

allowance. The three-fourths time and one-half time allowance authorized by my bill would be \$80 and \$55 monthly.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to resoundingly approve this bill, H.R. 14954, providing vocational rehabilitation training to service disabled veterans on a part-time as well as a full-time basis. Presently a disabled veteran can participate in this program and receive training allowance only if he trains full time.

Experience has shown that some disabled veterans have family responsibilities which preclude them from participating in vocational rehabilitation training on a full-time basis. The option of part-time training would allow many of these men to learn a skill.

Other veterans, while able to perform some type of gainful employment despite their disabilities, would like to participate in such training on a part-time basis, in order to improve their employment status. Except for their disabilities, these men would most likely have been able to attain more lucrative jobs and thereby achieve higher standards of living. Thus, they should be permitted to take vocational rehabilitation on a part-time basis while they are employed so that they can achieve the positions and income they might have attained but for their service-connected disabilities.

Obviously the purpose of this bill is to extend simple justice to those who have sacrificed much for this country and I hope it will be given the unanimous approval of this House.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, we have before us today a bill that would help thousands of disabled veterans to develop new job skills.

I want to voice my vigorous support for this bill—H.R. 14954—and to urge its swift enactment into law.

The bill, a proposed amendment to title 38 of the United States Code, would amend this title to allow disabled veterans to take part in vocational rehabilitation programs on a part-time basis as well as full time. Currently the title prohibits part-time participation in these programs. This restriction, Mr. Speaker, is clearly unfair. It presents many disabled veterans with a bleak dilemma: either leave their present jobs to take part in vocational rehabilitation programs full time, or abandon the rehabilitation programs entirely. Many disabled veterans, despite their disabilities, hold jobs that increase their morale as well as their bank accounts. Clearly they should be allowed to keep these jobs while participating part time in vocational rehabilitation programs that lead to better jobs. Many other disabled veterans—those not employed—have family responsibilities that prevent them from joining rehabilitation programs full time. These men, too, should be granted the opportunity of part-time activity in vocational rehabilitation.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 14954.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 14954.

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.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 15387, relating to assaults on postal employees, passed this afternoon without controversy by a vote of 333 for and 5 against.

Had I been present for the vote on final passage today, Monday, May 20, 1968, on the bill relating to assaults on postal employees, I would have voted "yea," thus to protect our good postal employees.

THE RECENT RIOTS IN WASHINGTON

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I know of no city or people in America that has had to endure more than the city of Washington and its people when this town was struck by rioting, arson, and looting a few weeks ago. Many reports were heard to the effect that the servicemen, National Guardsmen, and policemen who were put upon the streets were instructed not to load their weapons and not to shoot looters, arsonists or rioters even though the acts were committed in their presence.

Mr. McMILLAN and the House District Committee saw fit, as a result of these reports, to make some inquiry into the matter. I think this inquiry was most appropriate. I think a contribution was made toward having perhaps better protection of the public and the property thereof should the riots break out again. Many think a renewal of the riots is quite possible. Evidently the city fathers think there is a great possibility of such as they testified before the committee that preparations were being made for a "show of strength" on the streets in a minimum of time if such did break out.

This morning I noticed in the Washington Post—I seldom look at the Post, incidentally, but this was called to my attention—a report that it was my view that the police should be authorized to shoot suspects "indiscