" in the Wall Street Journal of March 22, 1963:

CAPITALISM AND COMMUNISM

(By Edmund K. Faltermayer)

Moscow.—"I suppose it could be said," a Russian cautiously declares at the end of a long dinner debate with an American here,

"that our system is becoming more like yours and yours like ours."

Though it comes from a citizen of Khrushchev's Russia, this statement is remarkably similar to a sentiment increasingly heard in the West these days: That the differences between the Soviet and American systems are narrowing, and that the two will eventually blur into some sort of hybrid system.

Superficially, some developments on both sides of the Iron Curtain suggest a narrowing of the gap. The Russian above cites such things as social security in the United States and France's postwar experiments with economic planning. His American acquaintance counters by listing some recent Soviet developments.

First, there is the feud with Red China, in which the Russians have taken a more tolerant line toward the capitalist world. Second, there is Premier Nikita Khrushchev's recent injunction to his economic chiefs, to "learn from the capitalists" how to solve some of their problems. And there is the new economic ferment: Some Soviet economists have advocated a partial decontrolling of the country's socialized industry and wider use of the capitalistic profit motive to spur production.

DE GAULLE'S VISION

Whether or not Russia is moving toward capitalism—or only appearing to do so—is of importance. If a genuine evolution is under way, it would make possible real East-West coexistence instead of the present uneasy truce. But if the trends within Russia are only an illusion, they might cause the West to lower its guard prematurely. Even now, President Kennedy's grand design of a close-knit Atlantic community aimed against Russia is threatened by French President de Gaulle's rival vision of an independent Europe, stretching ultimately "from the Atlantic to the Urals."

Underlying that vision is the general's belief that the Russians are gradually becoming Westernized. Reports of capitalistic or other liberalizing tendencies in the U.S.S.R. lend support to this theory. Moreover, the notion of an ultimate ideological compromise appeals to many European pacifists who think East-West differences have been exaggerated.

Nevertheless, a meeting of the two systems somewhere in between does not appear very likely—at least not as long as the present generation of Soviet rulers remains in power.

For one thing, most of the moving would have to be done by Russia and not by the West. Indeed, there is considerable doubt whether the West has moved in Russia's direction at all. The welfare state legislation of the American New Deal, for example, had its roots not in Bolshevik Russia but in the Germany of the 1880's, where ultra-conservative Chancellor Bismarck pushed through a social security system to steal the thunder of the Social Democrats. As for the future, the United States is in no mood to go very far in the direction of Russia's 100-percent socialized economy. Nobody in the United States—not even the most extreme liberal—is talking of nationalizing anything.

Even in socialistic Western Europe, the big wave of nationalization is over. State takeovers to date have been limited mainly to basic industries producing a homogeneous product and relatively easy to administer—railroads, utilities, and banks. The economic planning that goes on in France is utterly different from Russia's. Carried out in a spirit of cooperation between government and private industry, it is limited to capital investment and is not strictly compulsory.

In short, there appears to be a sticking point beyond which the Western democracies will not go in any supposed "evolution" toward the Soviet model.

But to the extent that this hoped-for development does in fact take place, there arises the danger that under the double influence of labor union monopoly and the doctrinaire pursuit of ever higher levels of "effective demand," the embers of American inflation, now only glimmering under the ashes, will again flame up. In this case, international confidence in the dollar will again decline, possibly to a critical degree.

The danger of a too-precipitate expansion of demand is the more serious where the belief persist that only in this way can the unsatisfactory domestic performance of the economy be improved. The forces involved in economic growth and prosperity are much more complex than is suggested in such a simple model. Thus, there can be little doubt that the functioning of the American economy has been slowed both by the relative shrinkage of profits, itself a result of increases in wages in a period of relative stagnation and underutilization of capacity, and by uncertainties about the future engendered by the attitudes and practices of the Kennedy administration.

In particular, the ruthless use of Government power to roll back the price increases with which United States Steel had attempted to compensate for increased labor costs constituted a step in the direction of a controlled economy and "repressed inflation." As such, it was a severe blow to public confidence. To the inevitable hazards of daily economic life, including those imposed by unbridled labor power, was added a vast and continuing uncertainty respecting the Government's readiness to accept the outcome of market processes. In short, the frustrations experienced under Roosevelt's New Deal, which failed in spite of years of effort to generate genuine economic expansion and prosperity, have reappeared on the New Frontier.

RISE OF FISCAL SOCIALISM

The similarity between the "New Deal" and "New Frontier" finds expression not only in the general decline in business confidence which the latter has provoked but in an openly defiant glorification of "big government" and in the fiscal megalomania which serves this questionable ideal.

We have to do here with an approach to economic problems which may be described as fiscal socialism. Increasingly, it has come to the fore as the key technique of the Socialist program in the developed countries as the classical goals of socialism—socialization of private property and planned economy—have diminished in attractiveness. In a recent session of the West German Parliament, the budget expert of the Socialist Party was moved to remark that "the continuous enlargement of the Government budget is a fact which will shock only the naive members of the population." The observation itself, however, marks merely the continuance of a tradition which began with the Jacobins of the French Revolution.

The Kennedy administration stands clearly in this general tradition, as its pronouncements amply attest, and in this respect too it is continuing Roosevelt's New Deal. A prominent explorer on the New Frontier, John Kenneth Galbraith, has furnished in his widely read book, "The Affluent Society," a theory in behalf of fiscal giantism whose stylistic elegance, if not its logic, has seduced many. Seldom has the conviction that government expenditures insure a wiser use of the people's income been put forward with such disarming candor. But Mr. Galbraith notwithstanding, the elephantiasis of contemporary government expenditures in general, and those of the United States in particular, is verily a pathological process. In it is expressed the tendency for the increasingly centralized state of our times to surround like a parasitical vine both society and economy and, by sapping

the strength of the latter, to deny itself the means of life.

Clearly, there are limits to the process of continuing growth of government, limits which may be exceeded only by eroding and ultimately destroying the spiritual, political democratic society.

ROSTOW'S THEORY

The role played by theories of this sort in the shaping of American policy is evident as well as in the esteem in which the administration holds the economist and economic historian, Walt W. Rostow. In his famed essay, "The Stages of Economic Growth," Rostow argues that the prime forces moving a country through the several stages of economic development are technology and capital formation. Carried forward by the engine of capital investment, the economy ultimately reaches a stage at which it "takes off" like an airplane from the ground. The developmental process is allegedly the same everywhere. Germany and the United States in the past, or Canada and the Soviet Union at present—all are subjected to precisely similar mechanisms of growth.

When the stage of takeoff has been reached, a country will rise with increasing speed toward economic maturity and level off at the stage of "high mass consumption." In turn, economic maturity and the transition to mass prosperity (and here the economic hypothesis subtly becomes a determinant of world policy) are accompanied by "democratization" and "liberalization." This is a process, it is implied, which of itself will serve to brake the political expansionism of the Communist countries. The latter, that is to say, will grow directly from their teens into settled middle age—a development which is to be awaited with patience and forbearance. Time is on the side of reason and freedom; anticommunism which takes communism at its face value is mere hysteria.

If this theory is to be set in its proper framework, it must be remembered that the genuine progressive, believing mankind to be on the road to the millennium, finds in communism a most disturbing challenge to his Weltanschauung. His irresistible desire is to fit it somehow or other into his optimistic vision of the future. He is forever on a search for new theories calculated to demonstrate the innocuousness of communism's satanic drive to overturn and enslave the world. For communism then ceases to be an affront to progressivist optimism; on the contrary, it emerges as a comrade in arms in the march toward progress.

Such theories of Communist innocuousness, it is safe to say, have played a more important role in the advance of communism to its present power than has the whole panoply of Communist tanks, rockets, and divisions. Rostow's theory, in particular, constitutes little more than a new version of Rooseveltian illusionism in the dress of economic determinism (a determinism which is not nearly as far removed from that of Marx as Professor Rostow seems to think). But even as an economic hypothesis, it cannot stand. To see in an increase in the merely technical accouterments of the economy the ultimate engine of economic development, is to confess to the crassest form of materialism in which everything spiritual, political, and moral is robbed of its decisive role in the life of society. But the most egregious and alarming defect of the Rostovian growth model is its total indifference to the kind of economic system within which growth occurs.

HOW THE RICH GOT RICH

Progress in science and technology and increases in physical capital are necessary but by no means sufficient conditions for improvement in the welfare of the peoples of the world. The rich countries of today

are rich because to these necessary conditions is added the further condition of a specific economic system functioning within a specific legal and philosophical framework. But the economic system of which we speak is none other than the market economy; the framework we have in mind is none other than the assemblage of spiritual, moral, and political postulates upon which such an economic system depends. Only those unwilling to face facts can deny that prosperity for the masses in any real sense is found today only within that sharply defined area which is constituted of the fully developed industrial countries of the free world.

While the one-sided economism of current theory is remarkable enough, its political purblindness is downright menacing. Its unforgivable error is its disregard of the essence of communism as a cultural, social, and political system imbued with the apocalyptic messianism and expansionism of a pseudo-religion. Communism remains a highly active volcano. It is the mark of a dangerous naivete to regard it as extinct (and hence something to be turned into a sort of tourist attraction) merely because it occasionally stops spewing out ashes and lava. To reduce it to a mere technique of industrial growth is as absurd as to downgrade national socialism to a method by which Germany was provided with a network of autobahns.

So it is that false economic theories can terminate in national and in international policies which must end not only in bitter disappointment but in increased peril for the still free half of humanity. And this is excuse enough for an economist to step outside his accustomed pursuits to enter a protest and a warning.

A BILL TO PERMIT THE ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSALIST WOMEN AND THE ALLIANCE OF UNITARIAN WOMEN TO MERGE

(Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. HARRISON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which will permit the Association of Universalist Women and the Alliance of Unitarian Women to merge. This action is made necessary by the previous merger of the Unitarian and Universalist churches. To avoid the necessity of obtaining judicial interpretations of past and present gifts and legacies, the two groups will consolidate and the property now owned by the two groups will, after merger, become the property of the new organization.

Congressional participation in this procedure is required because the Universalist group is incorporated in the District of Columbia. The Unitarian group is incorporated in Massachusetts, and similar action by the State legislature has already been initiated.

UNITED STATES SIDING WITH COMMUNISTS

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

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, impossible as it may seem, it now appears likely that the United States will protect Castro from the Cuban exile armed attacks in

To date the Government's intelligence-gathering activities in Cuba have inspired little confidence. Defense Secretary McNamara's theatrical television briefing raised a good many more questions than it answered. Moreover, McNamara recently admitted that, when the going got tough, CIA surveillance aircraft were inadequate to cope with Cuba and airplanes of the Strategic Air Command had to be pressed into service. But even those skilled SAC recon experts cannot photograph the inside of a cave. If the Soviets do not even permit the "highly placed military" of Cuba near the caves we would doubt that our CIA men have penetrated them either. Thus, it seems to us that we really don't know what might be inside the caves. We think it is dangerous to assume that they do not contain IRBM missiles and submarines pens.

If, as the exiles contend, the caves are loaded with IRBM's and submarine facilities, then Cuba, in fact, has become a Soviet Gibraltar. Only a few Soviet IRBM's in Cuba dangerously tilt the balance of power in Soviet favor. If the Soviets are allowed to operate Polaris-type submarines from Cuban bases, the Reds can attain a serious "third force" threat, with only one-third the number of nuclear submarines required to operate from Soviet home bases. This is the grave threat of the caves of Cuba.

To Americans, the important point is that we do not know what the caves conceal. We think it is vital that our Government find out, beyond doubt, and soon. Having failed once to listen to the warnings of Cuban exiles, it seems to us the Government now has an obligation to disprove their present charge, by whatever means are necessary, including force.

FARM SUBSIDIES—FACT AND FICTION

(Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. HARRISON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, American farmers are often unfairly criticized by people in our urban areas who do not quite understand the problems of our agricultural population. This is often due to poor public relations and, hence, I am always pleased when someone comes up with the facts and truth about expenditures in the Department of Agriculture. A splendid article by Lauren Soth appeared recently in the Des Moines (Iowa) Sunday Register, and it is worthy of note and attention. I wish to include it herewith as part of my remarks:

FARM SUBSIDIES—FACT AND FICTION
(By Lauren Soth)

How much Federal subsidy does agriculture receive?

Those who oppose farm programs, price supports, and payments to farmers usually label as farm subsidy the entire U.S. Department of Agriculture budget, which recently has been running around \$6 to \$7 billion per year. And, by using a little arithmetic, such a figure can be made to seem outlandish Federal spending for farmers.

The last census showed 3.7 million farms in the United States. Divide that into \$7 billion and you get nearly \$2,000 of Federal expenditure per farm.

If you eliminate the 1.6 million noncommercial farms (those with total sales less than \$2,500), that leaves only about 2 million real farms and it appears that Uncle Sam is spending \$3,500 for each one of them.

Farmers and their leaders have tried to explain that everything in the USDA budget

is not of benefit to farmers. However, the exaggeration of farm subsidies still goes on.

Recently, Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, (Democrat, of Georgia) got the Department of Agriculture to break down its proposed budget for the fiscal year beginning next July to identify expenditures which are not subsidies to farmers. This breakdown is shown in the accompanying table.

Only the \$2,606 million shown in the last part of the table can be properly called farm subsidy.

It is true, of course, that the exports of food at cutrate prices and donations of food to foreign countries benefit agriculture. But foreign aid in money also benefits certain U.S. industries. The foreign recipients use the dollars to buy machinery and other goods in the United States. The food-for-peace program is foreign aid and should be classed as such in the Federal budget, just as other grants or loans to foreign countries are.

It is also true that food distribution programs, including the food stamp plan, are of some benefit to farmers, although in this case the benefit is very small. But the main benefit is to poor people in this country who receive balanced diets they could not otherwise obtain.

One of the biggest illusions of all is that the vast programs of agricultural research, education, and technical assistance are of primary advantage to the farmer.

These public efforts to stimulate more efficient farm production help the consumer directly by lowering the cost of food.

Individual farmers who adopt new methods first tend to gain a temporary benefit from them. But, in the long run, farmers as a group actually suffer a cut in income from this advance of productivity.

The reason for this is that, in a rich country, demand for food is highly inelastic. A 5-percent increase in total output of food in this country results in a 20-percent reduction in price. Thus, a larger supply sells for less gross revenue.

Programs which tend to stimulate more farm output, therefore, are not a subsidy to farmers but to consumers.

This is the basic reason why production controls, price supports, and other subsidies are necessary. In a sense, the expenditures in the last section of the accompanying table are a consequence of the expenditures for research and education just above them.

If the Government only spent money for farm research and education, the farmer's income would slide downhill rapidly. There is no way that the individual farmer can protect himself against the oversupply and low-price situation. What he does by himself has no effect on the market, so he must produce as much as he can at all times.

When farmers can work together to discipline themselves to restrain production and marketing, they can develop bargaining power to hold their own in an inelastic demand situation. Some small commodity groups do this with the help of Government marketing orders and agreements. The big sectors of farming, however, such as wheat, cotton, feed grains-livestock, have to rely on more direct Government action to either (1) offset the effects of lower market prices through subsidies or (2) help farmers keep production in check.

That the work of USDA is not entirely for the benefit of farmers is shown by a study prepared by Walter W. Wilcox, economist for the Library of Congress.

Wilcox calculated that food costs today are \$4 to \$6 billion a year less than they would be if prices of farm products had risen as much as prices in other parts of the economy in the last 8 years. This amounts to a saving of about \$100 per family.

These savings may be compared with average costs of farm income-support programs of \$1.9 billion per year in 1953-54 and \$2.6 billion per year in 1961 and 1962.

It would appear from these figures that the U.S. consumer has been doing very well, on balance, between expenditures for farm subsidies and expenditures which reduce the cost of food. Perhaps the Department of Agriculture should be renamed the Department of Food and Agriculture.

It is as much a consumer's agency in the food field as a farmer's agency.

Proposed USDA budget

| PROGRAMS WHICH BENEFIT GENERAL PUBLIC | |
|---|-------|
| Food distribution programs: <i>In millions</i> | |
| Purchase of surplus agricultural commodities..... | \$164 |
| Pilot food stamp plan..... | 51 |
| School lunch program..... | 182 |
| Special milk program..... | 102 |
| Total..... | 499 |
| Programs having foreign relations and defense aspects: | |
| Sales of surplus farm commodities for foreign currencies..... | 1,282 |
| Emergency famine relief to friendly peoples..... | 246 |
| International wheat agreement..... | 72 |
| Transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile..... | 62 |
| Payments to Veterans' Administration and armed services for milk and dairy products used in excess of normal requirements..... | 40 |
| Value of foreign currencies used by Defense Department for military housing and long-term supply contracts..... | 284 |
| Defense food stockpiling..... | 30 |
| Total..... | 2,016 |
| Investment in REA and FHA loans, which are subject to repayment..... | 448 |
| Long-range programs for improvement of agricultural resources, including research, meat inspection, disease and pest control, market development and services, protection of soil and water resources, and forest and public land management: | |
| Forest Service..... | 311 |
| Agricultural Research Service..... | 195 |
| Soil Conservation Service..... | 195 |
| Extension Service..... | 77 |
| Cooperative State Experiment Station Service..... | 40 |
| Agricultural Marketing Service, marketing research..... | 43 |
| Farmers Home Administration salaries and expenses..... | 39 |
| Expenses and staff offices for other agencies, including Rural Electrification Administration (REA), and Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC)..... | 94 |
| Total..... | 994 |
| Total..... | 3,957 |
| PROGRAMS FOR STABILIZING FARM INCOME | |
| Agricultural conservation program..... | 214 |
| Conservation reserve program..... | 294 |
| Land-use adjustment program..... | 27 |
| CCC price support, supply and related programs (less payments to VA and armed services for dairy products used in excess of normal requirements)..... | 787 |
| Grain acreage diversion payments..... | 400 |
| Grain price support payments..... | 581 |
| National Wool Act program..... | 106 |
| Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service expenses..... | 115 |
| Sugar Act program..... | 84 |
| Total..... | 2,603 |
| Grand total..... | 6,565 |

1963

If the West is unlikely to "move" toward Russia, the latter seems equally disinclined to move toward the West. For the men in the Kremlin, too, there is a sticking point: Relaxation of control over every phase of Soviet life from poetry-writing to pig-farming. Unsure of popular support and intent on overtaking the United States, Russia's rulers cannot, in their own view, leave anything to chance. The economy is completely state controlled. Industry, trade, and agriculture, for all practical purposes, belong to the state as surely as the Army and Post Office Department belong to the U.S. Government.

Then what about those recent developments that suggest Russia is moving down the road toward capitalism?

The feud with Red China is the least convincing bit of evidence, for it centers more on the inevitability of war than on future internal developments in Russia. The fact that Mr. Khrushchev considers coexistence with the West necessary in an era of thermonuclear weapons has not dimmed his belief that capitalism will be buried through peaceful competition and subversion.

Mr. K's injunction to Russia's economic chiefs to learn from the capitalists is somewhat more intriguing. It indicates a new appreciation of areas in which Western practice is superior to Russia's, e.g. in standardizing components, eliminating the duplication of production facilities, and junking obsolete machinery. But this hardly means Mr. Khrushchev wants to remodel his economy extensively along capitalist lines.

Generally, when the Soviet Premier praises capitalist accomplishments, he is trying to goad his subordinates into outdoing the capitalists—but by socialist means. If private businessmen in the West do certain things well, he recently declared, "then the planned, socialist system can even more successfully use its inherent advantages to speed the technological progress of production, and to increase the output of products and improve their quality."

If this sounds like so much hot air, it nevertheless illustrates Mr. K's unwavering belief that socialism will prove superior in the long run. As far as he is concerned, Russia is not moving toward capitalism but further away from it, hopefully to "pure communism" sometime after 1980.

LIBERMAN'S PROPOSALS

Many in the West see a more hopeful sign of evolution in the new economic ferment in Russia. In particular, they cite the proposals of Y. G. Liberman, the Kharkov economics professor, to grant more powers to Russia's tightly reined factory directors and to let the pursuit of profits boost production and raise the quality of goods. The men in the Kremlin may think Russia is moving toward pure communism, these Western observers say, but it's more likely that they will be forced to make some "capitalistic" changes in their system long before 1980.

Unquestionably, Professor Liberman's proposals, if adopted, could mark a first step down the road toward some sort of Western-style market economy. The fact that his and other proposals have been printed at all shows that an important "thaw" is taking place in Soviet economic thinking. But there is no guarantee the Liberman scheme will ever be adopted. And even if it is, it would still leave the hard-core features of the Soviet system—state ownership of all production facilities, central planning, wage and price controls, and political dictatorship—intact.

Indeed, Professor Liberman's proposals are "capitalistic" only in the sense that the one rational direction in which Russia's system can go is toward increased delegation of power to the man on the spot. Yet despite their mildness, there's plenty of opposition. Even O. Antonov, the aircraft designer who

has praised some of capitalism's features, warns self-righteously in a recent issue of *Izvestia* that profits, "taken by themselves" as an indicator of efficiency—as Professor Liberman proposes—"are, I would say, commercial and in practice sometimes mercenary."

There's a far more important objection. Some Western analysts—and probably many Russians—doubt the proposals would work without more decontrol than the Kharkov professor has called for. For example, price control and centrally planned distribution might have to be abolished or at least relaxed before factory directors would really get interested in maximizing profits. Otherwise, how could they shop around for raw materials or haggle over prices?

IMPLICATIONS FOR PARTY MEN

All this must raise fearsome implications for many Russians. For the various controls over the Soviet economy reinforce each other. Take some of them away, and the others are weakened. To some conservative Communists, any harmless-looking proposal to prune away red tape is really a bid by the economists and professional managers to take over. Since they might do a better job than is being done now, there would be less need for trouble-shooting by the local Communist Party officials who constantly look over their shoulders—and thus enable Moscow politicians to control Russia's economy.

Thus, few drastic changes are likely as long as Mr. Khrushchev rules Russia, short of a major economic catastrophe analogous to the 1929 stock market crash and subsequent depression in the United States. The men deemed most likely to succeed Mr. K. undoubtedly share his fear of introducing any real spontaneity into the system. Indeed, when the going gets rough the Soviet leaders are just as likely to tighten the screws as loosen them. The creation of a new Supreme Economic Council, announced last week, apparently will tighten control somewhat.

Even if some liberalization takes place later on—and this isn't precluded by the latest action—the sticking point would quickly be reached. In the arts, this seems to have happened already. Early this month Mr. Khrushchev told Russia's writers and artists, who have been increasingly bold of late, that they will not be allowed to create whatever they please.

Ultimately, perhaps when a new generation comes to power in Russia, true evolution toward capitalism may begin. But for the foreseeable future, barring a popular uprising which most observers consider unlikely, talk of the two systems "moving closer together" is largely wishful thinking.

CUBAN CAVES

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. HARRISON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished former Ambassador to Mexico, the Honorable Robert C. Hill, sent me a copy of an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of March 30, 1963.

Entitled "The Secret Caves of Cuba," the editorial comments on the possibility of "underground Soviet submarine bases in Cuba."

The Honorable Robert C. Hill greatly distinguished himself as our Ambassador to the Mexican Republic. He made many friends for the United States.

While others were beguiled by Fidel Castro, Ambassador Hill was alert to the

threat posed by the bearded demagog. He deserves recognition and appreciation by all Americans for his devoted service to our country.

The editorial follows:

THE SECRET CAVES OF CUBA

As many geologists have known for years, and many so-called intelligence experts are beginning to discover, the island of Cuba is honeycombed with thousands of underground caves. Many of these caves, as the geology textbooks point out, open directly on the sea. It is quite possible for a Soviet submarine to steam directly into some of these caves.

Cuban refugees and exiles have warned our Government for 3 years that the caves of Cuba have been the scene of mysterious and possibly sinister activity. Curiously, when Castro took over, Antonio Nuñez Jiménez, Cuba's leading spelunker (a person who explores caves), was appointed to a top Government position. Some of the Cuban exiles now in this country actually worked in these caves, cleaning them and pouring concrete. Then they were barred from further work in the caves. Today, if reports of the refugees can be believed—and we should not be quick to doubt them—the entrances to many of these caves are heavily fortified and no Cubans, not even top-level military personnel, are permitted near them. Whole villages have been relocated away from the caves. The caves are guarded by military personnel of the Soviet Union or satellite soldiers, reportedly including Czechs.

What is inside these caves? The exiles and refugees say some of them contain intermediate-range ballistic missiles, complete with guidance and launching systems. Other caves, they charge, house Soviet-built and Soviet-manned supersonic jet fighters, any of which could be easily converted to carry nuclear weapons. At least five of the caves, those opening on the sea, are said to be complete, operational Soviet submarine bases. Appearing before a congressional committee recently, the Army's Chief of Intelligence, Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch, said, "From the large volume and frequency of reports concerning the underground storage of ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft, it is certain that there is considerably activity in connection with underground installations through the island. In numerous caves, reports indicate that this activity is being carried out solely by Soviet personnel and that Cubans, including highly placed military officers, are not permitted access."

"There are several thousand caves in Cuba," General Fitch continued, "and many have been used for storage over the years. With the reported addition of dehumidification and air-conditioning equipment, many would be suited to storage of both large and delicate electronic items. Aerial photography has further revealed the extension of roads to known and suspected cave locations. In view of the shortage of above-ground facilities and the requirement for storage of the large amounts of military supplies and equipment believed to be in Cuba, and the relatively simple adaptation of caves for this purpose, it is considered highly probable that much military equipment and supplies are being stored underground."

General Fitch does not believe that the Soviets have installed intermediate-range ballistic missiles in the caves, as the exiles insist. He says, "While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis, it is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time the quarantine was imposed." General Fitch, an Army man, did not comment on the possibility of underground Soviet submarine bases in Cuba. Thus far, our Navy experts have remained silent on this point.

visible among thousands of children across the country.

The chief problem we on the committee have encountered in our investigations of this subject over many years is an overtolerance—amounting often to an apathy—on the part of the public. Major effort, therefore, has been directed to developing a public awareness that smut and obscenity are a very real danger and can strike every home, even though an individual may have escaped thus far.

A second part of the problem is the adverse press that tends to block correct measures. Any public official, legislative group, or private organization risks the brand of "censor" or "professional do-gooder" in recommending positive legislation or administrative action.

A third handicap has been the very tolerant attitude of some courts—particularly in metropolitan areas where much smut originates—evidencing a serious miscalculation of the extent and the danger of smut peddling, as well as of the moral temper of the public.

Both Postmaster General Day and his predecessor, Postmaster General Summerfield, have cited the obscenity racket as a half-billion-dollar-a-year business.

Keeping smut out of the mails, even with stronger laws originated by our committee, demands an ever larger share of time, money, and manpower of the postal service each year. Incidentally, I wish to credit both Postmaster General Day and former Postmaster General Summerfield for their effective and determined efforts to combat the use of the mails by peddlers of smut.

I direct your attention to House Appropriation hearings on the postal budget for 1964 which highlights this condition. Assistant Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen testified—page 107:

At the close of fiscal year 1962, the inspection service had a backlog of about 5,000 cases involving the transmittal of obscene matter in the mails. This is over and beyond the normal carryover and represents the equivalent of 18 man-years of work. It is apparent that at least five additional inspectors must be assigned to investigate the transmittal of obscene matter in the mails.

I commend the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman GARY, of the Appropriations Subcommittee, and point to his comments—page 128—with respect to imports of smut:

Frankly, I did not fully realize the importance of this program [of the postal service] until our recent trip to New York. * * * there is a pronounced effort to flood this country with communistic materials and also with pornographic materials from outside countries.

We were told that one country has been collecting approximately \$10 million a year from the pornographic material being shipped into this country.

The Post Office Department's General Counsel cited the difficulty in coping with purveyors of smut who, when they are about to be caught, change their names and addresses to circumvent prosecution.

He cited the dual attack of the postal service and the customs service on ob-

scenity of domestic and foreign origin, and some of the effective steps being taken to combat the evil. His description of procedure—page 130—indicates how tedious and costly and how sometimes frustrating their best efforts are. Controlling obscene imports at New York alone requires 12 full-time postal employees, in addition to the customs officials.

The venue law, which permits prosecution of obscenity offenders at destination of their mailings, as well as at origin points, has been tremendously helpful, because the community moral attitudes where the material does its harm are considerably better than in some metropolitan points of origin. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee developed and wrote this legislation, and referred it to the Judiciary Committee, because it provides strong criminal penalties.

The chief postal inspector submitted a chart—page 133 of the hearings—showing fine progress in combating smut mailings, but the whole tenor of the hearings is that efforts must be redoubled to protect the public.

I also direct your attention to an interesting sidelight of the unified effort at Federal level—page 133—concerning arrangements between our postal service and the National Central Interpol Office in The Hague. Successful prosecution of foreign smut mailers under this arrangement, and under similar arrangements with nations which are members of the Universal Postal Union, should help keep foreign obscenity out.

Finally, the main operating problem is lack of adequate manpower. Cooperation by an informed citizenry can be a tremendous aid. Any citizen who finds obscenity moving through the mails should report it promptly to his local postmaster or law enforcement officials, just as he would report any other crime. If he does so, he may well be striking the first blow in defense of his own home and children—since many of the filth merchants direct their "pornography for profit" efforts at our children and young people.

However, we must realize that this issue is important and must be met, since it so adversely affects the lives of thousands of youngsters. Thousands and thousands of children throughout our country in the largest city and the smallest village are the targets of pornographic peddlers and their lives may be twisted and perverted if they become addicted to the clever little magazines and related material that reaches them through the mail or just as often available over the counter of local stores.

We have an obligation to cooperate through legislative enactment in providing the Post Office Department with weapons to effectively fight this battle in this field. We then have an additional responsibility to help arouse public opinion, which can be a vital force for good in halting this consistent attack on our moral standards. The family, the community, private groups and government must work together in this field to develop an effective, consistent anti-

obscenity program, and in turn, to develop additional leadership to expand the use of better reading materials, while eliminating the flow of filth from our Nation.

THE SECRET CAVES OF CUBA

(Mr. WYMAN (at the request of Mr. HARRISON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great voices of America is the Saturday Evening Post. Its editorials have long expressed the interest and concern of a great number of our people. Such an editorial is that of the issue of March 30, 1963 entitled "The Secret Caves of Cuba."

As this editorial so well points out, there are such caves and we do not know what is in them. However, we do know that for years Soviet Communists have been working on and in them with concrete. We also know that there have been shipped to Cuba all manner of military equipment. Finally, we know that wherever Communists are at work, they are not peddling sewing kits.

No longer is Cuba a question of laissez faire. Nor is our problem there confined to whether or not the guestimates of administration officials, that heavy missiles have been removed by the Russians, are so. Cuba in Communist hands is an acute threat to American security and survival on account of submarine bases alone, to say nothing of missiles or propaganda. Astride the whole Caribbean and strategically located on America's soft underside we cannot and we must not tolerate Communist control of Cuba.

As the Saturday Evening Post editorial so well emphasizes, the U.S. Government, acting for our people, "now has an obligation to disprove—the claims that offensive weaponry is presently hidden in Cuban caves—by whatever means are necessary, including force."

This, I have urged for more than 3 years.

The editorial reads as follows:

THE SECRET CAVES OF CUBA

As many geologists have known for years, and many so-called intelligence experts are beginning to discover, the island of Cuba is honeycombed with thousands of underground caves. Many of these caves, as the geology textbooks point out, open directly on the sea. It is quite possible for a Soviet submarine to steam directly into some of these caves.

Cuban refugees and exiles have warned our Government for 3 years that the caves of Cuba have been the scene of mysterious and possibly sinister activity. Curiously, when Castro took over, Antonio Nufiez Jimenez, Cuba's leading spelunker (a person who explores caves), was appointed to a top government position. Some of the Cuban exiles now in this country actually worked in these caves, cleaning them and pouring concrete. Then they were barred from further work in the caves. Today, if reports of the refugees can be believed—and we should not be quick to doubt them—the entrances to many of these caves are heavily fortified and no Cubans, not even top-level military personnel, are permitted near them. Whole

**CININNATUS' WORDS OF WISDOM
AND CAUTION ON TOTALITARIAN
DESPOTISM**

(Mr. PILLION (at the request of Mr. HARRISON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, Miss Taylor Caldwell, of Buffalo, N.Y., is an internationally famous American novelist, the author of many bestsellers.

She has a profound understanding of the philosophical, human and political fallacies and deceptions contained in the Soviet-directed Communist drive for the destruction of the free world. She is a dedicated defender of our liberties, an ardent Conservative, a true liberatarian.

Miss Caldwell recently wrote to me expressing her alarm over the tax reforms recommended in President Kennedy's budget message. Her letter was especially critical of the increased taxes that would be imposed upon the middle class of our citizens by the proposal to limit present deductible items for interest, charity, property and State taxes. In my answer, I expressed my opposition to the President's recommendations for these tax increases.

Miss Caldwell's letter enclosed portions of the speech of Cincinnatus, delivered in the Roman Senate, 300 B.C.

Cincinnatus perceived and eloquently stated that a free nation begins to perish when its citizens place their faith in men instead of in principles and laws. Today, there is a concerted effort being made to destroy the faith of our people in the U.S. Constitution and in the U.S. Congress. There is a subverting effort underway to condition the minds of our people for the acceptance of an all-planned, all-wise, all-powerful totalitarian Federal Government. The process is one of usurpation of power and misinterpretation of the purpose of the U.S. Constitution.

I believe that the words of wisdom and caution, contained in the following speech of Cincinnatus are especially applicable, today.

The speech follows:

SPEECH OF CININNATUS, "FATHER OF HIS COUNTRY," DELIVERED TO THE ROMAN SENATE, 300 B.C., WHEN HE WAS CALLED UPON TO SAVE ROME FROM HER ENEMIES

My dear fellow countrymen, you have imposed upon me an honor and a terrible obligation and faith for which I am little fitted, for no man is worthy of the devotion of his people. Worthiness resides in no man, and let that nation beware which discovers itself regarding its temporal ruler as a divinity, fawning upon him, delighting in news of his comings and goings, reverencing him, listening to his words as though they rolled down from Olympus with the sound of thunder, ostracizing those who differ from him, raising up their voices like trumpets hailing all that he does, and deluding themselves that he is superior to those who have elevated him by vote or in the name of emergency.

For such a people have taken upon themselves the aspects of slaves. They have greatly injured their ruler by persuading him he is more than a man and that he does not possess their own evils and follies and weaknesses. If he becomes arrogant and oppressive this is the crime of his people, the

crime above all other crimes, for they have endangered his stature as a man and have aroused in him base passions and have afflicted him with the wrath of God, who will have no rivals. Much has been written in history of the sufferings of nations under tyrants, but where does one read that the tyrant is the victim of his people and therefore more to be pitied? If, in your history, long after I am dust, you raise up a tyrant to destroy and enslave and terrify you, say not to him: "You have betrayed and imprisoned and tormented us beyond endurance." Say, rather to him: "Forgive us."

God, in His wisdom and knowledge and understanding has created infinite diversity among men, so that no man shall think or act or speak in the exact manner of his brother. This variety is our shield, our fortress, our wall, our immortal protection against despots, against error, against weakness, and evil. In argument, in difference, in dialog and in freedom of speech and in all liberty, the truth will emerge concerning man's duty and man's God. But let no ruler of mere flesh, unsanctified and in all ignorance no matter his learning, shout in your presence, "I alone am truth, and you shall believe it and speak no word against it." For truth comes only from God, the possessor of our days, the guardian of our nights, the ultimate receiver of our souls, the giver of our breath, the Light of our spirit.

No nation has ever perished until it has said, "My faith is in men, and he whom I have placed upon the throne which I have built with my own hands is the repository of wisdom and justice, and he I shall obey without question and with my heart's great loyalty and devotion. He is my law, and I delight in him, and bow my head before him." There are times of dire emergency when power is given to one man, but that time must be limited, and that man's days scanned sleeplessly lest he be devoured by ambition, and be a mischief.

You have called me from my peaceful fields and my household to save you. I shall, in the fear of God and in the wisdom with which He sees fit to endow me, serve you with courage and steadfastness and faith, and shall deliver you. But I implore you to let me go when my service has been rendered. For no man is worthy of the trust of his fellows, not even I, nor those who will come after me. For men are ambitious and their hearts are evil.

And now let us take up our duty and gird our strength and lift up our shields and our swords in defense of our country. Let us be men and not cowards. If death is our portion then we shall have died honorably and in the name of liberty, and we shall have delivered our children. War and struggle are indeed monstrous trials, but never must they be avoided for a year of uneasy peace or an era of compromise with evil. It is better to die on one's feet, fighting for freedom, than to live on one's knees as a slave. It is better to eat the dust than the bread of despotism. It is better to expire as a man.

Let us now to our arms, as freemen and Romans.

(Source: Vatican Library, Rome.)

NATIONAL BEAUTY CAREER DAYS

(Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. HARRISON) was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the National American Cosmetology Schools, for the third consecutive year, have designated the second week in April—April 7 through 13—as National Beauty Career Days. A constituent of

mine, Mrs. Grace Talarico, of Cleveland, is the chairman of the National Beauty Career Days Committee. The purpose of this special week is to make teenagers and adults more aware of career opportunities in the beauty industry.

Twenty-four hundred beauty culture school owners work closely with vocational guidance counselors in junior high schools, high schools, and government agencies to assist the teenager in acquiring salable skills in today's complex labor market. During the week in April which has been set aside, an educational program will be conducted and an open invitation will be issued to high school counselors, teenage groups and parents to visit their community cosmetology schools, to inspect the facilities and gain first-hand information regarding the advantages of a career in cosmetology.

There are many people who do not realize the great impact which the beauty industry has on our national economy. It contributes well in excess of \$1 billion a year to our gross national product. There are more than 200,000 beauty salons located in every State in the Union, employing more than a half million operators classified as cosmetologists, hairdressers, and beauticians. Each operator must comply with State board regulations which usually require from 1,000 to 2,500 hours of practical and academic training. In addition to the operators there are more than 1,500 beauty supply dealers and more than 2,400 beauty culture schools which supply and service the industry.

Mr. Speaker, the beauty industry is to be congratulated for their foresightedness in setting aside this week to call attention to the advantages to teenagers and others of acquiring this particular skill. Otherwise many of these young people would have the problem of facing the competitive labor market as unskilled workers.

**PROBLEMS IN COMBATING USE OF
THE MAILS BY DISTRIBUTORS OF
PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL**

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. HARRISON) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I wish to direct the attention of the Members to the continued problem our Nation faces in our efforts to combat the use of the mails by distributors of pornographic material. Additional legislation is needed in this field, and I am hopeful that our committee will continue the necessary research to provide the Post Office Department with effective legal weapons with which to halt the purveyors of smut.

Filth peddling today produces billions of dollars a year in income to persons involved in its distribution, despite all efforts of the Post Office and local authorities to stamp it out. The suppression of traffic in obscenity is a tremendous and never-ending problem and the ill effects that it causes are tragically

villages have been relocated away from the caves. The caves are guarded by military personnel of the Soviet Union or satellite soldiers, reportedly including Czechs.

What is inside these caves? The exiles and refugees say some of them contain intermediate-range ballistic missiles, complete with guidance and launching systems. Other caves, they charge, house Soviet-built and Soviet-manned supersonic jet fighters, any of which could be easily converted to carry nuclear weapons. At least five of the caves, those opening on the sea, are said to be complete, operational Soviet submarine bases. Appearing before a congressional committee recently, the Army's Chief of Intelligence, Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch said, "From the large volume and frequency of reports concerning the underground storage of ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft, it is certain that there is considerable activity in connection with underground installations through the island. In numerous caves, reports indicate that this activity is being carried out solely by Soviet personnel and that Cubans, including highly placed military officers, are not permitted access.

"There are several thousand caves in Cuba," General Fitch continued, "and many have been used for storage over the years. With the reported addition of dehumidification and air-conditioning equipment, many would be suited to storage of both large and delicate electronic items. Aerial photography has further revealed the extension of roads to known and suspect cave locations. In view of the shortage of aboveground facilities and the requirement for storage of the large amounts of military supplies and equipment believed to be in Cuba, and the relatively simple adaptation of caves for this purpose, it is considered highly probably that much military equipment and supplies are being stored underground."

General Fitch does not believe that the Soviets have installed intermediate-range ballistic missiles in the caves, as the exiles insist. He says, "While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis, it is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time the quarantine was imposed." General Fitch, an Army man, did not comment on the possibility of underground Soviet submarine bases in Cuba. Thus far, our Navy experts have remained silent on this point.

To date the Government's intelligence-gathering activities in Cuba have inspired little confidence. Defense Secretary McNamara's theatrical television briefing raised a good many more questions than it answered. Moreover, McNamara recently admitted that, when the going got tough, CIA surveillance aircraft were inadequate to cope with Cuba and airplanes of the Strategic Air Command had to be pressed into service. But even those skilled SAC recon experts cannot photograph the inside of a cave. If the Soviets do not even permit the "highly placed military" of Cuba near the caves we would doubt that our CIA men have penetrated them either. Thus, it seems to us that we really don't know what might be inside the caves. We think it is dangerous to assume that they do not contain IRBM missiles and submarine pens.

If, as the exiles contend, the caves are loaded with IRBM's and submarine facilities, then Cuba, in fact, has become a Soviet Gibraltar. Only a few Soviet IRBM's in Cuba dangerously tilt the balance of power in Soviet favor. If the Soviets are allowed to operate Polaris-type submarines from Cuban bases, the Reds can attain a serious "third force" threat, with only one-third the number of nuclear submarines required to operate from Soviet home bases. This is the grave threat of the caves of Cuba.

To Americans, the important point is that we do not know what the caves conceal. We think it is vital that our Government find

out, beyond doubt, and soon. Having failed once to listen to the warnings of Cuban exiles, it seems to us the Government now has an obligation to disprove their present charge, by whatever means are necessary, including force.

BILL PROPOSED TO STRENGTHEN IMMIGRATION LAWS TO PREVENT U.S. CITIZENS FROM GOING TO CUBA FOR SUBVERSIVE PURPOSES

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, for 2 weeks now I have waged an effort to prevail upon the Justice and State Departments to close the open door to subversion in the Americas through Mexico City to Cuba, but so far unsuccessfully.

I have called to the attention of the State Department and the House Un-American Activities Committee the fact that some 97 U.S. citizens, during a period of only 6 months during 1962, went to Cuba through Mexico, since the ban on such travel dated January 16, 1961, was issued by the State Department and I have turned these names over to the House Un-American Activities Committee, having been advised that this list has been denied the committee for reasons which I cannot understand.

The House Un-American Activities Committee advises that it is engaged in a full-scale investigation of the matter in that my cursory examination of the list indicated that a number of those going to Cuba have known Communist backgrounds and are continuing to participate in support of Communist-front organizations, including the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, the Medicine for Cuba Committee, and the July 26 movement.

I also have placed in the RECORD evidence that a number of those who have gone to Cuba have publicly advertised this fact in the Worker, with announcements of speechmaking programs about Cuba, the funds from which are to be used to finance the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Despite these public announcements, only one prosecution has taken place.

We are calling upon all nations in this hemisphere to try to close this open door of subversion and we look a little silly in so doing while at the same time permitting our own citizens not only to go to Cuba but to use information gained there to sell Castro's communism in the United States and to finance Communist-front organizations working for Castro in the United States.

I find this situation completely intolerable and I again call upon the Justice and State Departments to prosecute these Communist sympathizers who have openly and notoriously violated the law and to do all it can to close this door permanently.

I am today introducing a bill which I believe will tighten travel restrictions as they relate to persons, particularly U.S. citizens, who travel to or interrupt their journeys in transit through any country

with which the United States does not maintain diplomatic relations, making this specifically a crime when the President of the United States has declared that such travel should be prohibited in the best interests of the United States. This latter limitation obviously would make it applicable to Cuba and would perhaps also help bring about clarification of rules and regulations relating to other countries whose governments we do not recognize.

The further purpose of this bill is hopefully to get this general issue before the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee so that amendments to the basic law can be considered while at the same time House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Committee consider the possible subversive impact of these visits within this country.

I am also placing in the RECORD for the first time the list of the number of people who have gone to Cuba from other countries during this same 6-month period in 1962. This list indicates the extent to which countries in the Americas permit the flow of people, numbers of them known subversives, to Cuba, and, again, I say I am confident this information is correct in that the basic source of the information comes from the manifests of the planes of Cubana Airlines. The list, which is self-explanatory, indicates a total of 3,447 have traveled to Cuba from other countries, including 265 from Russia and its satellites.

The list follows:

| | |
|---|-------|
| Canada..... | 81 |
| United States..... | 99 |
| Total..... | 180 |
| Argentina..... | 229 |
| Bolivia..... | 51 |
| Brazil..... | 80 |
| Colombia..... | 15 |
| Costa Rica..... | 47 |
| Cuba..... | 435 |
| Chile..... | 126 |
| Ecuador..... | 67 |
| El Salvador..... | 70 |
| Guatemala..... | 78 |
| Honduras..... | 229 |
| Mexico..... | 443 |
| Nicaragua..... | 14 |
| Panama..... | 49 |
| Paraguay..... | 27 |
| Dominican Republic..... | 2 |
| Uruguay..... | 122 |
| Venezuela..... | 7 |
| Total..... | 2,135 |
| From undetermined nationalities, total..... | 648 |
| Russia and satellites..... | 265 |
| Other countries outside of this hemisphere..... | 221 |
| Total..... | 1,132 |
| Grand total..... | 3,447 |

I again call for the closing of this open door of subversion and call for early hearings and favorable action on legislation of this nature.

It will be my intention, your invitation of the Senate Internal Security Committee, to appear before that committee

on Wednesday to present this evidence and other matters—this list of names having been denied even this committee by the executive branch to date.

OUR FISCAL PROBLEM

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

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the President, unintentionally I am sure, has placed our fiscal problem in the proper perspective when he referred to those who oppose his planned deficits as being possessed of a puritan ethic.

Dr. Elton Trueblood, of Earlham College in Indiana, recently defended those who do possess a "puritan ethic" very effectively in the publication *Quaker Life*, April 1963.

Under unanimous consent, I include his article in the body of the RECORD, as follows:

THE PURITAN ETHIC (By Elton Trueblood)

Walter Heller, chief economic adviser to President Kennedy, has given it out as his judgment that one of the chief barriers to be overcome is that of the puritan ethic. By this he means that adherence to the ethic of the days when America was young is wholly inapplicable in our time. It would, he thinks, be far easier to put across the idea of spending ourselves into prosperity if only an antiquated philosophy did not persist as an intellectual anachronism. Running a big deficit is the right thing to do, we are told, but some people are still so old fashioned that they do not know this. Among those of whom Heller speaks with such obvious condescension are a good many Quakers.

This approach would not be very disturbing if it came from a mere private citizen, for each person has a right to his opinion, but it is highly disturbing when it comes from those who are among the chief architects of national policy. We can be grateful to Heller in that he helps the public to understand the character of the challenge which the economic advisers are presenting. What we have on our hands is not mere economic theory, but rather a proposed alteration of our basic philosophy. We are foolish if we do not become aroused when the philosophy which helped to make our country great is spoken of with contempt.

The President says that his policy of cutting taxes by \$10 billion, while expenses rise, is attacked on both the right and the left. What he needs to know is that it is deeply disturbing to some who do not belong to either the right or the left. We are not ashamed of the puritan ethic, which means trying to live within our income, and we refuse to feel out of date just because some man with access to the White House says so. I do not especially enjoy paying.

I am well aware of the argument given, to the effect that the alternative to a huge deficit is a depression, with the consequence of an even larger deficit. I am aware of this because this is what the President and his key advisers keep saying. Whether this is true or not I do not know, but I do know that an economy in which these are the only alternatives is terribly sick. Imagine the richest country of the world admitting that it cannot avoid a depression except by a deliberate plan of deficit financing, to burden its descendants. Already we pay \$10 billion a year to finance our debt. As the debt rises, as is promised, this amount will increase greatly. One does not have to be

very wise to envisage a time when the total debt will be fantastic. Certainly it will be if we add to it substantially in allegedly good times.

The danger is very great, a danger which any person ought to be able to see, even if he is a doctrinaire economist. Consider, for example, how a similar policy has practically ruined Brazil. Both reason and experience should warn us, but those who command the headlines seem impervious to both. Perhaps it is the desire to be popular and to stay in power that is really at work. People always love a gift, even if the source of the gift is their own money. The basic issue may not be primarily economic; it may be moral. The awful thought is that demagogues tend to win, particularly in the short run.

CLAY REPORT IS OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTION

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, throughout this great Nation of ours, the press and the people are discussing and studying the foreign aid report of the Clay committee, submitted by a 10-man committee named by President Kennedy and headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay. Let me say that I believe this study and report represents one of the finest actions taken since I have been a Member of the Congress.

I think President Kennedy should be commended for having named this committee of outstanding Americans to reassess our foreign aid program. It has long been my conviction that we needed to reassess the role we are playing in our foreign aid program, to seek out those areas where our funds are being wasted, and eliminate these, and where the goals of this Nation are being met, to bolster our programs.

The report aptly noted that even with due consideration for improvements, much remains to be accomplished, that we are attempting too much in too many places and that a higher quality of reduced quantity of our diffuse aid effort in certain countries could produce more.

Particularly do I support the part of the report which stated that we cannot indefinitely continue commitments at the present rate to the 95 countries and territories which are now receiving our economic and military assistance. Substantial tightening up and sharpening of objectives in terms of national interest are necessary.

The point which impresses me most about the report is in calling for a definition of American objectives. We seek to aid those nations which seek to help themselves, to make the reforms which would make their lands productive and free for their peoples. In Latin America for example, we must insist that the leaders of these nations mobilize their internal forces to develop their economy, for promises are not enough, and failure to meet these commitments should be accompanied by reduction or complete elimination of aid to those nations which fail to meet these guidelines.

I think it should be particularly noted that we seek not enslavement, but freedom. Our aid programs should be de-

signed to bolster the economies of nations which have the capacity and the determination to build a strong free economy of free men. For us to do less is sheer folly.

The Clay Report in my opinion is a great contribution. It brings into sharp focus for the American people the accomplishments and the failings of our aid programs over the past 2 decades. I think it should be carefully studied and considered, and that the Congress and the Administration should make a concerted effort to define our goals. We should call strongly on those other free world nations, which we have helped pull up by their bootstraps from the ravages of war and which are now self-sufficient, to pay their fair share of such programs which are vital to all of us. And finally, we should begin to cut the huge expenditures which this Nation has been making, in some cases unwisely, for foreign aid.

NASSER'S RAPALLO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last week I brought to the attention of the House the appalling situation in the Middle East where the Egyptian military and missile buildup has been supplemented through the past several years by the U.S.S.R. and is now being aided by West Germans. I add sadly that this buildup has been facilitated to a tremendous degree by our own economic assistance program favoring Dictator Nasser, which has made possible a diversion of Egypt's own resources to facilitate this offensive arms buildup.

I am particularly concerned over the flagrant irony of the apparent collaboration by the West German Government with the "Castro of the Nile," Colonel Nasser. I say irony because it is Nasser's own boast that he intends to obliterate the tiny state of Israel which has been the haven of hundred of thousands of Jews, victims of the tyranny of Hitler's Germany. The appalling thing to me is the condoning of the work of ex-Nazi rocket scientists and other Germans in Egypt by our Government through its "whitewash" of West Germany in this connection.

West Germany is our partner in the NATO Alliance. We certainly can speak out and demand responsible and moral behavior. The State Department has so far merely sought to minimize, excuse, and justify the notorious German role in Egypt.

If West Germany is truly devoted to freedom and is a trustworthy partner of America, it behooves our Government to intercede. Civilization can certainly expect the West Germans to heed in the light of the German allegations that they regret the barbarism of the Nazi era. If West Germany ignores the dictates of humanity on this issue, her role on other matters involving peace and security will bear closer scrutiny.

The world has forgotten neither the German-Russian Treaty of Rapallo nor

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4087

J. (Two-Gun) Hart, who, as a marshal and an Indian agent in Nebraska, enforced the law for 30 years. True, he changed his name, but by any other name, his heredity was exactly the same.

Those who blame society for an individual's behavior are themselves creating a society of weak and irresponsible individuals. Making society guilty is an admission that the individual is not capable of choosing or controlling his behavior. No man is free who is not the master of his fate. If his fate is determined by society, or any other force outside himself, he is not the master, and he is not free. Let those who excuse and blame ponder this. Will they have a free and responsible citizen who can choose and control his own destiny? Or will they have one who is a slave of circumstances and conditions, without any sense of responsibility for his own life or the community in which he lives? They must decide on one or the other. They cannot have both.

ELSIE KING MORELAND.

POLITICAL CLEARANCE FOR STUDENT SUMMER JOBS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, recently I received an inquiry about a disturbing report that student summer jobs in Washington were being controlled by the administration for political purposes. Reports that applicants were being subjected to clearance through the New Frontier political machine were brought to my attention.

I immediately made inquiry through the Civil Service Commission and was assured both by phone and by letter that there had been—to quote Civil Service—“no departure from past policies or practices in employing students.”

The writer, Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., continued with the reassuring words:

Any political clearances for appointments to positions in the competitive service, either permanent or temporary are clearly prohibited by the Civil Service Act, rules, and regulations.

I realize the repetition involved in reading Chairman Macy's letter in full, but to avoid any chance of pulling his statements out of context I will quote the full letter at this point in my remarks:

DEAR SENATOR SIMPSON: This is in reply to your letter of March 12, 1963, in behalf of Mrs. Pollyann Lucas, 167 South 12th East, Salt Lake City, Utah, who asks about summer employment in the Federal service.

Let me assure you that there has been no departure from past policies or practices in employing students or other persons for temporary periods during the summer. Pamphlet 45 has been reissued (a copy is enclosed) to set forth the summer employment opportunities known to the Civil Service Commission and the procedures to be followed by applicants interested in such opportunities. Any political clearances for appointments to positions in the competitive service, either permanent or temporary, are clearly prohibited by the Civil Service Act, rules, and regulations. The Commission will promptly investigate any specific charge that such prohibitions have been violated.

Your enclosure is returned.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, JR.,
Chairman.

Despite the abuses of power politics that I have witnessed in my brief tenure in the Senate, this letter did seem quite explicit and I in turn assured Mrs. Lucas that her trepidation was without

cause and that no politics figured in the summer jobs.

At this same time the administration testified before the House Civil Service Committee that there was certainly no political patronage involved and that White House interest in the program was predicated on the most noble of motives; simply to set up the summer student seminars. The fears of all who questioned the patronage reports were thus quickly assuaged.

Senators can imagine my surprise Sunday when I read in the newspaper that the official publication of the National Federation of College Democrats had unveiled this play for the cruel hoax that it is. In an article last week the paper informed its readers that responsibility for summer employment jobs had been transferred to the White House.

We learn that each applicant is to write his Congressman for his recommendation and then forward it to the White House patronage clerk who will ascertain the political thinking of the students.

I submit, Mr. President, that this is the rankest type of vicious manipulation of the 10,000 students who are honestly seeking summer jobs in Washington, and of the Civil Service Commission, which is obviously in the dark about the situation.

In its insatiable drive to twist a political advantage from every event, program, and person the administration has violated the civil service law as explained by Mr. Macy and it is attempting to turn a nonpartisan student employment program into a campaign device for the New Frontier.

The American people are witnessing the antics of an administration that plays politics with everything from students to Cuban refugees to an agency of its own Government.

It is patent now that the White House will subtly reject applications of students who are not deemed compatible with the New Frontier grand design.

In his note of reassurance Chairman Macy takes note of the prompt investigation of any reports such as this usurpation of civil service employment. Here we have a clear-cut case for such an investigation before Washington is surfeited with a summer youth corps which is unwittingly giving some Democrat Congressman a boost for reelection, at the taxpayers' expense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred, written by Mr. Young, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

COLLEGE DEMOCRATS ARE TOLD HOW TO GET SUMMER GOVERNMENT JOB

(By Joseph Young)

The Kennedy administration's disavowal of political patronage intent in the filling of student summer jobs in Government is sharply contradicted by one of the Democratic Party's own publications—the National College Democrat.

Only last Thursday, administration officials told the House Civil Service Committee that there was no political patronage involved and that the only interest the White

House had in these jobs was in planning the student seminars which are held in connection with the summer employment.

However, the National College Democrat, the official publication of the National Federation of College Young Democrats, has this to say in its current issue:

“You may have noticed in recent newspaper stories that responsibility for such summer jobs has been transferred to the White House.

“The Young Democrats division has checked out what this means for you.

FORM TO WHITE HOUSE

“We have been recommended to suggest the following procedure. Write to your Senator or Congressman, asking him for a form 57. When you return it, ask him to enclose an accompanying letter of recommendation and to forward it with the form 57 to Mrs. Dorothy Davies at the White House.”

Mrs. Davies is an assistant to Kenneth O'Donnell, special assistant to President Kennedy, and is handling Government summer employment for the White House.

The Democratic student publication mentions that “Washington's summertime lure is ‘getting to’ many college Young Democrats this time of the year.”

With such competition among the Young Democrats, it reminded them that a political letter of recommendation to the White House from one's Senator or Congressman may not be a “guarantee” of getting a summer job. It urges the Young Democrats to follow up “any personal leads you may have” in pursuing a Government job.

The article concludes by reminding the Young Democrats that if they have any further questions they should contact Jim Hunt, the college director of the Democratic National Committee.

AN APRIL FOOL'S DAY NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it is an unfortunate coincidence that the Congress chose April Fool's Day to fool the American people concerning the size of the national debt.

Pursuant to an act of Congress, the papers will solemnly announce that today the ceiling on the debt drops from \$308 billion to \$305 billion, leaving the impression that there has been a marked reduction in the size of the debt, which, of course, is not true. For purposes of flexibility, the Treasury in recent years has been insisting upon a debt ceiling of at least \$3 billion above the actual debt at any given time. As of today, the actual debt is \$303,171,874,612.20. The Treasury had planned to ask Congress to provide a ceiling above \$308 billion, but abandoned the plan when it became apparent that a bitter fight over the debt ceiling would mitigate against the chances of an income tax cut.

April is the month of the largest payment of personal income taxes and the Treasury feels there will be sufficient funds to meet current bills for the next 2 months under a debt limit of \$305 billion prior to June 25, when under existing law the debt ceiling will drop to \$300 billion, the Treasury will be forced to ask for legislative action to increase the debt ceiling. We do not know the exact figure that the Treasury will request, but in view of the fact that the Treasury Department anticipates a deficit of about \$12 billion for the next fiscal year and probably just as much

4988

for the following fiscal year, there are many who now believe that the Treasury will ask Congress to fix the new ceiling at \$320 billion. The budget estimate for interest on the present debt is \$9,400 million, but if Congress concurs in the planned deficits for the next 2 fiscal years, the carrying charge on the national debt will soon be close to \$1 billion a month.

On this April Fool's Day, it is pertinent to point out that almost one-third of our monumental national debt has been created by the money we have loaned and given to foreign nations since the end of World War II.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation of those loans and grants which were published in the last issue of Time magazine. That tabulation shows how much each foreign country has received, making a total of \$97,674,700,000. Whatever the accomplishments of foreign aid have been, the cost has been tremendous. We must review all further requests in this field.

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

WHERE THE MONEY WENT

The breakdown of military and economic aid from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1962. An asterisk indicates classified military aid that is included in the regional totals:

[In millions of dollars]

| | Eco- nomic | Mili- tary | Total |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Europe: | | | |
| Austria..... | 1,173.8 | | 1,173.8 |
| Belgium-Luxem- bourg..... | 739.5 | 1,256.4 | 1,995.9 |
| Denmark..... | 306.3 | 905.3 | 1,211.6 |
| France..... | 5,175.8 | 4,262.4 | 9,438.2 |
| West Germany..... | 4,047.5 | 951.9 | 5,000.4 |
| Berlin..... | 131.0 | | 131.0 |
| Iceland..... | 70.2 | | 70.2 |
| Ireland..... | 146.2 | | 146.2 |
| Italy..... | 3,463.3 | 2,292.5 | 5,755.8 |
| The Netherlands..... | 1,288.6 | 1,252.8 | 2,541.4 |
| Norway..... | 349.8 | 707.0 | 1,056.8 |
| Poland..... | 522.6 | | 522.6 |
| Portugal..... | 152.1 | 336.6 | 488.7 |
| Spain..... | 1,173.6 | 537.7 | 1,711.3 |
| Sweden..... | 108.9 | | 108.9 |
| United Kingdom..... | 7,668.2 | 1,045.0 | 8,713.2 |
| Yugoslavia..... | 1,703.0 | 893.9 | 2,596.9 |
| Regional..... | 718.4 | 1,908.0 | 2,626.4 |
| Total..... | 28,872.7 | 15,930.8 | 44,812.5 |
| Far East: | | | |
| Burma..... | 95.4 | | 95.4 |
| Cambodia..... | 248.6 | 85.9 | 334.5 |
| Nationalist China..... | 2,051.6 | 2,376.7 | 4,428.3 |
| Hong Kong..... | 30.4 | | 30.4 |
| Indochina region..... | 825.6 | 709.6 | 1,535.2 |
| Indonesia..... | 670.9 | | 670.9 |
| Japan..... | 2,660.7 | 1,033.1 | 3,693.8 |
| Korea..... | 3,431.4 | 2,002.2 | 5,433.6 |
| Laos..... | 291.9 | 169.8 | 461.7 |
| Malaya..... | 23.2 | | 23.2 |
| Philippines..... | 1,334.4 | 415.8 | 1,750.2 |
| Thailand..... | 336.1 | 417.8 | 753.9 |
| Vietnam..... | 1,609.3 | 742.4 | 2,351.7 |
| SEATO..... | 1.8 | | 1.8 |
| Regional..... | 41.9 | 461.1 | 503.0 |
| Total..... | 13,743.2 | 8,417.3 | 22,160.5 |
| Middle East and south Asia: | | | |
| Cyprus..... | 16.0 | | 16.0 |
| Greece..... | 1,784.8 | 1,602.8 | 3,387.6 |
| Iran..... | 732.3 | 577.9 | 1,310.2 |
| Iraq..... | 21.6 | 46.1 | 67.7 |
| Israel..... | 874.7 | 3.0 | 877.7 |
| Jordan..... | 325.2 | 24.1 | 349.3 |
| Lebanon..... | 30.4 | * 8.6 | 39.0 |
| Saudi Arabia..... | 45.5 | | 45.5 |
| Syria..... | 75.8 | | 75.8 |
| Turkey..... | 1,581.3 | 2,288.0 | 3,869.3 |
| United Arab Repub- lic (Egypt)..... | 628.6 | | 628.6 |

[In millions of dollars]

| | Eco- nomic | Mili- tary | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Middle East, etc.—Con. | | | |
| Yemen..... | 22.9 | | 22.9 |
| OENTO..... | 27.4 | | 27.4 |
| Afghanistan..... | 216.8 | 2.8 | 219.6 |
| Ceylon..... | 79.7 | | 79.7 |
| India..... | 3,952.0 | | 3,952.0 |
| Nepal..... | 48.4 | | 48.4 |
| Pakistan..... | 1,889.6 | * | 1,889.6 |
| Indus Basin..... | 33.8 | | 33.8 |
| Regional..... | 139.4 | 713.0 | 852.4 |
| Total..... | 12,577.7 | 5,266.2 | 17,843.9 |
| Latin America: | | | |
| Argentina..... | 593.5 | 44.0 | 640.5 |
| Bolivia..... | 254.9 | 3.5 | 258.4 |
| Brazil..... | 1,736.8 | 215.9 | 1,952.7 |
| Chile..... | 675.6 | 62.2 | 737.8 |
| Colombia..... | 360.7 | 47.8 | 408.5 |
| Costa Rica..... | 89.1 | .8 | 89.9 |
| Cuba..... | 41.5 | 10.6 | 52.1 |
| Dominican Republic..... | 39.3 | 6.1 | 45.4 |
| Ecuador..... | 113.1 | 25.2 | 138.3 |
| El Salvador..... | 39.6 | 1.1 | 40.7 |
| Guatemala..... | 158.2 | 4.4 | 162.6 |
| Haiti..... | 94.6 | 6.2 | 100.8 |
| Honduras..... | 43.0 | 2.3 | 45.3 |
| Jamaica..... | 8.8 | | 8.8 |
| Mexico..... | 760.7 | 6.2 | 766.9 |
| Nicaragua..... | 66.1 | 3.8 | 69.9 |
| Panama..... | 99.9 | .9 | 100.8 |
| Paraguay..... | 57.9 | 1.4 | 59.3 |
| Peru..... | 337.1 | 83.6 | 420.7 |
| Uruguay..... | 58.7 | 29.5 | 88.2 |
| Venezuela..... | 220.0 | 52.9 | 273.8 |
| West Indies..... | 3.5 | | 3.5 |
| British Guiana..... | 2.4 | | 2.4 |
| British Honduras..... | 3.4 | | 3.4 |
| Surinam..... | 262.0 | 7.4 | 269.4 |
| Regional..... | | | |
| Total..... | 6,195.5 | 616.1 | 6,811.6 |
| Africa: | | | |
| Algeria..... | 15.0 | | 15.0 |
| Cameroon..... | 13.3 | .3 | 13.6 |
| Central African Re- public..... | .2 | | .2 |
| Chad..... | .4 | | .4 |
| Congo (Brazzaville)..... | 1.3 | | 1.3 |
| Congo (Leopoldville)..... | 94.6 | | 94.6 |
| Dahomey..... | 5.9 | | 5.9 |
| Ethiopia..... | 117.8 | 67.5 | 185.3 |
| Gabon..... | .5 | | .5 |
| Ghana..... | 156.5 | | 156.5 |
| Guinea..... | 14.3 | | 14.3 |
| Ivory Coast..... | 4.6 | | 4.6 |
| Kenya..... | 18.5 | | 18.5 |
| Liberia..... | 127.2 | 4.3 | 131.5 |
| Libya..... | 187.2 | 4.5 | 191.7 |
| Malagasy..... | 1.3 | | 1.3 |
| Mali..... | 5.1 | 1.0 | 6.1 |
| Mauritania..... | 1.6 | | 1.6 |
| Morocco..... | 352.0 | * | 352.0 |
| Niger..... | 3.2 | | 3.2 |
| Nigeria..... | 43.6 | | 43.6 |
| Rhodesia-Nyasa- land..... | 36.1 | | 36.1 |
| Ruanda-Urundi..... | 6.1 | | 6.1 |
| Senegal..... | 4.6 | | 4.6 |
| Sierra Leone..... | 3.5 | | 3.5 |
| Somali..... | 27.4 | | 27.4 |
| Sudan..... | 65.0 | | 65.0 |
| Tanganyika..... | 17.6 | | 17.6 |
| Togo..... | 5.8 | | 5.8 |
| Tunisia..... | 293.3 | * | 293.3 |
| Uganda..... | 5.2 | | 5.2 |
| Upper Volta..... | 3.2 | | 3.2 |
| Zanzibar..... | .1 | | .1 |
| Other French possessions..... | 6.0 | | 6.0 |
| Other Portuguese possessions..... | 12.8 | | 12.8 |
| Other British possessions..... | .9 | | .9 |
| Regional..... | 11.1 | 34.3 | 45.4 |
| Total..... | 1,664.7 | 112.0 | 1,776.7 |
| Nonregional..... | 3,561.4 | 708.0 | 4,269.4 |
| Total..... | 66,615.2 | 31,059.5 | 97,674.7 |

* "Regional" expenditures include multilateral programs in given areas; in Europe "Regional" also includes contributions to NATO.

† Aid given before Indo-China was given up by France in 1954.

‡ India, Pakistan, and other nations' participation in the Indus River project.

§ Includes international bodies such as the United Nations and the International Labor Organization.

Source: Time, Mar. 29, 1963.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, April Fool's Day is a good day to remind those who are now contributing to their

Government the largest percentage of their earned income of any free nation in modern times that the shibboleth of our State Department, "foreign aid with no strings attached," has actually meant foreign aid with little regard to a return to the American taxpayer.

April Fool's Day is likewise a good day to warn every man, woman, and child that, unless we take courageous steps to end deficit financing, there will come an April Fool's Day when they will learn to their sorrow that inflation has eroded the value of their life savings to a point where their insurance policies, savings accounts, and savings bonds are worthless. This has happened in many countries. It can happen here, unless we take steps to prevent inflation. We must take those steps, beginning today.

FREEDOM HOUSE POSITION ON CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a full page advertisement which appeared in the March 25 edition of the Washington Post concerning a relatively new organization known as the Freedom House. Under the very able leadership of Roscoe Drummond, who is chairman of the board of trustees, the Freedom House is dedicated to the principles of peace and liberty throughout the world. Through their educational program, conducted by means of mass media, the Freedom House attempts to alert the public to any threats to our security and, in addition, it makes positive recommendations for action.

Mr. President, in this most recent advertisement, the situation now existing in Cuba is discussed. The advertisement correctly points out the bipartisan areas of agreement—first, to eliminate the Soviet political and military base in Cuba; second, to prevent the spread of Communist subversion and terrorism to other countries in Latin America; and third, to liberate Cuba from the terror of Castro's police state. The Freedom House puts forth six viable propositions which they believe are fundamental to a satisfactory solution to the Cuban matter—a solution in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks here today the text of the advertisement be printed in the RECORD.

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

FREE CUBA

A Communist Cuba is intolerable. It is intolerable to America for reasons which bear upon our security. But beyond that, there are other concerns which must move freemen.

Communist Cuba has betrayed 6 million people who won their freedom from the Batista dictatorship.

It has deprived them of a free press and the right to vote.

It has imprisoned more than 100,000 Cubans for suspected antipathy to communism.

It has compelled a quarter of a million to flee their homeland. An additional 180,000 await transportation and countless others wish to escape the reign of terror.

It has become the first Soviet satellite in the Americas. Even if we could be certain that every offensive military weapon has been removed from Cuba, there would remain the most effective offensive weapon of the 20th century: aggressive communism.

Freedom House holds it imperative that Americans close ranks to meet that threat.

The leaders of both parties appear to agree on these objectives of U.S. policy: (a) eliminate the Soviet political and military base in Cuba, (b) prevent the spread of Castro-Communist subversion, sabotage and guerrilla warfare, and (c) liberate the Cuban people from the terror of Castro's police state.

The issue before us, therefore, is not whether to move toward these goals, but how and when. Only the President, who has full access to the facts, can determine the character and timing of actions that will meet hemispheric and global requirements.

Freedom House believes, however, that public acceptance of the following propositions is basic for a viable solution:

1. The heart of the issue is the existence of a Communist regime in Cuba, serving as a Soviet political and military base for the purpose of multiplying Soviet satellites in this hemisphere.

The Soviets have helped to make Cuba a major training center and staging area for armies of Communist agents and guerrillas.

They have made Cuba the No. 1 military power in Latin America as a direct threat against weaker republics, which could generate an arms race with serious economic and political consequences.

2. The solution of the area's grievous social and economic problems will become increasingly difficult if not impossible to achieve should Cuba continue as a base for Communist penetration.

Under rising pressure from Communist Cuba, no Latin American government can be sure from one day to the next that it can maintain the peace and order necessary to carry out its social and economic plans. This could doom the Alliance for Progress.

The spread of the Castro-Communist infection is inclining influential Latin Americans to reach for the traditional solution of rightwing military dictatorship. Communists would welcome that as a step toward their seizure of power.

3. The nature of the threat requires that we be as much concerned with the security and freedom of our neighbors and allies as we are with our own.

A narrow interpretation of our national security suggesting that we will only take great risks to protect our own territory is bound to breed uncertainty. Some Latin Americans are already beginning to say: if the United States is unable or unwilling to repel this Communist menace we may have to fend for ourselves and somehow come to terms with it.

4. It is important to act and to time our action in consultation with our allies to assure maximum unity of the Organization of American States and the Atlantic Alliance.

Such action is authorized in the 1947 Rio Treaty which applies the U.N. Charter provision for self defense to the Organization of American States (OAS).

The resolutions adopted at Punta del Este in 1962 focus this doctrine on Cuba, and call for individual and collective measures to counteract the continued intervention in this hemisphere of the Sino-Soviet Powers.

While preparing for action, we must not downgrade the danger. Nor should we defer to the timid members of the OAS in making decisions. The confidence of those who are under attack would thus be shaken; further provocations and miscalculations would be invited.

5. Failure to follow up initial success jeopardizes the gain and can lead to a setback.

The forceful and prudent U.S. action in the missile crisis induced Khrushchev to back away from his gamble. His credibility as well as the influence of Castro and Communism were considerably diminished. But these gains have since been partly dissipated.

Communists and their sympathizers can now make headway in Latin American trade unions, in universities and among the discontented generally. Growing uncertainty is causing flights of capital and discouraging investments sorely needed to get the Alliance for Progress moving.

6. The uncompromising assertion of our bipartisan objectives by word and deed is vital in rallying support for measures to realize our goals.

Our determination to see Cuba free and independent can be demonstrated now by helping qualified Cuban refugees to prepare themselves for democratic leadership. They should be given a chance to use their language and skills in the struggle for freedom throughout Latin America.

Our commitment to prevent the spread of Castroism should be implemented in cooperation with the threatened countries by working out unified defenses against the infiltration of Communist propagandists, terrorists and guerrillas. Their movements should be more effectively controlled and freedom fighters trained to counter their tactics.

We are confronted with a clear and present danger of more "Cubas" in Latin America. To turn the tide, we must not permit preoccupation with risks to impose paralysis on action. Consideration of this issue must not degenerate into a partisan wrangle.

An alliance for freedom is indispensable to the success of the Alliance for Progress. To that end Americans north and south of the Rio Grande should unite in a movement for a free Cuba.

FREEDOM HOUSE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Roscoe Drummond, Chairman; Harry D. Gideonse, president; Leo Cherne, chairman, executive committee; Harry J. Carman, George B. Ford, honorary chairman; Rex Stout, treasurer; Mrs. Henry Gale, assistant treasurer; George Field, executive director; Herbert Agar, Irving Brown, Ernest Cuneo, Christopher Emmet, Arthur J. Goldsmith, Nathaniel L. Goldstein, Mrs. Andrea Jackson, Jacob K. Javits, Maxwell A. Kriender, John V. Lindsay, Edgar Ansel Mower, Dwayne Orton, Mrs. Bonaro Overstreet, Rudolph Rathaues, Whitelaw Reid, John R. Richardson, Jr., Elizabeth M. Riley, Francis E. Rivers, Mrs. Kermit Roosevelt, Elmo Roper, Eric Sevareid, Whitney North Seymour, Mrs. Caroline K. Simon, Nathaniel Singer, Gerald L. Steibel, Herbert Bayard Swope, Jr., James J. Wadsworth, William L. White, Roy Wilkins.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE DOWNSTATE NEW YORK DIVISION OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the ruthless murder of 14,000 Polish officers 23 years ago was recently commemorated by the downstate New York division of the Polish American Congress. This brutal act of genocide committed by Soviet NKVD agents in 1940 still remains unpunished, and, at the present time, Poland still remains the exploited victim of Soviet imperialism, subjugated to the force and terror of Communist tyranny. In my judgment, the United States—in fact, the entire free world—cannot afford to neglect the hopes and ideals of these freedom-loving people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the downstate New York division of the Po-

lish American Congress be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

Whereas 1,200 American friends of the cause of a free Poland are assembled this 10th day of March 1963, in the Polish National Hall, 19 St. Marks Place, New York, under the auspices of the Downstate New York division of the Polish American Congress, for the purpose of commemorating the 23d anniversary of the brutal murder of 14,000 Polish officers, professors, scientists, priests, and other leaders of Polish life in the Katyn Forest of Russia; and

Whereas a special congressional committee following the conduct of hearings in the United States and Europe, found substantial evidence that this infamous crime was committed by Soviet NKVD agents in the spring of 1940; and

Whereas the U.S. Congress forwarded these findings to the Secretary of State requesting him that all of the evidence produced at these hearings as well as the record be transmitted to the Geneva Assembly of the United Nations; and

Whereas the then Secretary of State failed to pass on these findings and this evidence to the Assembly of the United Nations; and

Whereas this murder at Katyn perpetuated by Soviet Russia and constituting one of the worst acts of genocide in the recent history of mankind still remains to be formally brought to the attention of the Assembly of the United Nations: It is hereby

Resolved, That the perpetrators of this crime must be punished; that the continued evasion by free nations of their responsibility to Poland, their loyal ally during World War II must cease; that we join with every friend of liberty in a continuing effort to bring to justice those who were responsible for this massacre; and be it further

Resolved, That this meeting calls upon the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, the Honorable J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable Thomas E. Morgan, chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable Jacob K. Javits and the Honorable Kenneth B. Keating, U.S. Senators from New York, to make every effort to bring the findings of the special congressional committee investigating the Katyn massacre to the attention of the Assembly of the United Nations, with the demand that the perpetrators of this crime be punished in order that the ideals of justice may be made to prevail.

WLADYSLAW BORZECKI,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.
FELIKS POPLAWSKI,
EDWARD WITANOWSKI.

RIGHTS-OF-WAY FOR ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION LINES OVER FED- ERAL LANDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak briefly this afternoon on two subjects: First, dealing with the problems arising in connection with the granting of rights-of-way for electric transmission lines over Federal lands; and second, dealing with some of the problems that are arising in connection with what I consider to be, under international law, illegal conduct on the part of certain Cuban exiles in the United States.

Turning to the first subject matter first, I was very happy to learn that last weekend the Interior and Agriculture Departments gave final approval to new regulations governing the granting of

4990

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

April 1

rights-of-way for electric transmission lines over Federal lands. Secretaries Udall and Freeman have demonstrated that it is possible to protect the public interest in spite of the pressure of utility interests which want free access to the public domain.

Last week the distinguished Senator from Wyoming (Mr. SIMPSON) submitted for the the RECORD a column from Newsweek entitled "Whose Lands Are These?" written by Mr. Raymond Moley. It was in response to the announcement of the two secretaries on granting rights-of-way for electric transmission lines over public lands that Mr. Moley wrote his article.

Mr. Moley was talking about the public lands; and if I did not know him better I would have expected from the title to hear that the public lands belong to the people of the United States, through their Government.

This is not the way Mr. Moley sees it. He viewed the public domain as the property of the private power companies.

Referring to Mr. Moley's column, Senator SIMPSON expressed the fear that the private utilities may be forced to "importune" the Government for "the right of existence" if the new regulations go into effect, requiring the companies to wheel Government power when excess capacity is available.

Mr. Moley goes even further and says that a Government policy attaching conditions to the granting of rights-of-way across these public lands would, "in effect, be violations of primary rights of property."

That is very interesting language—"primary rights of property." Whenever I read that sort of language, I am always looking for the definition. That is what we call the use of an emotional sanction. The question may be asked, "What is meant by 'primary rights of property'?" What do they accomplish?

This is a very interesting journalistic technique. It involves the use of phrases that can be characterized as emotional sanctions that stir the thalamus rather than the cortex.

When we start dealing with "primary rights of property," we must deal with legal definitions.

As I say, Mr. Moley talks about "violation of primary rights of property."

This is curious reasoning indeed. The proposed regulations were in effect in pretty much the same form from 1948 and 1954 and during that period some 84 rights-of-way were granted to utilities which willingly, if not cheerfully, agreed in return to carry Government power where excess capacity was available. It was not until the heyday of the Eisenhower "partnership" with the private utilities that the regulations were rescinded, under circumstances which needed the careful scrutiny which they received from a congressional committee.

Senator SIMPSON says that in imposing a wheeling requirement in exchange for a right-of-way across the Federal lands the Government is somehow violating the sanctity of company prop-

erty. Or, as he said, the power companies "are seeking to build a house in which the Federal Government demands the right of entry as a building prerequisite."

If a fellow came to me and asked for permission to build a road across my farm, I might give him permission to do so if it did not damage the farm unduly. If I were a hard-headed business man, I might sock him with a substantial bill for the valuable right-of-way. At the very least, I feel sure that I would ask permission for me and my family to use the road, since it crossed our property. Only if I were in an exceptionally generous mood would I agree to use this road only at times when it would not inconvenience him.

In my view, the Interior and Agriculture Departments have adopted the generous view, in proposing that only excess capacity would be used to carry Government power, capacity not needed by the utility for its own deliveries.

What could be fairer? What could be more equitable?

Let us not forget for one moment that these lands belong to the people of the United States and are held in trust for them by their government. In asking permission to construct transmission lines over them, the power companies are asking a favor of no small magnitude.

Mr. Moley remarks in his column that "for such easements and rights-of-way, they—the power companies—pay to the Federal Treasury."

Mr. Moley does not say how much they pay. That is quite understandable, because it is so little that it would damage his argument rather than strengthen it. It is a token payment, roughly covering the cost of administering the permit. To compare these payments with the cost of acquiring right-of-way from private owners of land, possibly resorting to time-consuming condemnation proceedings, indicates the magnitude of the gift which these companies receive when they are permitted to build lines across the public domain.

And let us take a look at these allegedly onerous conditions which they must accept along with the gift:

First, the Government reserves the right to use excess capacity in the lines to transmit power—at its own expense. Second, where additional capacity is needed, the Government would have the right to add it, again at Government expense. And, third, where the proposed private transmission lines would conflict with the power-marketing program of the United States, companies could be refused permission to cross public lands but not, it should be pointed out, permission to build the lines elsewhere. In other words, the companies may build duplicating lines if they will, but not on Government land.

I fail to see how the first or second conditions could damage the utility companies in any way, except in weakening their monopoly position in some areas. Their power moves first, and in a manner to be determined wholly by the company.

But let us examine this monopoly question. The top spokesman for Pacific Gas & Electric Co., in hearings on this ques-

tion back in 1955, said frankly that P.G. & E. did not want to wheel Government electricity because "there is no reason why in my opinion we should permit our lines to be used to enable the Government to take away our customers."

Here we get to the heart of the matter. That spokesman was the company's executive vice president, Mr. Gerdes, and the customers he was talking about were the so-called preference customers, entitled by law to first call on power from the Central Valley project in California. With the wheeling requirement, as with Federal transmission lines, these municipalities and rural electric cooperatives could contract directly with the Government for power from the Federal projects. Without wheeling or transmission, the preference customers were obliged to buy their wholesale power from P.G. & E., at P.G. & E. prices, at the very moment the power company itself was enjoying low-cost Central Valley power. The congressional intent to pass along the benefits of this power to nonprofit groups was frustrated because a single utility controlled the transmission system.

Mr. Gerdes testified that his company reluctantly agreed to wheel Federal power, by agreement, in 1951, and subsequently the General Accounting Office found the deal most beneficial to the company, if not to Uncle Sam.

It was brought out during the same hearings, which were conducted by the Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources of the House Government Operations Committee, that virtually every major power company in the West took part in the effort to get the transmission line regulations repealed in 1954. He named them—Montana Power Co., Utah Power & Light Co., Colorado Public Service Co., Portland General Electric Co., the California Pacific Utilities Co., Washington Water Power Co., Public Service Co. of New Mexico, Arizona Public Service Co., Pacific Power & Light Co., California Electric Power Co., Southern California Edison Co., and perhaps some others. He explained that the list comprised "the principal electric companies in the western part of the United States where the lands are in substantial part owned by the Federal Government"—hearings, "Certain Activities Regarding Power," Department of the Interior, "Changes in Power Line Regulations," page 438.

Representatives of these companies got together to prepare a list of changes which they thought Interior should make in its regulations, you will recall, and the result was a memorandum, drafted in the offices of Idaho Power Co., and left on the most appropriate desk in the Interior Department by Herman Kruse, Pacific Gas & Electric's chief Washington lobbyist.

The memorandum was adopted—as the Chudoff subcommittee described it in its report:

The changes in the regulations * * * were adopted by the Interior Department verbatim from an anonymous document delivered personally without a covering letter or memorandum by a registered lobbyist of

representatives in Congress; and certainly his right to vote will be protected if this amendment is ratified by a sufficient number of States and becomes part of the U.S. Constitution.

So, all of us are very much interested in having it ratified. No one has helped more in that connection than the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is quite correct when he says that all of us are very much interested in having the amendment ratified. Whenever exercise of the right to vote is made difficult of attainment by any citizen, of whatever color, full citizenship rights are denied him. So I believe it most important that every American citizen be given ample opportunity to exercise the precious right to cast a free ballot.

ACTIVITY OF CUBAN REFUGEES AND THEIR RECENT FORAYS AGAINST CUBA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, events of recent days have brought to the fore a matter which has largely been ignored in this country, although it can cause painful consequences if it is ignored any longer. That is the activity of the Cuban refugees and their recent forays against Cuba.

Not much has been said about the fact that since the Castro government took power, some 250,000 Cubans have come to the United States, nearly all of them simply as guests of the United States. They are not here under immigration quotas, but are outside them. They are here in a form of asylum, despite the fact that it has never been a normal practice for the United States to receive political refugees, except as immigrants who have come to live here as permanent residents.

As noted in Hackworth's Digest of International Law—volume II, page 622:

The Government of the United States has strongly disapproved of the principle of asylum as such and has declined to recognize or subscribe to it as a part of international law.

Yet about 95 percent of the registered Cuban refugees over the past 2 years have entered this country under a visa waiver, and are on parole here.

The provision of law which authorizes such a proceeding is section 212(d) (5), which reads:

The Attorney General may in his discretion parole into the United States temporarily under such conditions as he may prescribe for emergency reasons or for reasons deemed strictly in the public interest any alien applying for admission to the United States, but such parole of such alien shall not be regarded as an admission of the alien and when the purposes of such parole shall, in the opinion of the Attorney General, have been served the alien shall forthwith return or be returned to the custody from which he was paroled and thereafter his case shall continue to be dealt with in the same manner as that of any other applicant for admission to the United States.

There appears in the same statute, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, the following provision, just a few para-

graphs after the provision I have already cited:

Whenever the President finds that the entry of any aliens or of any class of aliens into the United States would be detrimental to the interests of the United States, he may by proclamation, and for such period as he shall deem necessary, suspend the entry of all aliens or any class of aliens as immigrants or nonimmigrants, or impose on the entry of aliens any restrictions he may deem to be appropriate.

We know that the use of the mass parole provided by the 1952 act, although contrary to American practice, and quite unique in our history, was completely justified on humanitarian grounds alone.

We have done more than merely admit these people. Over three-quarters of them have sought and have received cash assistance. Thus far, the Federal Government has spent more than \$50 million in direct financial aid. The cost of medical care, educational benefits, and other items is not counted in that total. The current rate of grant assistance is running at about \$21½ million each month.

Because of the difficulties experienced in handling this sudden influx into the Miami area, over 50,000 refugees have resettled in other parts of the United States. Many of them have obtained jobs, with the help of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I do not question for a moment the good faith of all the Cuban refugees. They have been grateful for our assistance, and in many cases, have repaid our financial help as soon as they were able to do so.

But it is also true that all of them are here on a temporary basis, under special regulation. Save for an early wholesale return to Cuba, their status in time will have to be regulated by special legislation by the U.S. Congress.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF CUBAN REFUGEES

While they are here, however, it is not amiss to remind them that they are expected to observe all the laws, and to respect the foreign policy objectives of the United States.

Nor is it for Cuban refugees to determine U.S. foreign policy. It is not for Cuban refugees to attempt to determine American foreign policy. It is for Cuban refugees never to forget for one moment that they are here as our guests. We are providing them with a sanctuary. We are providing them with protection. They are not in the United States with any rights, legally or morally, to use the territory of the United States for activities aimed at implicating American foreign policy in situations that might very well lead to war.

I wish to stress that point by way of digression, because I know that what I am now saying will not be music to some ears. The responsibility for American foreign policy rests with the American Government and not with Cuban refugees.

One of the most important, and most critical of these foreign policy objectives is the removal of the forces of the Soviet Union from the island of Cuba. The type of raid on Cuba which has been

carried on recently is certainly more of a display, built up by publicity and advertising, than a genuine assault on the Russo-Cuban armed forces in Cuba; it does nothing to hurt or diminish those forces. But it certainly gives the Russians a justification for remaining to protect Cuba.

Similarly, the raids give Castro justification for increasing his indigenous armed forces, and for taking sterner measures against the Cuban people.

Yet in neither case do the raids inflict any real damage or harm upon either the Castro forces or the Russians.

There is the even more important consideration that the repercussions of raids planned and staged by the Cuban refugees will bring patrol actions that will draw American forces into the picture. The shooting at U.S. ships on the high seas is one ramification of this possibility. Increasing measures taken by the Russo-Cubans against the raids will, sooner or later, be directed against Americans, either civilian or military, who may have every right to be where they are, but who will nonetheless feel the brunt of these defense measures by Cuba.

The repercussions of these raids, in other words, will undoubtedly have to be borne by the United States and not by the Cuban exiles at all. It is here where the real danger of them lies. In the end, the confrontation between ourselves and the Soviet Union could build into proportions that would once again threaten us and the world with war.

I do not rule out the possibility that such a confrontation could again occur. But if we are forced into such a situation, it should be on behalf of ourselves and not because we were forced into it by a hotheaded group of guests in our own house.

It is not outside the realm of possibility that such a climax is exactly what the exiles' raids are designed to bring about. One cannot help but wonder what the real objective of the raids may be, when it is so evident that they are completely inconsequential in their military effects.

A final reason why the raids are harmful to American foreign policy interests is the bad precedent they set for other exiles in the hemisphere. So long as these raids have any connotation of American support, approval, or even permission, they encourage exiles from other Caribbean countries to begin the same type of operation in order to return to power.

We know that conditions in Haiti parallel those in Cuba; there are Haitian exiles in the United States, too, who may be encouraged to undertake raids against Haiti. And who is to say but what the change of government in Guatemala may create a faction of exiles seeking to overthrow its new military regime.

The Caribbean is too unstable to permit the United States to become the home base of dissident elements from any of its member countries. If we ever do become such a base, we will become hopelessly entangled in the web of Caribbean politics.

ADDING COUP DE GRACE

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I read with interest your editorial of March 22 applauding the fact that 24 States have now approved the proposed 24th or anti-poll-tax amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

I expect that many readers were intrigued by the map which you printed, showing the State of Tennessee, which was the first Southern State to approve the amendment, surrounded by other States that have not yet done so. This is no legislative accident, but is in keeping with the progressive traditions of Tennessee, and with an historic stubborn anti-poll-tax sentiment among Tennesseans.

The Tennessee Legislature first voted to eliminate the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in 1943. This was frustrated by a decision of the Supreme Court of Tennessee, which held the act unconstitutional. In 1953, this court decision was overruled by an amendment to the State constitution which finally eliminated the poll tax requirement.

Since the demise of the poll tax restriction in Tennessee, there has been a healthy increase in the percentage of voter participation, and I am proud that our legislature has approved the amendment to eliminate this voting restriction from the Nation as a whole.

ESTES KEFAUVER,

Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish again to congratulate the Senator from Florida for his leadership on behalf of the ratification of the 24th amendment. As he has stated, there is no organized group or paid lobby behind this effort. The great success of the proposed amendment has been due to the interest of all Members of the Senate and the interest which we have been able to generate in our own States through the Governors and members of the legislatures.

I am very happy that Tennessee was the 25th State to ratify the amendment. At that time I said that a large part of the credit was due the Governor, Hon. Frank Clement, and two members of the general assembly, who took the lead in behalf of ratification, Senator Robert C. Taylor, of Nashville; and Representative Ray R. Baird, of Rockwood.

I am proud of the fact that Tennessee was the 25th State—and the only State in that section of the country—to ratify the amendment. I am also proud that this action was taken by overwhelming majorities in both the senate and the house of representatives.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, again I thank my distinguished friend, who, himself, has been so greatly responsible for the action taken by his State.

Mr. President, yesterday there was published in the Florida Times-Union, of Jacksonville, Fla., a fine article written by John Chadwick, of the Associated Press. It is a well written, factual summation of the situation in regard to this amendment; and the article states, in a more comprehensive manner than anything else I have seen, the situation at this time. With 29 States having ratified the amendment and with ratifi-

cation by 9 more required to complete action on this important proposal—and it will be difficult to get them all, this year—the picture is fully painted by Mr. Chadwick in his article. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Anti-Poll-Tax Amendment Needs Ratification by Nine More States," be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT NEEDS RATIFICATION BY NINE MORE STATES

WASHINGTON, March 30.—Will an anti-poll-tax amendment be written into the Constitution before next year's elections?

The proposed amendment, approved by Congress last summer, must be ratified by the legislatures of 38 of the 50 States to become effective.

As of today, it has been ratified by 29 States. This leaves 9 to go, with 15 other State legislatures now in session or to be in session before the end of the year.

SIX STATES OPPOSED

What's the outlook in these 15 States? In six of them, ratification is unlikely. Backers of the amendment are not counting on approval by Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, or Texas.

This means the other nine States all must ratify if the amendment is to become effective this year.

In three of these States, Arizona, Iowa, and Missouri, one branch of the legislature has approved the amendment but not the other. In Delaware, Maine, Nebraska, New Hampshire, and Oklahoma neither house has acted yet. The Florida Legislature doesn't meet until next week.

HOLLAND OPTIMISTIC

Senator SPASSARD L. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida, chief sponsor of the amendment, said today he regards as excellent the prospects for ratification by the Florida Legislature.

The amendment would outlaw payment of a poll tax, or any other tax, as a requirement for voting in presidential or congressional elections.

Only five States—Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia—now make poll tax payments a requirement for voting.

HOLLAND first introduced an anti-poll-tax amendment in 1949 and has been plugging for it ever since.

The Senate approved the amendment by a 77 to 16 vote last March 27 and the House by a 294 to 86 vote August 27.

HOLLAND says that abolishing the poll tax will make an important contribution to better government by bringing about greater participation of qualified voters.

DEPLORES PRICE IN VOTE

"I have strongly felt for many years that the voter who is otherwise qualified should not have a price set upon his right to participate in the selection of his national leaders," he says.

"Nor do I believe that the qualified citizen's right to vote in a national election should be abridged or denied because of his failure through poverty or oversight to pay a poll tax or any other tax."

His fight against the poll tax goes back to his days as a State legislator. He played a key role in Florida's elimination of its poll tax in 1937 when he was a member of the State senate.

But HOLLAND, like other Southerners in Congress, battled bills introduced year after year by civil rights advocates to wipe out the poll tax by statute.

Illinois was the first State to ratify HOLLAND's amendment, completing action last

November 14. Since then it has been ratified by the Legislatures of New Jersey, Oregon, Montana, West Virginia, New York, Maryland, California, Indiana, Rhode Island, Michigan, Alaska, Ohio, Idaho, Hawaii, New Mexico, Utah, Minnesota, North Dakota, Colorado, Vermont, Washington, Nevada, Tennessee, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, and Kansas.

The Mississippi Legislature is the only one that has voted to reject the amendment, but the Legislatures of South Dakota, Wyoming, and Arkansas adjourned this year without acting on it.

HOLLAND told the Senate the other day that the legislatures of 9 States had ratified the amendment unanimously and that in 12 other States either the house or the senate ratified without a dissenting vote.

The closest vote was in the Montana house, where ratification was voted 56 to 37. But the Montana Senate voted for ratification 51 to 4.

HOLLAND has credited Senate colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, with yeoman service in bringing the amendment to the attention of State officials and urging its ratification.

But he told the Senate that "there is no lobby behind the effort. Not a nickel's worth of money from any source in pushing it."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, again I thank the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his courtesy, which I have learned to expect from him during all these years of friendly association. He is always courteous to his colleagues, and particularly to his seatmate, the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that from day to day I await with great anticipation the reports by the Senator from Florida on the progress which his anti-poll-tax amendment is making throughout the country.

As I have said before, and I repeat today, one of the greatest contributions to the civil rights issue, and one which is completely helpful in connection with a most important part of it, is made by the Senator's anti-poll-tax amendment. Certainly their right to vote is a civil right which is completely basic to freedom for Americans. In that connection, the anti-poll-tax amendment is most important.

I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that although, as usual, he speaks with considerable understatement when he discusses the prospects for incorporation of his anti-poll-tax amendment in the U.S. Constitution, I venture to predict—dangerous though prediction is—that his amendment will be ratified by a sufficient number of States and will become part of the Constitution of our country at a very early date.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon always overwhelms me.

As he knows, I am very greatly interested in the right to vote, and have been for many years. In that connection, I found that even in my own State, literally thousands of citizens were prevented from voting, either by penalty or by other circumstances, when we had a poll tax. Certainly it is most important that every citizen, whatever his circumstances, have an opportunity to vote for electors for President and Vice President and for Senators and Repre-

STATUTES LIMITING INTERFERENCE IN
FOREIGN COUNTRIES

We have many statutes on the books which restrict Americans and non-citizens alike from engaging in expeditions against other countries. One of these is the Neutrality Act which reads in part:

Whoever, within the United States, knowingly begins or sets on foot or provides or prepares a means for or furnishes the money for, or takes part in, any military or naval expedition or enterprise to be carried on from thence against the territory or domination of any foreign prince, or state, or of any colony, district, or people with whom the United States is at peace, shall be fined not more than \$3,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

Some of the Cuban exile raiders claim they have violated no law because they jumped off from islands not belonging to the United States.

But we know they left from the United States as individuals and returned to the United States when the raids were over. I wrote to the Attorney General of the United States on March 20 about one of these raids and the application to it of this section of the law, section 960 of title 18 of the United States Code.

I shall read the letter into the record. Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Alaska?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I am much impressed with the cogency and logic of the Senator's argument, I have seldom found myself in disagreement with his public policies. But I wonder if he does not have a little sympathy for or understanding of people who have a burning conviction, people who are frustrated here, and are waiting on a policy of liberation which does not seem to eventuate. They would like to do something to bring it about even at the sacrifice of their own lives. History is full of the exploits of brave people who have been ready to die in fighting tyranny—tyranny of the kind that exists in Cuba. What shall we do about those people who are willing to risk their lives to strike a blow for freedom—the kind of freedom which we would like to see restored in Cuba? Is there not something to be said on that side?

Mr. MORSE. Not a thing. Not a single thing can be said on the side of people who desire to use a sanctuary in the United States to endanger 180 million Americans by following a course of action as exiles which they cannot reconcile with international law, and which may very well determine whether or not we engage in war or remain at peace. I favor a settlement of the Cuban issue, but not by a group of self-appointed diplomats to whom we have given sanctuary in the United States, and who obviously are seeking to follow a course of action that could very well embroil the United States in war.

I shall tell the Senate what I would have done down at the Roger Smith Hotel the other day when two of the exiles held a press conference at which they

boasted to the world of the raid they had just carried out in Caribbean waters. I would have had them met with U.S. marshals.

Mr. GRUENING. I am not concerned about what a group of diplomats meeting in a hotel far from the firing line might do, but I think there is something to be said for young men who are so determined, who have seen such atrocities as those committed by the Castro regime in Cuba, who are willing to risk their own lives to go down there and strike a blow for freedom. I doubt whether such individual actions would imperil the safety of 180 million Americans.

Mr. MORSE. Of course it is going to imperil the safety of 180 million Americans. Suppose they sink a Russian ship. Suppose they sink a U.S. ship. I have not forgotten my history, about the sinking of the Maine. Does the Senator think that would not increase the possibilities and dangers of war?

I wish to say that American foreign policy must be run by America and not by Cuban exiles to any degree whatsoever.

If they were so anxious to die for freedom they could have stayed in Cuba.

Mr. GRUENING. They would either be shot or imprisoned in Cuba, and they would not be very effective, if either dead or imprisoned.

Mr. MORSE. There are many patriotic Cubans who are still in Cuba, in the Oriente Mountains, fighting for freedom in Cuba.

I do not object to the giving of sanctuary to those who want to leave Cuba, but I am objecting to Cuban exiles using the United States as a base, to the embarrassment of American foreign policy.

Mr. GRUENING. Is the Senator's objection that they returned to the United States after striking a blow for freedom? In other words, if they were to stay in Cuba and fight for the underground, would that meet the Senator's test?

Mr. MORSE. If they stayed in Cuba they would not be involving the United States, through their activities, in difficulties with Cuba.

We will handle Castro. But so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, the Cuban exiles in the United States should be told by the U.S. Department of Justice, as I shall point out in a moment in my manuscript, that we are going to enforce the law governing their sanctuary in the United States. If they do not like that, they can leave the United States. They have no right to stay in the United States and proceed to follow a course of action which jeopardizes American foreign policy.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator's objection seems to be that they leave the United States and then come back to the United States. Suppose they should leave the United States and go to Cuba and fight in the underground. Would that still be objectionable to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. I think it would have been preferable if they had stayed there in the first place.

Mr. GRUENING. At the time, perhaps they did not realize we would not be able to be successful in the effort at the Bay of Pigs.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator means they did not realize we would not go to war.

Mr. GRUENING. No; that we would not give the support necessary to enable them to win.

Mr. MORSE. I do not take the position that we must have a bloody victory over Castro to defeat him. We will have a bloody victory over Castro if he forces us into a war, but I do not propose to let the Cuban refugees force us into a war with Castro.

We must reach that decision on the basis of our own independent judgment, as the people in charge of the Government of the United States, and not by way of collusive activities in which the Cuban refugees are engaging. There is no question, when we read their statements to the press, that what they want is a war between the United States and Cuba. That is what they are after.

It is the position of the senior Senator from Oregon that we must meet the Communist threat. We must continue our efforts. We must contain the Communist threat. We must continue, as the President did last October, to make it clear to Castro and to Khrushchev, "If you cross the line of defense into the area of aggression, then we will proceed immediately to protect our security."

But I do not propose to sit in the Senate in silence while a group of Cuban exiles in this country engages in various activities designed to embarrass American foreign policy.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I agree with the premise of the Senator from Oregon that no group has the right to decide extra-legally what shall be the foreign policy of the United States, and this must be true with respect to Cuba. It follows that Cuban exiles have no authority to take action—sympathetic as we are toward their plight and their cause—to decide what our policy and course of action shall be respecting Cuba.

I must say that what troubles me is that the action of the Cuban exiles is a part of a series of provocations and events that are a source of continuing danger. There are provocations which come from the other side, from Castro. Only recently American ships have been fired on by MIG planes, and we can anticipate that there will be additional provocations—firings upon American ships, and the mounting of subversions and even aggressions by Castroites against the countries of Latin America.

Though I do not speak directly to the Senator's point, I affirm the statement which I made in the Senate on February 11. I believe the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba provides to Castro the authority and backing, which will result in reckless provocations and continuing subversion against Latin American countries.

I hold that the United States ought to have a clear policy—which I do not think it has now—and it should be that we will not accept the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba, or any place else in this

hemisphere. It is their presence which gives authority to Castro, which will lead him to reckless actions, and increases the danger of war.

I am sure that the President is trying to secure the removal of Soviet troops, as Khrushchev promised, but we may reach the point where there will be a deadlock and the Soviets will not withdraw. Then I believe we would have to take sterner measures.

What I have said is not quite upon the Senator's point. I agree with the Senator's point that Cuban exiles cannot be allowed to make policy for the United States. But I would see greater hope for a Cuban solution if we insist that the United States will not accept the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba and this hemisphere.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky, if I correctly understand him, that we are in agreement that American foreign policy vis-a-vis Cuba should be carried out by the United States, so far as our part in it is concerned, and that the Cuban exiles should not be allowed to assume any power of intervention in the determination of that foreign policy.

Secondly, I wish to say that no one could be more concerned about the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba than the senior Senator from Oregon. My Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs—in fact, the whole Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate—is greatly concerned about it.

I wish to say that the President of the United States, in my judgment, is doing a magnificent job of leadership and international statesmanship in his international negotiations with the Russians concerning that matter.

However, there is one ugly fact to be faced. In mentioning it, I do not want to be interpreted as implying that we should in any way retreat from our position in connection with Russian troops in Cuba. But there is one ugly fact which we must face, and that is that under international law a Communist nation has the same sovereign rights as a free nation; and a Communist nation has the same sovereign right to negotiate its treaties, agreements, understandings, and alliances.

I have not yet exhausted the analysis of the international law concept concerning Russian troops in Cuba and their right to be there, so far as the relationship between Castro and Khrushchev is concerned; but I am satisfied that we should exhaust every possible resource of diplomacy in trying to arrive at an arrangement for their removal. The Cuban exile raids are not going to help such diplomatic negotia-

tions. As I said earlier in my speech, we must watch both Castro and Khrushchev for excuses and alibis. They will seize upon every rationalization they can for delaying or suspending negotiations looking toward an agreement.

This afternoon I am only making the plea that the Cuban exiles understand clearly from the U.S. Government that they must conform to their obligations under sanctuary, and that they cannot be allowed to continue to pursue a course of action that could be interpreted by anyone as creating a critical situation which might very well lead to armed conflict.

I think the Senator from Kentucky is perfectly correct in stating that there will be many incidents. The shooting at an American ship the other day followed the Alpha 66 raid. The fact that we were not responsible for the Alpha 66 raid is not going to stop Castro and Khrushchev from saying that we were. That kind of propaganda, which the Russians are able to disseminate about the world, puts us in a very embarrassing situation.

The other night a group of us were discussing the subject, and the question was asked, "What would happen in a discussion of this situation in the United Nations, where the contention is made by the Red bloc, and by other countries which are not Communist countries, that we have the responsibility for doing a better job than is being done, to hold the Cuban exiles in check while we give them protection or sanctuary in this country?"

My plea today is that we make clear, not only to the Cuban refugees, but to the world, that we are going to conduct our own foreign policy, and that we will not tolerate any meddling with it or intervention in it by a group of patriotic Cuban exiles who would like very much to have armed intervention in Cuba on the part of the United States.

I had referred to a letter which I wrote to the Attorney General under date of March 20. It outlines in part the position of the senior Senator from Oregon.

I stated in that letter:

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have called my office staff from Costa Rica, asking them to obtain for me certain information concerning the recent attack on Cuba by a refugee group, and asking that a letter be sent to you over my signature, posing some specific questions about it.

As you know, the Department of Justice is responsible for the enforcement of section 960 of title 18 of the United States Code, which provides: "Whoever, within the United States, knowingly begins or sets on foot or provides or prepares a means for or furnishes the money for, or takes part in, any military or naval expedition or enterprise to be carried on from thence against the territory or domination of any foreign prince, or state, or of any colony, district, or people with whom the United States is at peace, shall be fined not more than \$3,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both."

I would like to know whether the Department has ascertained the facts of the raid on Cuba claimed to have been carried out by the groups called Alpha 66 and the Second National Front of Escambray, widely reported in the press on March 19 and 20.

1. From where was this expedition begun?
2. Who financed it?
3. From what country were its weapons obtained?

4. Why were its participants admitted to the United States after the raid?

5. If the leaders Vazquez and Veciana reside in Miami, as reported in the press, does Section 960 apply to them, irrespective of the takeoff point of the raid itself?

6. On what kind of visa are these men admitted to the United States?

I would also like to know what general steps the Immigration and Naturalization Service takes to enforce the statutes against this type of activity when it is carried on by Cuban refugees.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

I have not yet received a reply; but I am pleased and gratified to read of the steps taken over the weekend to curb the adventurers among the exiles.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my speech the following articles and editorials:

First, an article entitled "Raid on Soviet Camp in Cuba Disturbs United States," written by Murray Marder and published in the Washington Post under date of March 20. This article deals with the conference held by the Cuban refugees at the Roger Smith Hotel after they came back and announced to the country their course of action.

As I stated in Costa Rica, in a confidential conference with American officials, I thought they ought to be met by U.S. marshals, because in my judgment they stood in violation of their right to sanctuary; and I think we should put a stop to that kind of misuse of the right of sanctuary.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial entitled "Dangerous Game," published in the Washington Evening Star of March 29, 1963; an article entitled "Controlling the Cuban Exiles," written by William S. White and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 29, 1963; an editorial entitled "Caught in the Vise," published in the Washington Post of March 30, 1963; an article entitled "Cuban Exiles Angered by U.S. Restrictions," written by Theodore Ediger, and published in the Washington Post of April 1, 1963; an editorial entitled "The Coup in Guatemala," published in the New York Times of April 1, 1963; and an article entitled "United States Curbs Miami Exiles To Prevent Raids on Cuba," published in the New York Times of April 1, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the articles and editorials may be printed in the Record, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with that material in the Record, I congratulate the Attorney General for the course of action he has taken over the weekend and the steps he has enunciated, aimed at bringing the Cuban exiles within the framework of their sanctuary rights, and notifying them of the intention of this Government to confine them to the framework of their sanctuary rights.

In addition to the condition put upon the parole of many of these persons under the authority residing in the Attor-

ney General which I cited at the beginning of these remarks, several other statutes have application and it would seem they are being invoked.

One relates to the illegal exportation of war materials, and is found in section 401 of title 22.

It states:

Whenever an attempt is made to export or ship from or take out of the United States any arms or munitions of war or other articles in violation of law, or whenever it is known or there shall be probable cause to believe that any arms or munitions of war or other articles are intended to be or are being or have been exported or removed from the United States in violation of law, the Secretary of the Treasury, or any person duly authorized for the purpose by the President, may seize and detain any vessel, vehicle, or aircraft containing the same or which has been or is being used in exporting or attempting to export such arms or munitions of war or other articles.

It is my hope that the Customs Bureau will stringently enforce this section.

There has also been brought to my attention section 215 of the 1952 Immigration and Nationality Act, which provides for control of travel outside the country by aliens and citizens in time of war or national emergency. Under this section, it would be illegal to enter or leave the United States without a valid passport, unless under exceptions or exemptions set forth by the President. The penalty for violation of this section is a \$5,000 fine or 5 years in jail, or both.

The national emergency proclaimed in 1950 during the Korean conflict remains in effect and brings section 215 into full force.

Still another international obligation we are bound to observe is the Convention on Duties and Rights of States in the Event of Civil Strife, signed at Havana in 1928 by the Inter-American Conference.

Article I reads:

The contracting states bind themselves to observe the following rules with regard to civil strife in another one of them:

1. To use all means at their disposal to prevent the inhabitants of their territory, nationals or aliens, from participating in, gathering elements, crossing the boundary or sailing from their territory for the purpose of starting or promoting civil strife.

2. To disarm and intern every rebel force crossing their boundaries, the expenses of internment to be borne by the state where public order may have been disturbed. The arms found in the hands of the rebels may be seized, and withdrawn by the government of the country granting asylum, to be returned, once the struggle has ended, to the state in civil strife.

3. To forbid the traffic in arms and war materiel, except when intended for the government, while the belligerency of the rebels has not been recognized, in which latter case the rules of neutrality shall be applied.

4. To prevent that within their jurisdiction there be equipped, armed, or adapted for warlike purposes any vessel intended to operate in favor of the rebellion. (48 Stat. 2749; entered into force for the United States May 21, 1930.)

Also involved in this matter is article 15 of the Charter of the Organization of American States, to which we are signatories, which states:

No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other states. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the state or against its political, economic, and cultural elements. (TIAS 2861; entered into force for the United States, Dec. 13, 1951.)

I would hope that the exile community itself would understand the importance to the United States of living up to these treaty obligations, and of maintaining in the hands of our President and his administration complete control of American policy regarding Cuba. We simply cannot allow a faction of the exile group to take that control out of our hands.

What I have said with respect to the raids also applies to the statements made by some Cuban refugees about the Bay of Pigs affair, and about current conditions in Cuba. I have become increasingly of the opinion that many of these individuals have found that any statement made by a Cuban on these subjects will be snapped up by the American press, whether it is said in ignorance or in full knowledge of the truth.

What the Cubans know as facts about conditions in Cuba should be reported to the proper U.S. authorities.

On the floor of the Senate a few weeks ago I indicated that one of these exile groups had gotten in touch with me and had offered to supply me with what were described as very important photographs, photographs which would show that certain things were going on in Cuba which could not be reconciled with announced policies of the Government of the United States.

I said, "Take them to the CIA and the Department of State. Do not be bringing them to a politician in the U.S. Senate. It is our job, under the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution, to give our Government advice and consent in regard to foreign affairs in regard to the official policies of our Government."

It would be unfortunate, Mr. President, if we established a pattern whereby exiles in this country could think that they could submit to us information which they claimed was sound information and use that in an attempt to embarrass the official foreign policy of the United States.

I do not like to say it, but it is true—and I say it because, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I know that we have been briefed sufficiently to know it to be true—that a considerable amount of the information which is offered by Cuban refugees is not reliable, is not true. Much of it is propaganda. Much of it is designed to bring about their desires.

The Cuban refugees owe it to the State Department and to the White House to submit any material they have through the channels which have jurisdiction and primary responsibility over American foreign policy and over our relationships with Cuba.

What they are only guessing at, or what they would like Americans to think

is going on in Cuba, is better kept to themselves.

I realize that many American newspapers are as culpable in this respect as are the refugees from whence come many of these stories, which might better be labeled rumors.

In short, I want to remind the American public, the Cubans in this country, and the administration, that aside from the dictates of what constitutes appropriate behavior on the part of refugees enjoying asylum in the United States, the Federal Government is amply clothed with power to forestall actions by the exiles which conflict with American policy. I am very pleased that the agencies of the Federal Government are beginning to make use of the statutes giving them this authority. I surely hope they will continue to see to it that the Cuban exiles conduct themselves in conformity with U.S. law and U.S. foreign policy objectives.

One closing word about the United States-Cuba situation. I was one of the congressional delegates from the Senate, along with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], to the Punta del Este Conference in January of 1962. Many people are still not fully aware of the commitments the United States undertook in the pact of Punta del Este. We have kept faith with those commitments.

When we were at Costa Rica a few weeks ago, it was interesting to take note of the attitude of some of the Central American Presidents, after they had been briefed by the President of the United States on the commitments we are already carrying out in connection with the Punta del Este pact. Reading some of the quoted statements attributed to some of our friends in Central America, it seems that apparently they have been unaware of the fact that we have been maintaining a vigilant surveillance by water and by air in protection of the Western Hemisphere from any attempted threat on the part of the Castro regime to export from Cuba Russian arms sent through Cuba or attempted to be sent through Cuba into the Western Hemisphere. They apparently were unaware of the 24-hour vigilance and surveillance in international waters by various segments of the American naval forces. All are on the alert to protect the Western Hemisphere, including the United States, from any threat to the security of the free nations of this hemisphere.

Apparently they had not been fully informed of the air surveillance that we have been maintaining in defense of the security of the Western Hemisphere, including that of the United States. The Kennedy administration is thoroughly familiar with and greatly concerned about the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere via Cuba and Russia.

Mr. President, it is important that we stay within the framework of international law, so that we can maintain our allies and can prove to the world, as we proved it to the world last October, that we move only when our opponent violates our right of security.

I say again, as I have said so many times before, that the American people have every reason to have complete confidence in the handling of the Cuban crisis by the President of the United States. The President is deserving of the wholehearted support of patriotic Americans in his insistence that we follow a course of action such as has been announced over the weekend in connection with conducting American foreign policy by ourselves and for ourselves. We should not permit a group of exiles who have been given sanctuary in this country to engage in provocative acts which could very well lead to a serious crisis in the Caribbean, a crisis which might endanger the peace of the world.

Oh, I know it has been said that this position is some form of appeasement of Castro. Nonsense. Let us take a look at what is happening inside Cuba. We must present to the American people the facts concerning the policy of containment which we have been following with respect to Cuba. According to the best information our intelligence provides, the economic productive capacity of Cuba is down some 66 percent. Cuba is in a bad way internally. In my judgment, we ought to continue to follow the course of no economic intercourse with Cuba, and call upon our friendly allies among the free nations to understand that they have some moral duty in the cause of freedom to see to it that they do not strengthen the economic sinews of Cuba.

I believe that if we maintain the kind of vigilance that the President is maintaining, it will not be too far in the future when the people of Cuba recognize that there is no hope under communism and under the false leadership that Castro is giving them.

Of one thing the senior Senator from Oregon is certain: We cannot justify, from the standpoint of the foreign policy interest of the American people, permitting a group of exiles in this country to superimpose themselves as intervenors in the direction of American foreign policy.

I close by congratulating the Attorney General for the course of action he has taken over the weekend in calling to the attention of the exiles and the American people our position with respect to our determination to carry out our international law obligations.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 20, 1963]

CASUALTIES PUT AT DOZEN: RAID ON SOVIET CAMP IN CUBA DISTURBS UNITED STATES

(By Murrey Marder)

Cuban exile leaders claimed here yesterday that anti-Castro commando units inflicted more than a dozen Russian casualties in a dawn attack Monday on a Soviet military camp and a Soviet ship at a Cuban port.

The raid, which could turn into a major international incident, was openly discussed at a news conference at the Roger Smith Hotel. The raid was carried out in the name of two Cuban exile revolutionary groups that have announced similar hit-and-run attacks in the past. Alpha 66 and the Second National Front of Escambray.

Just before the news conference, the United States denounced these irresponsible and ineffective forays.

They "serve to increase the difficulty of dealing with the unsatisfactory situation which now exists in the Caribbean," said the State Department.

"The U.S. Government is strongly opposed to hit-and-run attacks on Cuba by splinter refugee groups," said the statement. "It has stated repeatedly that such raids do not weaken the grip of the Castro regime in Cuba. Indeed they may strengthen it.

"Nothing we have heard of the latest incident changes our judgment on this matter. . . . The U.S. Government is investigating fully to determine whether any violation of U.S. law is involved."

As in the past, the Cuban exiles' spokesmen stressed that none of the attacks were mounted from U.S. territory. U.S. officials yesterday said neither Central Intelligence Agency nor any other arm of the American Government was involved with Monday's raid.

In the Cuban crisis that brought the United States and the Soviet Union to the edge of war last October, Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev wrote President Kennedy that piratic attacks on Cuba justified the Soviet decision to supply Cuba the defense means missiles which you describe as offensive.

RED REACTION MODERATE

Up to last night, the Soviet reaction to the new raid was relatively moderate.

Moscow radio charged that anti-Castro revolutionaries staged a "new provocation" in an attack on the Cuban coast. But Moscow radio made no mention of Russian casualties or attacks on a Soviet vessel or personnel.

The Fidel Castro government, after a day-long silence, last night also admitted the raid, United Press International reported.

But the Cuban regime did not confirm that any Russians had been killed or wounded as claimed by the raiders.

A communique from the Armed Forces Ministry, broadcast by Havana radio and heard in Miami, blamed the United States directly for the attack.

Spokesmen at yesterday's news conference were Antonio Veciana, 33, described as "co-ordinator" of Alpha 66 and Cecilio J. Vazquez, representing the Second National Front of Escambray.

They distributed a mimeographed paper entitled "War Communique 4." Issued "in the Caribbean area" by a Maj. Eloy Gatiarres Menoyo.

It said that at dawn on Monday, commando units in two boats "attacked a Russian encampment located at Isabela de Sagua's port, on the north central coast of Cuba," which the group previously raided on October 8, when they said they captured a Russian and Cuban flag and Czech weapons.

DREW RETURN FIRE

In Monday's raid the exile groups said the attackers drew return fire "from the coast guards, the custom house and trenches of the Russian encampment." A Russian merchant ship anchored in the bay opened fire, and return machinegun and cannon fire from Alpha 66 hit the Soviet ship's smokestack and bridge. "As a result the Russian ship was seriously damaged." It was claimed and "the estimates of casualties of Russians (on ship and ashore) was more than a dozen." Two commandos were reported lightly wounded.

This demonstrated, the exiles claimed, "that the Cubans have the ability, the courage and the strength to overthrow the Communist government of Havana if given the necessary support of the free nations of the Western Hemisphere; especially the people of the United States and the Cubans themselves."

Veciana and Vazquez, who said they live in Miami, spoke through an interpreter and said in answer to questions, that:

The raiding operation lasted 45 minutes, and some of the men went ashore.

They believe the raids have "a physical and economic impact upon the Castro regime . . . leading to discontent and internal action in Cuba against the present regime."

FURTHER RAIDS PLANNED

Neither United States nor British territory is used in the raiders' secret base of operations; further raids are contemplated.

No attempt was made by the United States to block their news conference yesterday, or to hamper their activities. Asked if they believe their raids conform with U.S. policy they replied they "are not sure of the present policy in reference to these things."

The men said they and their organizations are registered with the Justice Department under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. A Justice spokesman said last night that officials of the two groups "talked with us," but at present no active registration statements are on file.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 20, 1963]

DANGEROUS GAME

The hit-and-run attacks by Cuban exiles and the counterharassment of American shipping by planes based in Cuba add up to a dangerous kind of game in which someone, sooner or later, is going to get hurt.

The Cuban exiles who attacked a Russian freighter off the coast of Cuba Tuesday night doubtless were inspired by what they considered to be patriotic motives. But actually they were behaving like juveniles, irresponsible and ineffectively.

The same thing goes for the pilots of the Mig planes, which, unquestionably are based in Cuba. Last February two of these planes fired in the general direction of an American shrimp boat. Yesterday two other planes, presumably Mig's, fired machinegun bursts near the U.S. MS *Floridian* in international waters. Since the *Floridian* is 360 feet long, it is obvious that the aircraft, one of which flew in quite low, were not trying to hit the vessel. Nevertheless, this sort of thing is a serious business, and it can lead to serious consequences—as Castro will find out if it continues.

Our own Government has condemned the hit-and-run raids by the Cuban exiles, and, as far as we know, it is not responsible for them. We suspect, however, that our officials could find the means to put a stop to these attacks. And we think they should do so.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 29, 1963]

CONTROLLING THE CUBAN EXILES—RAIDS ARE BELIEVED LIKELY TO ENTRENCH CASTRO AND DEFEAT THEIR PURPOSE

(By William S. White)

Though it is a harsh thing to have to say, the fact is that a means must be found for bringing into control the anti-Castro Cuban exiles in this country.

This is one of those painfully paradoxical occasions in the cold war when honorable and patriotic but foolish efforts to strike at the common foe of international communism are far more dangerous to the common cause than no action at all.

Pinprick exile Cuban raids upon Soviet shipping in Cuban waters, and upon the shore positions of Castro himself, have got to stop, for all these reasons:

1. They are wholly ineffectual and serve only to help entrench rather than to weaken Fidel Castro. They permit him to present himself to the Cuban people as their protector from foreign attack, and beyond doubt will retard rather than advance that hoped-for day when the Cuban people will have had enough of him.

2. They are both fatally weak and fatally irresponsible. There will be no getting rid of Castro, in a heavily armed island fortress, by small and gallant but also pointless sorties against a ship here or there, a coastal position there and yonder. When and if military forces go after Mr. Castro from offshore, they ought to go in overwhelming force, or not at all.

Surely, we have learned this terrible lesson from the abortive invasion by Cuban exiles in the spring of 1961. All this accomplished was the unnecessary expenditure of good lives and an unnecessary loss in American prestige. If and when the big blow is to be put in against Mr. Castro it must be put in at the decision of the United States and not of its exile guests, welcome among us though they are.

3. They embarrass the conduct of the foreign policy of the United States by its only rightful conductor, the U.S. Government, itself. No matter how galling the present situation—and galling it is, indeed—no set of foreigners granted sanctuary by the United States has the right to involve this country indirectly in military adventures which this country has not sanctioned and—worse yet—which in any case will do nobody but the Communist enemy any good.

4. They—these unauthorized attacks—may give the Russians some excuse to refuse to withdraw the balance of their troops in Cuba. Though it is true they have no business whatever being there in the first place, it is also true that American policy does not now contemplate any forcible effort to remove them. This being the bedrock reality, there is no sense in needlessly muddying the diplomatic waters in this affair, having in mind that we are not in any event ready at this point to go beyond diplomatic into military action.

Apart from all this, there lies upon the U.S. Government a heavy responsibility not to allow cruelly false hopes of early deliverance to rise among the Cuban people. To our lasting national shame, we encouraged just such cruelly false hopes among the Hungarians nearly a decade ago. And the end of it all was to bloody the streets of Budapest with the broken bodies of Hungarian patriots who died waiting for the deliverance that never came.

There is an old expression from back in frontier days that only a fool draws a gun unless he really means to use it. We cannot escape it that the world—and not merely the Soviet Union—can be led to believe that through others we are drawing a popgun we don't mean to use. If there is one thing worse than no action by a great power it is the puerile action of sending, or appearing to send, a boy to do a man's job.

The State Department's repeated admonitions against these hit-and-run sorties, therefore, deserve everybody's support—and the support of Cuban hardliners most of all. To this columnist's knowledge, the most authentic hardliners in both Congress and administration well know this. It is the time for them to speak up, unpopular though the message may be.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 30, 1963]

CAUGHT IN THE VISE

The hit-and-run raids on Fidel Castro's Cuba stir the blood but also chill the mind. The latest foray by Cuban exiles again puts the United States in an intolerable dilemma. What is President Kennedy to do? If he retaliates fiercely against Cuban exiles, he puts the United States in the hapless position of being the guarantor of Mr. Castro's regime. The Cuban Prime Minister presides over a despotic totalitarian government—and why should we protect Mr. Castro from

the wrath of his fellow citizens who want to terrorize a foreign force occupying the island?

And yet it must be understood that these free-booting raids could place the United States on the first step of an escalator leading to a massive confrontation. Suppose, in retaliation, the Cuban regime begins shooting at our reconnaissance planes that regularly scrutinize the island. The United States would have no alternative but to fire back—and at this point the escalator could begin moving up.

The Cuban Government has denied that the planes which fired across the bow of the American ship *Floridian* did so on orders, but this kind of reprisal might occur in any ascending scale of military measures and countermeasures. Even an unintended move in violation of orders might set forces in motion that would be beyond recall by the time corrections and apologies were made.

What makes the problem more grievous is that the pained denials of the State Department do little good at all. The Soviet Union, if it wishes, can insist that the CIA is covertly supporting the raids; to prove that this is not the case is about as difficult as it would be for Mr. Kennedy to prove that Soviet troops have completely evacuated from Cuba. Even in times past, diplomatic denials about encouraging revolutions elsewhere have occasioned skeptical hoots. Today, the word "volunteer" itself is usually bracketed by quotation marks in reporting what the other fellow claims.

But the problem of the raiders remains. It is disquieting to recall—as Edmund Taylor reminds us again in his "Fall of the Dynasties"—that the ghastly tragedy of World War I was set in motion by a high-minded terrorist in the Balkans. It is against this nightmare that the United States must balance the demands of prudence and the claims of conscience.

Surely the Government has no reasonable alternative but to disavow the raids and to investigate the incidents in order to determine if any U.S. laws were violated. Whatever the Cubans do in retaliation, let us keep our heads and sense of proportion. The primary appeal should be to the Soviet Union and not to the Cubans—and the appeal must be for a removal of Russian forces.

These forces are a provocative presence. They do not protect Mr. Castro as much as they expose the Soviet Union to the risk of having Russian prestige involved in a national struggle between Cubans. Every incident that occurs throws into more vivid relief the terrible hazards involved in trying to sustain a Soviet military outpost on an island so vulnerable to uncontrollable hit-and-run raids. It is this circumstance that provides the kindling for a conflagration.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 1, 1963]

CUBAN EXILES ANGERED BY U.S. RESTRICTIONS (By Theodore Ediger)

MIAMI, March 31.—Exiles reacted angrily today to U.S. Government restrictions designed to halt commando raids on Fidel Castro's Cuba.

Some exile leaders were especially critical of orders prohibiting 18 exiles from leaving the Miami area. The orders were issued yesterday to persons considered prospective raiders.

The 18 received notices from U.S. Immigration agents not to leave Dade County, a 2,500-square-mile area including Miami and environs, or the continental United States.

Edwin Guthman, public information officer for the Justice Department, said the notices were issued following a meeting in Miami of representatives of the Coast Guard,

the State Department, the Customs Bureau, the FBI and the Immigration Service.

Guthman did not identify the Cubans but said some of the 18 were admitted to the United States as permanent residents. Others of the group, he said, are on parole status as refugees.

He said if they violate the restriction, they will be detained by the Immigration Service, a branch of the Justice Department.

Immigration authorities indicated more orders might be issued.

Exile organizations went into emergency session to discuss plans.

Commandos L., whose attack on a Russian vessel off Cuba's north shore last week appeared to have brought the issue to a head, declined comment pending study of the situation.

A spokesman for the Second National Front of Escambray, and Alpha 66, merged organizations which raided a Russian encampment in Cuba 2 weeks ago, declared, "We are continuing the fight."

A member noted that their chief, Eloy Gutierrez Menoyo, was safe from U.S. directives at the moment. He is directing operations from a Caribbean base.

"We violate no U.S. laws," the member said. "We never operate from American soil."

Antonio Veclana, coordinator, and Armando Fleites, secretary general of the combined groups, were among those handed restriction orders.

Jose Antonio Lanusa, spokesman for another group, the Revolutionary Student Directorate, said:

"If these restrictive orders are going to completely snuff out any outside action against Castro, internal rebellion will become almost impossible in Cuba."

DEPEND ON RAIDS

Lanusa said his group had learned from underground contacts in Cuba that they depend greatly on raids as an impetus for uprising.

"The restrictions will undoubtedly cause many heartaches in Cuba," he added.

Pedro Luis Diaz Lanz, Castro's former air force chief, who created headlines with leaflet raids over Cuba in 1960, said he and several associates had received restriction notices.

He declared such action means the Kennedy administration has decided on a policy of coexistence with Castro.

Immigration authorities said the notices went only to persons who have participated or plan to participate in raids.

The Cuban Revolutionary Council, headed by Jose Miro Cardona, and formed in 1961 to mount the unsuccessful Bay of Pigs invasion, was not included.

An exile leader who did not want his name mentioned, said of the U.S. action:

"This is the last straw. No invasion, no government in exile, no jobs, and now no more attacks on Castro. It looks as if Castro has won."

Two notices were served by Immigration agents. One by the Department of Justice expressed sympathy for the exiles' cause, but added, "this does not mean that we are prepared to see our own laws violated with impunity, or to tolerate activities which might provoke armed reprisals."

The other said the exiles' parole into the United States would be violated if they left Dade County. Also, that their departure from the United States could mean \$5,000 fines or 5 years' imprisonment or both.

BRITAIN TO COOPERATE

Meanwhile, it was learned that the British Government has agreed "to do anything possible to prevent the use of British territory for illicit purposes," United Press International reported.

The statement referred to a U.S. request for the British to increase surveillance of isolated keys in the Bahama Islands north of Cuba, which raiders are suspected of using as bases for launching raids.

U.S. officials confirmed that the British Government had agreed to increase its vigilance in the Caribbean. There was no elaboration, but informed sources in London said the British frigate *Londonderry* had been ordered from Bermuda to patrol the region.

For its part, the United States was reported to be strengthening its Coast Guard sea and air patrols to guard against forays launched from Florida or U.S. Territories in the Caribbean.

United Press International also reported that the FBI is investigating Cuban refugee groups in the Miami area to determine who is backing their efforts. In addition, immigration authorities were intensifying checks of Cuban refugee movements.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1963]

THE COUP IN GUATEMALA

The military coup in Guatemala spells danger for all of Central America and will send shock waves deep into South America. Every indication points to this as an example of the sort of reaction by the extreme right that all authorities on Latin America have been fearing. It is an attempt to answer the leftism symbolized by Fidelismo but is a swing to the other extreme. The irony and the danger are that such a reaction will play straight into the hands of the Fidelistas and of Latin-American communism.

The Guatemalan military clique had indicated in recent weeks that it would act if ex-President Juan José Arévalo was allowed back into the country to campaign for the presidency. Dr. Arévalo returned Friday night. The armed forces seized the opportunity "to defend Guatemala from the threat of communism," as they put it.

An idea of how far to the right the new chief executive, Colonel Peralta, and his group are can be gleaned from the fact that they accuse President Ydigoras of "complicity in dealing with communism." It was President Ydigoras who arranged for the training of the Cuban exiles for the Bay of Pigs invasion and whose presidential career has virtually been based on his anti-Fidelismo.

President Kennedy certainly would not want to condone, let alone support, a straightforward, old-fashioned, military dictatorial extreme rightwing coup in Guatemala. Whether he does or not, the coup was a blow to democracy in Latin America.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1963]

UNITED STATES CURBS MIAMI EXILES TO PREVENT RAIDS ON CUBA

WASHINGTON, March 31.—The Government moved today to enforce its policy of preventing Cuban refugees from using U.S. territory to organize or launch raids against Cuba. The Justice Department placed restrictions on 18 Cubans in the Miami area.

In some cases they were ordered not to leave Dade County, in which Miami is situated, and in others not to leave the United States.

The Department did not disclose the names of those restricted. Dispatches from Miami confirmed that some members of two exile groups already involved in raids had been given the restriction orders. These were the Alpha 66 and the Second Front of Escambray groups.

VIOLATORS FACE ARREST

Violation of the orders, issued through the Immigration and Naturalization Service, could be enforced by arrest or deportation.

In its announcement yesterday that it planned to take "every step necessary" to

prevent raids, the Government expressed sympathy for the anti-Castro cause. But it said it could tolerate no activities that might provoke reprisals against American forces.

Yesterday's announcement was made by the State and Justice Departments. It did not specify what the measures would be to guard against new hit-and-run attacks on Cuba. Today's action by the Justice Department revealed one step.

RAIDS TRACED TO BAHAMAS

In addition, officials said, they expect the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Coast Guard to increase their surveillance of Cuban refugee circles, of the Florida coastline and the waters between the United States and Cuba.

It was understood that some of the small boats used by raiding groups had been tracked and might be seized in the next few days. The Coast Guard can challenge the seaworthiness of any vessel and presumably will check on suspicious craft by invoking this right.

Information available now about the two attacks on Soviet ships in Cuban ports in the last 2 weeks suggests that the raids were not launched from American soil, the Government said yesterday.

But its statement promised further investigation. The statement avoided the question of whether the expeditions were supplied with men or materials from the United States.

Some of the recent raids, it has been established, were launched from some of the smaller islands of the British Bahamas group. However, the participants did not live there and their expeditions almost certainly originated elsewhere.

American surveillance efforts will be coordinated with the British Government.

The administration's dilemma was reflected in the careful wording of yesterday's statement. Washington fears that, should the exile attacks continue, the Soviet Union and Cuba would be provoked to retaliate, either against American shipping in the Caribbean or against the American reconnaissance planes that now fly over Cuba daily with impunity.

But because it has encouraged Cubans to work for the overthrow of Premier Fidel Castro, the administration has hesitated to harass or take sanctions against the anti-Castro fighters.

However, the refugee raiders have been exceptionally resourceful in carrying through attacks that have damaged Soviet merchant ships in Cuban ports.

Because of this President Kennedy and his advisers have therefore decided to do everything possible to discourage and prevent continuation of the refugees' raids.

The United States will not, however, take responsibility for events in Cuba or her territorial waters.

THE POLICY ANNOUNCEMENT

The following is the text of yesterday's statements by the State and Justice Departments:

"The position of the U.S. Government regarding hit-and-run attacks by Cuban refugee groups against Soviet ships and other targets in Cuba have been made perfectly clear by the President and Secretary of State. These attacks are neither supported nor condoned by this Government. The President has pointed out that they may have effects opposite to those presumably intended by those who carry them out; that is, they may strengthen the Soviet position in Cuba rather than weaken it, tighten Communist controls rather than loosen them.

"For preliminary evidence suggests that these raids have not in fact been launched from the territory of the United States. However, the FBI and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, with the cooperation of the Coast Guard and Customs Service, are intensifying their investigations.

"We intend to take every step necessary to insure that such raids are not launched, manned or equipped on U.S. territory.

"The sympathy of this Government and the American people is with those Cubans who hope to see their country freed from Communist control. We understand that these raids reflect the deep frustration of men who want to get back to their homeland, to a Cuba that is independent.

"But this understanding does not mean that we are prepared to see our own laws violated with impunity or to tolerate activities which might provoke armed reprisals, the brunt of which would be borne by the Armed Forces of the United States."

RESOLUTION OF OREGON SENATE AND HOUSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record Senate Joint Memorial 7 of the Oregon Legislature, pertaining to Rogue River Basin project, and House Joint Memorial 13, of the Oregon Legislature, relating to the livestock slaughtering and processing industry, together with covering letters of the Oregon secretary of state.

There being no objection, the letters and memorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SALEM, OREG.,

March 25, 1963.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As directed by the 52d Legislative Assembly of Oregon, I transmit herewith a certified copy of Senate Joint Memorial 7, pertaining to the Rogue River Basin project, a memorial enacted by our legislative assembly now in session.

Respectfully,

HOWELL APPLING, JR.,
Secretary of State.

ENROLLED SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

Resolution introduced by Senators Chapman, Newbry, Potts; Representatives Back, Bazett, Branchfield, Dellenback, and Redden
To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Rogue Basin project has been authorized by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the Rogue Basin project is a comprehensive river basin development plan providing for the maximum feasible benefits from flood control, fishery improvement, irrigation, recreation, municipal water supply and power production; and

Whereas the present low water flow and present high water temperatures threaten the continued existence of valuable anadromous fisheries; and

Whereas repeated winter floods destroy valuable property and prevent development; and

Whereas the Rogue Basin is highly populated and a growing area primarily dependent on the timber industry; and

Whereas the timber production of the area is stable and its employment decreasing because of increasing efficiency; and

Whereas the need for a more broadly based economy and increased employment opportunity is urgent; and

Whereas the construction and operation of the Rogue Basin project would restore the fisheries, broaden the economy, increase

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1857

dred refugees have been transported to Port Everglades. A fourth ship is scheduled to sail from Baltimore within a few days.

It is clear that we shall be in the shipping business for at least 2 more months. Please pray that we do not have any natural disasters in the United States during that period. Our key disaster experts are heavily engaged in the Cuban program.

With warm regard,

Sincerely,

ALFRED M. GRUENTHER,
President.

UNITED FRUIT CO.,
Boston, Mass., March 12, 1963.

Gen. ALFRED M. GRUENTHER,
President, the American National Red Cross,
National Headquarters, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL GRUENTHER: Thank you for your letter of February 20 concerning our donation of the use of the SS *Santo Cerro* and its crew in connection with the prisoner exchange program. We appreciate your very generous comments, particularly with respect to the attitude and action of our personnel.

Our personnel enjoyed working on this project, especially as it was concerned with the people of Latin America with whom we have enjoyed such a long relationship. Although the Cuban exchange program is a controversial matter, we could not permit this to stand in the way of the humanitarian aspect of the exchange. It was this latter aspect which was a major factor in our company decision to contribute over a quarter-million dollars in addition to the use of the ship and its crew.

I am certain you join in our hope that the day will come when Cuba will again be governed by the democratic, freedom-loving Cubans.

Sincerely,

THOMAS E. SUNDERLAND.

Brazil Resentful: United States Violated Rules of Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of the House the following column by Edgar Ansel Mowrer relative to U.S. foreign aid:

BRAZIL RESENTFUL: UNITED STATES VIOLATED
RULES OF GAME

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

In making public the charge of the American Ambassador in Rio that Brazil's Government is infiltrated with Communists, the State Department was merely revealing common knowledge. Nevertheless, the resentment of the Brazilian Government over the charge is perfectly natural. For the United States was violating the rules of the game. For many years, and particularly under the new Frontier, there has been a sort of unwritten agreement between Washington and a number of other capitals: the more Communists other countries can muster, the more assistance they get from the United States.

A joke? If you think so, look at the full scale of the foreign aid to various countries given by the United States since the end of World War II.

Yugoslavia, an all-Communist country, which has now returned to the bosom of Red Mother Russia, has received more aid than the Netherlands, which has no Communists to speak of. Poland, an all-Communist country (so far as the government is concerned), has received more assistance than Portugal, one of our firmest allies where Communists are forbidden.

IT PAID INDIA TO WAVER

India, a country that, until the Red Chinese invasion, could not make up its mind which side it was on, has received twice as much U.S. assistance as Pakistan, the one country between Turkey and Formosa which could be counted on to fight beside the United States if trouble came. Afghanistan, a country that flirts with the U.S.S.R., has managed to get a sizable chunk of dollars.

In Africa it is no different. Ghana, which denounces American imperialism in and out of season, has received more American baksheesh than trusty Liberia. The United Arab Republic, king among area troublemakers, chief denouncer of "Western imperialism," aggressor in the Yemen, continues to rely upon Washington to avoid bankruptcy.

Latin America is no exception. Brazil ranks first in the receiving line. Argentina, threatened by an unholy combine of Communists and Peronistas; Chile, a country notoriously soft on communism; Mexico, which provides Castro with an intangible headquarters abroad for his subverters of the other countries—these have all been richly rewarded by big-hearted Uncle Sam.

Brazil, the largest Latin American country, has naturally had the most aid. But since it began admitting Communists to high places, its allowance has been going up.

NO STRINGS ATTACHED TO AID

Moreover—the strangest feature of the whole aid plan—in most places American aid has been strictly a one-way street. Our leaders have gone out of their way to insist that we want nothing at all from our beneficiaries—no strings attached. See Yugoslavia and Poland.

Small wonder then that the Brazilian Government resents a breach of the rules on the part of Washington. Since the more Communists, the more money; the more neutral, the more attention from the boys in the State Department; President Joao Goulart obviously feels entirely justified in taking a lofty tone with President Kennedy. In fact, instead of asking for a big new loan, I should not be surprised if he demanded it or else. What is more, I think he would get it.

Our leaders believe that this is the way the incredible economic power of the United States can best be exercised. Maybe they are right—our job is to shut up and pay up. But sometimes I find myself in full agreement with ex-President Truman: the next time some government insists that without more help from us, it will "go Communist," President Kennedy should answer, "Go, see how you like it and don't yell when it hurts."

Welcome South, Mr. Chisholm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, on February 25 of this year, I inserted an editorial in the RECORD taken from the

Daily Reveille, written and edited by the students of Louisiana State University. The title of the editorial was, "Is ELLENDER Wrong?"

The editorial, written by Colin Chisholm, a student at the university, dealt with the remarks of the senior Senator from Louisiana, the Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER, who had questioned the wisdom of our foreign giveaway program. It contained the following statement:

ELLENDER, in a few choice words, said what probably a majority of Americans have been thinking for many years, that African nations are simply not ready for self-government.

I inserted the editorial because I was impressed by the young writer's obvious ability to cut through the verbiage and the fog of uncertainty surrounding our giveaway program and to see right to the heart of the matter. His display of clearmindedness was worthy of note by all of us here in the House.

Since that time, I have received a letter from Mr. Chisholm thanking me for sending him a copy of the insertion. His brief reply is equally worthy of note. Again he has shown that same instinct for stripping away the smug, the obvious and the false to find the truth hidden away in the center.

A hundred writers have written scores of thousands of words, particularly in the past two decades, on a subject to which most of them were ill prepared to address themselves: the South and its so-called conditions and problems.

Here, in 200 words, Mr. Chisholm tells of doing what few, if any, of these self-appointed savants have ever done: investigated these conditions and problems for themselves with a mind uncluttered with muddled presuppositions.

His two paragraph summation is a brilliant statement in which I would not want to change a single word:

Before coming to Louisiana, I had lived for 20 years in the State of Colorado. I was born and raised there. During the time I lived there I was filled with the usual ballyhoo about the South and the conditions that were supposed to exist there. When I had finally had enough, I decided to come to the South and take a look for myself.

Since the day I first came to Louisiana, I have fallen in love with the State and its people. I have made many friends over the past 2 years. The kind of friends that are lasting and ready and willing to help with any sort of problem I might have; something I could not find in my native State. I have found employment, not on the second or third try, but on the first attempt; something I had been unable to do in my native State. Illusion after illusion about the South has been shattered before me and I have grown to love Louisiana more and more as each day passes by. I plan to remain in Louisiana, to marry and raise my family here and to establish my own business here someday in the not-so-far-off future. I am most happy to be able to say that on September 13, 1963, I will be able to register to vote as a citizen of the State of Louisiana. It is also my pleasure to say that my parents, also native Coloradans, will move into a new home in Pascagoula, Miss., this summer after some 62 years of residence in the West.

I would like to welcome this young man to Louisiana, though selfishly I know he could serve the State and the

A1858

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 1

South better by returning to those parts of the Nation where these illusions and delusions are still held and still, sadly, passed on from one generation to another. He would make the South an illustrious missionary.

Welcome south, Mr. Chisholm.

Anti-Missile-Missile Base In Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the Allen-Scott report of March 25 points up the very serious situation in Soviet Cuba relative to anti-missile-missile defenses. The reported installation of a complex missile tracking system on that island linked to a new antimissile control center near Moscow further highlights the highly dangerous situation 90 miles from our shores and warrants urgent reappraisal of the administration's Cuba policies.

The text of the report follows.

[From the San Diego Union, Mar. 25, 1963]

THE ALLEN-SCOTT REPORT: ANTI-MISSILE-MISSILE BASE IN CUBA

Russia is converting Cuba into a menacing anti-missile-missile base that could force the United States to make vast changes in its nuclear defenses.

Soviet technicians are installing a complex missile-tracking system in Cuba that is connected directly with a newly established antimissile control center near Moscow.

This highly important Kremlin command post in turn is linked to the world's first operational antimissile base that has been constructed on the outskirts of Leningrad.

The startling discovery of these sinister Red missile installations was made by an Air Force Samos reconnaissance satellite and subsequently by other intelligence sources.

The satellite's highly sensitive camera photographed 11 modified SA-3 missiles on launchers at the Leningrad base. These antimissile missiles have the capability of shooting down intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, is so disturbed by those intelligence findings that he has set up a special three-member subcommittee to make a thorough study of the new threat.

RUSSELL asked Senator HENRY JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, and MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, of Maine, to determine the full extent of the calculated risk President Kennedy is taking on the following crucial decisions:

1. Deferring missile defense of American cities and other key centers until 1970.
2. Doing nothing to eliminate Russia's anti-missile-missile base in Cuba before it becomes fully operational this fall.

The report of these Senators is expected to determine whether the Senate Armed Services Committee will demand that the President take stern measures to counteract this new Soviet menace.

Already, the group has ascertained that major surgery performed on the anti-missile-missile program in Defense Secretary Mc-

Namara's budget has, in effect, eliminated the Army's Nike-Zeus as a potential weapon system.

Under McNamara's backstage plan a new so-called improved Nike-X antimissile missile would be developed by 1970.

This "missile gap" would give the Russians a 4- to 7-year lead in the deployment of an antimissile. Important U.S. military authorities believe this would be suicidal for the country.

Panama Canal: Republic of Panama To Press Sovereignty in Canal Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a statement in the RECORD of March 18, 1963, I mentioned that among the matters to be discussed at the Costa Rica Conference, March 18-20, would be the Panama Canal and expressed the hope that the President of the United States would meet with a rocklike stand any proposals that would further weaken our treaty rights concerning the Canal.

Though much has been published in the papers of the United States about that Conference, virtually nothing has appeared in the press about the Panama Canal. In contrast with the silence here about this vital matter, isthmian newspapers have revealed that on March 20, Presidents Kennedy and Chiari spent 41 minutes discussing steps to give further impetus to the conversations of the joint commission now considering Panama's aspirations in the Canal Zone. This Commission is composed of Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., and U.S. Ambassador John S. Farland to Panama.

In commenting on the San José Conference, President Chiari stated that the meeting had more or less fulfilled the objectives for which it was called and that Panama would continue advancing its case until it had "eliminated any doubt in regard to our sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone which we maintain is complete."

A feature news story by Luis C. Noli in the Star and Herald of Panamá, Republic of Panama, on March 21, summarizing the results of the San José Conference, is quoted as part of these remarks follows:

[From the Panama Star & Herald, Mar. 21, 1963]

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA TO PRESS SOVEREIGNTY IN CANAL ZONE—CHIARI DECLARES COSTA RICAN MEETING SATISFACTORY

SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA.—Panama will continue advancing until it has "eliminated any doubt in regard to our sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone which we maintain is complete," President Roberto F. Chiari emphatically declared at a press conference here today.

As an example of the advances already achieved by Panama, the Chief Executive cited the flying of the Panamanian flag at the Administration Building of the Panama Canal and the recognition in the Canal Zone of exequaturs issued by Panama to foreign consuls.

When he was asked what would happen if a Canal Zone court ruled that the Panamanian flag should be withdrawn from the Canal Zone, Chiari replied: "That's a matter for the North American Government. I don't believe that such an eventuality is possible."

In connection with the Conference of Presidents just closed here, President Chiari said: "It seems to me that this meeting has more or less fulfilled the objectives for which it was called. This meeting, in general terms, has been satisfactory." Chiari emphasized the results achieved in connection with the Central American common market.

Central American newsmen attending the press conference posed a number of questions in regard to Deputy Thelma King who one of them described as "the person carrying subversive means from Cuba to Panama." Chiari replied that as a deputy, Miss King has parliamentary immunity and it would be up to the national assembly to deprive her of this immunity.

When one of the attending newsmen said that he had a recording of the call for a revolution made by Thelma King, Chiari replied that it would be interesting to hear this recording.

There were several questions on Panamanian politics. Chiari said that he would soon reconstruct his cabinet.

Asked whether it was true that one of the possible presidential candidates of the ruling Liberal Party of Panama professed the extremist ideologies, Chiari replied that all of the prospective candidates of his party are Liberals in principle, temperament and conviction. He added that the proliferation of political parties in Panama will not return the country to the former great parties. Not only Dr. Arnulfo Arias but any other citizen can be candidate for the Presidency, he declared.

At the conclusion of his press conference, Chiari said that during the President's meeting here the problems of the Darien Gap and the Inter-American Highway were taken up with a view to giving further impetus to the work already underway.

CHIARI AND JFK

President Chiari met with President Kennedy for 41 minutes this afternoon to discuss steps to give further impetus to the conversations of the joint commission which is considering Panama's aspirations in its relation with the United States.

Chiari told Panamanian newsmen that upon his return to Panama he will report to the nation on his conversations here but he added that "one is always comforted by the interest which he (President Kennedy) shows in our affairs."

Chiari said that "he (Kennedy) was frank with me and I was frank with him."

In addition to the discussion of measures for a more speedy advance of negotiations being carried out by the personal representatives of the Presidents of the United States and Panama in United States-Panama problems, Chiari said that he and Kennedy viewed the results of what has already been achieved and discussed economic aid to Panama aside from the problems of Alliance for Progress.

In regard to the latter item, Chiari said that Kennedy told him once Panama presented approved plans, he will consider them with sympathy.

Chiari stressed Kennedy's interest in Panamanian problems.

The interview between the United States and Panamanian Chief Executives took place at the residence of U.S. Ambassador Be Escazu in the outskirts of San José. The U.S. Chief Executive greeted his Panamanian colleague together with Secretary of State Dean Rusk and U.S. Ambassador to Panama Joseph Farland, posing with them pictures.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1859

Hoosier Peace Corps Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Indianapolis News, an excellent column by Lou Hiner, Jr., on the Peace Corps volunteers from Indiana. I am pleased to say that Indiana is well represented in the Peace Corps program, ranking 18th among the States. There are at the present time 65 Hoosier volunteers who are working in 29 countries, and there are several more in training. Besides the volunteers, three of our institutions of higher education in Indiana are aiding in the Peace Corps training program. I would like to bring these articles to the attention of my colleagues and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

[From the Indianapolis News, Mar. 18, 1963]

ONETIME CRITICS NOW PRAISE JOB

(By Lou Hiner, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—The Peace Corps, a baby in our vast bureaucracy, has observed its second birthday anniversary, and surprisingly it was toasted admiringly, even by onetime critics.

On its second anniversary, the Corps has 3,965 volunteers, including 65 from Indiana, working in 141 countries, and 630 other volunteers are training for work in various countries, including 3 new ones.

Although it's generally conceded the Corps is doing a good job, there are many persons who wonder if it isn't turning out to be another agency that will continue to grow and grow and spend and spend.

In its first year, the Corps had a budget of \$30 million; the second-year cost approximately \$60 million, and the budget calls for \$108 million in its third year.

The purpose of the Peace Corps, as defined by President Kennedy, is to provide "skilled Americans to interested countries in need of manpower." The side product, of course, is to promote understanding.

When it was first suggested, critics predicted it would be a children's brigade, a sort of adolescent missionary society.

The "I-told-you-so" types had a field day when a young woman volunteer dropped a post card in Nigeria and it became an international incident momentarily because of critical remarks about the African nation.

Another rare incident of adverse publicity occurred when a 69-year-old grandmother blasted the Corps, in general, after she failed to snap through an obstacle course in the training program.

Of significance, only 3.2 percent of the volunteers sent abroad have been returned to this country, for various reasons including sickness and death. No volunteer has been asked to leave by a host government.

Every country in which volunteers work has asked the Peace Corps to double, triple, and even quadruple the supply of Americans.

Under present programming, the number of volunteers abroad will reach approximately 9,000 by the end of the calendar year. The largest concentration of these—about 4,000 volunteers—will be in Latin American countries.

ONE 76-YEAR-OLD SERVES

Here is some miscellany about the Peace Corps:

Who are the volunteers? They come from every State. About 63 percent are men. The average age is 26 for women and 24 for men. Minimum age is 18 with no maximum. A 76-year-old engineer now serves in East Pakistan.

What do they do? The greatest number works in education. Community work is the second largest field. This includes home-making, construction, social work, and so forth. Agriculture and public works projects rank third.

What do volunteers receive? They are not on salaries but receive a living allowance sufficient to maintain them at the level of the people of the host nation. At the end of service, they receive an adjustment allowance of \$75 a month, not to exceed \$1,800 in all. Cost of the program to the taxpayers is about \$9,000 a year per volunteer.

SIXTY-FIVE FROM STATE WORK IN 29 COUNTRIES

WASHINGTON.—In its first 12 years, the Peace Corps has drawn 65 volunteers from Indiana who now are working in 29 countries.

Four Hoosiers are in training now and will be assigned roles in the programs within the next few weeks. In the last 2 years, 324 other Hoosiers have taken the examination to join the Corps.

In addition to the Indiana volunteers' participation, three Indiana institutions of higher education have aided in the Peace Corps training program.

The University of Notre Dame, South Bend, and Purdue University, West Lafayette, both have trained contingents to work in Chile. Volunteers for Thailand now are training at Indiana University, Bloomington, and the same school has sent trainees to Tunisia.

As a provider of Peace Corps volunteers, Indiana ranks 18th among the States. California's 510 volunteers give that State top place while Alaska's 4 corpsmen rank it in the 50th spot.

Following are the Indiana volunteers, listed alphabetically, with their address and their assignments:

Anabel R. Stafford, Hobart, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Barbara A. Rush, Indianapolis, nurse, Sierra Leone.

Bernard J. Winburn, Richmond, nutrition, Peru.

Billie J. Sweany, Seymour, metalworking specialist, Ecuador.

Carole E. Harris, Indianapolis, cooperative worker, Dominican Republic.

Caroline L. Siedling, Brookville, English teacher, Thailand.

Charles E. Schimmoeller, Indianapolis, agricultural extension, Ecuador.

Cynthia A. Campbell, Columbus, elementary education, Philippines.

Dale E. Stichel, Elkhart, poultry extension worker, Brazil.

David E. Harris (husband and wife), Indianapolis, cooperative worker, Dominican Republic.

David E. King, Waterloo, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Donald W. Yancey, Madison, animal husbandry, Malaya.

Dorothy M. Freed, Waterloo, nurse, Afghanistan.

Edwin N. Viorol, Monroeville, commercial subjects teacher, British Honduras.

Elden L. Katter, Stendal, art teacher, Ethiopia.

Emilie A. Clevenger, Brookville, chemistry instructor, Thailand.

George J. Cractun, Indianapolis, forester, Malaya.

Hamilton J. Bims, Gary, elementary education aid, Philippines.

Helen McGill, Gary, English teacher, Ivory Coast.

Henry Dalleave, Ragsdale, carpentry instructor, Somali Republic.

Henry Leroy Jennings, Frankfort, physical education, Tunisia.

Jack L. Crowell, Tipton, physical education teacher, Ivory Coast.

James Crandel, Brookville, agricultural extension, Niger.

James Michael Justice, Newport, community development, Ecuador.

Julius J. Macy, Columbia City, irrigation specialist, Morocco.

James T. Mullins, Fort Wayne, mechanic, Colombia.

John T. Evans, Madison, physics teacher, Nigeria.

John D. Harvey, Indianapolis, construction worker, Jamaica.

John M. Summers, Middletown, teacher's aid, Philippines.

John R. Swallow, Cambridge City, English teacher, Dominican Republic.

Karel A. Crowley, Anderson, elementary education aid, Philippines.

Lance S. Dodson, Wheeler, 4-H worker, North Borneo and Sarawak.

Lawrence West, Goshen, agriculture, Chile.

Kenneth D. Buckstrup, Indianapolis, cooperative worker, Chile.

Kay E. Aylor, Muncie, home economics teacher, Ethiopia.

Linda A. Cover, Gary, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Linda Elaine Oatman, Fort Wayne, laboratory technician, Thailand.

Margaret M. Heineman, Connersville, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Marsha Anita Luzzi, Hammond, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Marvin S. Adams, Huntington, 4-H worker, North Borneo and Sarawak.

Mary T. Atwood, Indianapolis, nurse, Chile.

Mary E. Craig, Beech Grove, home economist, Chile.

Mary J. Smith, Sullivan, English teacher, Ethiopia.

Michael E. Connelley, East Chicago, cooperative worker, Chile.

Michael B. Murphy, Peru, teacher, Costa Rica.

Murray M. DeArmond, Indianapolis, physician, Malaya.

Myrtis Jean Becker, Elkhart, social worker assistant, Bolivia.

Paul D. Meier, Anderson, construction, Peru.

Peggy L. Davis, Worthington, home economist, Philippines.

Ralph B. Thomas, North Manchester, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Richard L. Kunz, Indianapolis, builder-engineer, Colombia.

Richard L. Vittilow, Rockport, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Robert T. Milhous, South Bend, civil engineer, Tanganyika.

Robert B. South, Bloomington, community development, Chile.

Robert B. Taylor, Fort Wayne, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Roger U. Schneidewind, Richmond, teacher's aid, Philippines.

Rosalie A. Replogie, Bremen, teacher, Costa Rica.

Ruth Ann Becht, Floyds Knob, home economist, Brazil.

Stephen T. Cockerham, Elwood, agronomy, El Salvador.

Thomas D. Carpenter, Portage, teacher's aid, Peru.

Susan J. Miller, North Manchester, primary teacher, Liberia.

Thomas R. Reno, Plymouth, physical education teacher, Iran.

A1860

Cuba
J.F.K. and San Jose

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

April 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an excellent article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 21. The article points out that Kennedy's publicity trip to Central America has not helped solve the basic Cuban problem, but has succeeded in pledging a huge sum for an aid program.

Text of the article is as follows:

J.F.K. AND SAN JOSE: TALKS AID KENNEDY'S LATIN IMAGE BUT WILL DO LITTLE TO QUIET CONGRESSMEN ON CUBA

(By Allan L. Otten)

SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA.—President Kennedy winged homeward yesterday satisfied his 3-day Caribbean visit accomplished most of what he had hoped for in improving U.S. relations with Central America.

But the trouble is his expectations never were very high and the congressional pressure on Mr. Kennedy to do something about Castroism has been great. Thus, even administration officials concede the south-of-the-border sojourn will do little to quiet, and might conceivably aggravate, back-home criticism of the Kennedy policy toward Cuba and Communist activity in the Western Hemisphere.

Viewed in this larger context, then, the Kennedy trip looms largely as a public relations triumph that will do more to enhance the Presidential image in the Isthmus than to curb Castroism and, in the process, ease the political impact of the Cuban issue on Mr. Kennedy and the Democrats come election day 1964.

It's quite true the steps discussed here, if ever carried through, would be stronger than the United States expected. Top representatives of the six Central American nations that took part in the Isthmus summit—Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—agreed to meet again next month with U.S. officials to devise ways to inhibit travel to and from Cuba and to slow the flow of money and propaganda from Cuba to Latin American lands.

At the same time the Organization of American States is to be prodded to urge tougher stands on other hemisphere nations still soft on Castro. There's to be additional sea and air surveillance and inspection of shipping in Central American waters and improved exchange of intelligence on subversive activity.

Nevertheless, the "ifs" are big. As they head for home, U.S. officials seem optimistic that the Central American nations, which now do not grant visas for travel to Cuba but which do not penalize citizens who manage to get there anyhow through Mexico or some other gateway, will get tough. They also seem hopeful that Mexico will cooperate.

FREE TRAVEL GUARANTEED

But most of the Isthmian nations have constitutional guarantees of free travel and it remains to be seen just how strongly they move to clamp down on indirect travel to Cuba by their citizens. If Mexico does cooperate, some new shipment point may open elsewhere.

As for exchanging intelligence, most Central American nations sharply distrust each

other still. "I just cannot see Costa Rica, for example, turning over its list of suspected subversives to Nicaragua," a Latin American official says.

Similarly, there seems no good reason for official optimism here that several of the nations still having diplomatic relations with Cuba may sever these ties in the next few months. There are five nations in this group—Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, and Uruguay—and U.S. officials are convinced Cuban Embassies in these countries are major sources of propaganda and money for local subversive movements.

U.S. sources suggest that the OAS may soon put pressure on these five, but the very fact that relations still exist, even after the Cuban missile crisis, shows just how tough a domestic political problem the diplomatic break must be for the governments involved.

But perhaps most importantly of all, some Government spokesmen—both United States and Central American—suggest that, even though there unquestionably is real concern among Central American groups over Communist subversion, some countries stress the Castro menace largely to keep the United States handing out money.

If that is a motive, then it worked. Mr. Kennedy promised "substantial" aid on a wide variety of fronts to help promote regional economic integration and development, at the same time stressing the need for local reforms in these nations.

Just how much financial help has been pledged was not revealed, but apparently it is a very large sum indeed. There will be a long-term loan to permit the Central American Bank for Economic Integration to study a raft of new economic development projects. There will be an "immediate substantial initial contribution," with even more to come later, for a new fund to carry out regional development projects. Other financial help will be extended to help each country set up a bank for low-interest loans to private industry, for a regional bank to provide a secondary home mortgage market, and to give vocational training to young men and women in agriculture and business practices.

FOCUS ON ECONOMICS

All this, of course, contributed mightily to the President's public relations success. Indeed, Mr. Kennedy and the Central American presidents, for the most part, focused their discussions on economics. Kennedy speeches throughout his visit stressed U.S. support of regional integration and the need for action to raise Latin American living standards as the most effective long-term defense against communism.

On Cuba, U.S. officials say, the President scored with major impact in a long and detailed briefing of his fellow presidents on what the United States is already doing and is prepared to do: the pledge against reintroduction of Red offensive weapons into Cuba; intensive air surveillance of the island; a determination, communicated to the Soviet Union, to move against any Hungary-type action to suppress an uprising in Cuba; a policy to fight attempts by Castro to ship arms to other Latin American nations or to overthrow another Latin American government; the campaign to cut back free world shipping to Cuba; increased U.S. propaganda activity in the hemisphere.

Back home, of course, the administration's task will be much more difficult. Despite the expected pledges of anti-Castro action by our south-of-the-border neighbors, White House officials have resigned themselves to continued and perhaps intensified criticism of the administration's Cuban policy, and that this unpleasant prospect will never really end so long as Cuba or any other Latin American nation remains in Communist hands.

Eyewitnesses Refute U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to include my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to insert an editorial appearing in the Santa Ana, Calif., Register of Friday, March 22, dealing with the U.N. atrocities in Katanga, and points up the fact that it is high time to sever relations with the United Nations.

EYEWITNESSES REFUTE U.N.

The American Association for the United Nations has sent out another batch of propaganda, this time in defense of the U.N. "rape" of Katanga. A covering letter from Clark M. Eichelberger, executive director of the A.A.U.N. says it is in "an effort to set the factual record straight."

One piece is a beautifully printed piece from the United Nations called The United Nations and the Congo—Some Salient Facts. It is an effort to defend the U.N. stand in the Congo where more than 20,000 troops have imposed the collective will of the U.N. on the former prosperous Katanga area.

Here's a good example of the propaganda: "There have been many allegations of atrocities against civilians by United Nations troops. For the most part, these have been wild, irresponsible, and a deliberate product of propaganda sponsored and paid for by the Katanga information machine."

Well, how about that? We have received a copy of a letter from R. H. Wentland, president of the Congo Union Mission of Seventh-day Adventists. Here are two paragraphs from his letter to Bob Bartlett of Cleveland:

"Before the U.N. came into Katanga we had prosperity, peace, and order. The U.S.-backed U.N. came in and brought war, lawlessness, murder, looting, ruination, poverty, and chaos and general destruction on the state of Katanga. Those of us who live here, can't see why civilized nations can ever think of doing such a thing.

"The idea is that if Katanga does not go back into the Central Government then Central Government will fall. Why should it? Only for this reason, that Mr. Gizenga wants all of the Congo to turn over to communism. The Central Government is far over the majority on the side of communism, and all they want is Katanga to make it complete, Russia gets it and America pays for it."

Here is part of a statement by Julia Hoel, a medical missionary associated with Mr. Wentland:

"We see and hear of tragic cases every day out at the refugee center. Today a man was standing at the desk with a foot bandaged. We asked him about it and he told us a woman had called the Red Cross * * * saying she was under constant fire and could not get out. When the e was a lull in the shooting, they went out in an ambulance after her. The driver and hospital assistant were Katangans. They found the woman and on the way out the Gurkhas shot and killed both of them and wounded the woman in the head and the Belgian in the foot. They had to stay there all night with the bodies of the two Katangans and with their wounds sore and bleeding until the next day when others came to rescue them."

April 1

Telling the Cuban resisters what not to do isn't going to further the cause of a free Cuba. If the administration is convinced that the Cuban refugees are doing it wrong then, at the very least, it should be suggesting to them and helping them to do it right.

Voice of Democracy Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, a young lady in my congressional district, Miss Susan Cardwell, of Barkley Drive, Middlesboro, Ky., has succeeded in winning the Voice of Democracy contest in my State of Kentucky that was sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Miss Cardwell submitted a splendid and eloquent essay under the title "What My Freedom Means to Me" and I now wish to insert her essay and make it part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that many people throughout our Nation may read this very fine, prize-winning essay written by one of our Kentucky high school girls. The essay is as follows:

WHAT MY FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

Tonight, I am doing as I usually do about this time of day, I am doing as girls all over the world do at one time or another in their lives, I am doing as old men do sitting in front of a country store, as the young man does while receiving his high school diploma, or as he leaves for war, I am doing as children do, I am dreaming.

I am dreaming of my senior year and of my graduation. I am dreaming of becoming an airline hostess, a veterinarian, a lab technician, or a writer. I am dreaming of my college years, of my marriage, and of the children I will raise, happy, free children.

There is one element that makes my dreams special, the element lacking in the dreams of girls in other lands. And that element is behind each of my dreams lies the hope of opportunity. Only in America does this hope exist. Only in America could I dare to hope that my dreams would ever be fulfilled. America is the land of opportunity, the land of dreams come true.

Over 350 years ago, in another land, there existed another dream. This dream conceived in a land of oppression and monarchy, was the dream of a free nation. It was this dream that helped our forefathers as they crossed the ocean in the *Mayflower*, suffering hunger, storm, and disease. It was this dream that brought them through that first winter, when food was scarce, and Indian attacks were everyday things. This dream grew and prospered, until it now stands as a brilliant symbol of the greatest nation on earth.

Yes, my dreams are special, because I am an American. Only in America will my dreams have the opportunity to grow and develop into realities. Only in America could Edison's dreams of the electric light have existed. Only America would allow the dreams of Thomas Jefferson, Jonas Salk, or Robert Frost to develop into the important achievements that they are today. Our Nation was born of a dream. This dream was behind Washington at Valley Forge. Behind "our boys" at Okinawa, Iwo Jima, and Pork Chop Hill. This dream brought about the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation Proclamation, the Constitution of the

United States. This dream inspired the speeches of Daniel Webster, Thomas Paine, Samuel Rayburn and all of the other great statesmen who dedicated their lives to the duty of making America and her people the free individuals that they are. This dream makes America's waters bluer, her pines taller, and her wind fresher and freer than that of any other nation on the face of the earth.

And yet, America is more than a dream, she is reality in its truest sense. She is a living, prospering, symbol of prosperity, justice, truth, and brotherly love. She is "One nation under God."

She is my Nation, the Nation in which I invest all my hopes, my dreams, and even my future.

And so, with this in mind, I return once again to my dreams. And perhaps I have gained a better understanding of my Nation, of her past, her present, her future, her hopes, her dreams, and of what my freedom means to me.

Ban the Bombers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week the Chicago Sun-Times editorially endorsed H.R. 4058, which I introduced on February 21, 1963. This legislation would make the bombing of any building or other real or personal property a Federal offense.

It is my earnest hope that the Judiciary Committee will give serious consideration to my proposal. I believe the editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times very convincingly spells out the reasons this legislation should be approved.

It is most encouraging to see a responsible newspaper like the Chicago Sun-Times take a positive stand on this much-needed legislation. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a great privilege to call the attention of my colleagues to this very fine editorial.

The Chicago Sun-Times editorial follows:

BAN THE BOMBERS

Last week Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois, asked the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee for reports and an early hearing on H.R. 4058, a bill sponsored by PUCINSKI.

PUCINSKI's bill would make the use of explosives to damage or destroy any building or other real or personal property a Federal offense. The bill creates the rebuttable presumption that the explosives used in the bombing were transported in interstate or foreign commerce with the knowledge or intent that the explosives were to be used for such purposes.

The Sun-Times questioned Representative PUCINSKI about applying the same logic of rebuttable presumption of interstate commerce in every other crime. PUCINSKI takes the stand that bombings are peculiar and special unto themselves in that this is a premeditated crime, not only against an individual, but against the entire community. Speaking from his years as a Chicago newspaperman before PUCINSKI went to the Congress he further noted that for the most part these bombings are done by hired mobsters

who come into Chicago from out of State and who leave the State jurisdiction after the crime to avoid detection and arrest.

If the bombing of a place of business—or, as covered in PUCINSKI's proposed bill, "any building or other real or personal property used for educational, religious, charitable, residential, business or civic purposes"—were to be made a Federal offense, as kidnaping was, the bombers would think twice. It is one thing to terrorize and bomb a helpless restaurant owner. It is quite another to take on the full might of the Federal Government.

A businessman has the right, under the Federal Constitution, to conduct his business without the interference of syndicate hoodlums. PUCINSKI's bill (H.R. 4058) is a good one and should receive the support of every businessman in Chicago.

U.S. Aid Calls for Attack on Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the *Deseret News* and Salt Lake Telegram of Salt Lake City, Utah, on Thursday May 10, 1962, in which the distinguished Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare gave warning of grave danger to the people of our beloved land from the fearful amount of poisoned and toxic substances which we are inserting into our waters today.

U.S. AID CALLS FOR ATTACK ON POLLUTION

The United States still hasn't solved water pollution problems which have arisen during the postwar period, said James M. Quigley, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare during a visit to Salt Lake Thursday.

Mr. Quigley, who is here to dedicate a water pollution laboratory, said "We would be kidding ourselves if we thought we had solved the problem."

He referred to such homely pollutants as detergents, which were unknown before the war, and said these are real problems for water sanitation.

INSECTICIDES, TOO

"Insecticides and pesticides are also a problem," he said. These have increased in use among farmers since the war, and are being washed into the Nation's streams.

"These poisons are 'potentially a real problem and could develop into a serious situation soon in some areas,' he said. "It depends on the water supply available."

He said the country had not developed adequate techniques to take care of these pollutants. "For those problems that existed before the war all we have to do is be more vigorous in our enforcement," he said.

DIFFICULTY OF VIRUSES

Another problem which has defied technology is treatment of water with viruses in it. To date there is no evidence that these are harmful, but sometime the country will have to find a means to filter them, he said.

Speaking at the dedication Thursday afternoon, Mr. Quigley said the "Federal Government has the resources, the scientific capabilities and the enforcement power to clean up all our Nation's streams and keep them clean.

1963

Testimony indicated that our various Government agencies are doing a creditable job in expanding foreign trade but more must be done. Expanding our foreign trade so as to provide a stimulus to our economy and to help in solving the balance of payment problem is one of the most important tasks facing us today. Small business should be encouraged and helped to participate in foreign trade to the fullest extent possible and I so pointed out to agency, bureau, and department heads which appeared before our committee.

Taxes and Political Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, fiscal responsibility, self-discipline, balanced budget, debt reduction and other sensible economic principles for the proper conduct of Government may not be out of style. It may be too much to hope but it is possible that those elected and appointed officials who believe it is politically wise to be for every appropriation and against every tax may be displeasing to an awakening public.

True, some witnesses testifying on the tax bill before the Ways and Means Committee tried to have their cake and eat it by saying they were both for a tax cut and a balanced budget, by accepting a transitional deficit, but some knowledgeable and influential representatives flatly stated that tax cuts must be earned first by a balanced budget.

So it is that I would like to point out the editorial in the Wall Street Journal which bears on this point of tax cut and fiscal responsibility for politicians and constituents alike.

LEAVES FROM A POLITICIAN'S HANDBOOK

One of the most persistent cliches about democracy is that the thoughtless masses, being given their head, would run headlong to disaster by whooping it up for all spending by the Government while howling down the taxes.

This has been the stereotype fear of philosophers about America since the beginning, moving De Tocqueville to concern and Emerson to indignation. "Of all debts," said the man from Concord, "men are least willing to pay the taxes. What a satire on government."

For politicians this thought has been a cynical truism. The successful officeholder, so it is said, is the one who votes for all appropriations and against all revenue measures. And in the politician's handbook, nothing is supposed to be more sure-fire than a tax cut.

So it has been fascinating to watch the parade of witnesses before the House Ways and Means Committee on the pending tax-cut bill, which in the words of one of its proponents was going to have the voters with their tongues hanging out.

True, there have been few witnesses not in favor of reducing the burden of taxes on the people. Economists, labor leaders, businessmen, all have testified to the stultifying effects of the present taxes on their personal affairs and on the growth of the Nation itself. If the question were simply a yea or nay on tax reduction, the tax cuts would win hands down.

But the question is not so simple. For what is actually proposed is that taxes be cut while spending is increased, the result being a deficit in the Government's account of at least some \$12 billion and very likely much more. And the truly amazing thing is that witness after witness, looking at the facts, is resisting the temptation the administration has put before him.

Most of the support for the presently proposed tax cuts, and this is the quaintest irony of all, has come from some professedly learned economists, who presumably should be the men standing against the tide of the masses clamoring for more spending and less taxes. The people whose self-interest should make them in favor of the proposal, according to the cynic's cliché, are the ones opposing this apparently lovely gift.

Their opposition, moreover, is based on something more than a Puritan ethic. As Roger Fleming, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, put it, "If the Federal Government expenditures are increased, a tax cut means more deficit financing, an increased national debt, the threat of inflation, and a loss of confidence in the soundness of the economy, which would discourage investment and prevent sound economic growth." Dr. Charles Walker, of the American Banks Association, was equally outspoken on the present proposal. "If the Congress cannot find effective ways to prevent the planned increase in spending . . . the entire tax proposal should be rejected."

Not all the people Congress has been hearing from have been so economically informed in their arguments. But every Congressman has noted with astonishment the number of letters instinctively opposing bigger spending and smaller taxes simultaneously. If there's a clamor for this fiscal proposal it has not been heard on Capitol Hill, which may explain why many Congressmen are losing their enthusiasm for it.

All this doesn't necessarily mean that the solemn plausibilities of its proponents may not carry the day; whatever the mind says, each man's heart hopes for lower taxes and hopes that he anyway can come out ahead. Certainly it doesn't mean we aren't going to get the bigger spending, the smaller taxes, and the bigger deficit all together. It will still take a brave politician to say "Nay."

Nonetheless, we find this public mood a rather heartwarming reply to philosophers gloomy about the commonsense of the common man. And maybe—well, just maybe—somebody is going to have to rewrite the politician's handbook.

Kennedy Talks One Way to Cuban Patriots, Acts Another

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has mastered the art of being on both sides of an issue. The current one is what to do about the Cuban refugees who are patriotic enough to risk life and limb for a free Cuba.

We all recall the dramatic visit the President made to Miami to welcome back the Cuban prisoners of war, whom the President himself had helped to become prisoners. He promised them that some day there would be a free Cuba. This promise is reminiscent of the many

others made during the campaign of 1960, very few of which have been kept.

In today's New York Herald Tribune, Roscoe Drummond, who can hardly be called a rightwinger, brings into bold perspective what Mr. Kennedy is doing to the freedom lovers he loudly proclaimed, before a TV audience, he wanted to help:

REFUGEES VERSUS CASTRO: A PUZZLE TO AMERICANS: WORDS AND DEEDS ON CUBA

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Many Americans must feel both confused and frustrated by the difference between what the administration says about Castro's Cuba and what it does.

Unquestionably President Kennedy seeks the goal of a free Cuba. He told the released Cuban invasion prisoners on their return to Florida that he was confident that their battalion flag would fly victoriously in Havana.

But when those Cubans hit at the Castro and Soviet forces, the President wants them to stop it.

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON tells the graduating class of the Inter-American Defense College that we "cannot be content until communism is gone from Cuba."

But when the Cuban refugees, who are intent upon wresting their freedom from those who have taken it from them, take action to do something about it, the highest officials of the administration express only disapproval.

Thus far President Kennedy has given no adequate explanation as to why he does not want the anti-Castro Cubans to fight the Castro-Soviet forces at any point they can make contact.

Until the administration makes a more persuasive case against the Cuban refugees' harassing their oppressors every chance they get, my instinct is on the side of the refugees.

I think a good case can be made that the refugee raids are useful and that we ought not to discourage them or stand in their way.

We say we want the Castro regime overthrown. We say that only the Cuban people can bring it about. With those two conditions, who is to begin the process unless it is the Cuban refugees?

You may believe that the hit-and-run raids are only insignificant, hectoring pinpricks. So were Castro's first hit-and-run attacks on Batista. The only way to begin is to begin.

Remember Hungary? Surely any prudent man could have told the latent and fermenting Hungarian freedom fighters that it would be fantastically foolhardy for them to consider attacking the occupying Soviet tanks with their bare fists and handmade grenades. But they did. You couldn't have prevented them. And despite the ultimate repression, it was a revolt for freedom which was worth all the bravery that went into it. Hungary is better off today for it.

Admittedly there are risks for the United States in the Cuban hit-and-run raids. Castro might sink an American boat in a spasm of anger. But might it not be better to deal with such an incident than to say that the Cuban freedom fighters must not decide how they shall fight for their freedom?

The administration has said it "will not be content until the last of Soviet forces are withdrawn from Cuban soil." It can be honestly argued that the refugee raids may provide an excuse for Moscow to keep Soviet troops in Cuba. The opposite may be nearer the truth. Is it likely that finding things calm in Cuba will provide any incentive for Mr. Khrushchev to call his troops home?

In 1960 Mr. Kennedy proposed that we should do more to help the Cuban resisters "both inside and outside Cuba." Now that the refugees are regaining their morale after the Bay of Pigs, it seems ironic, at the very least, that the United States should send the FBI and the Coast Guard after them.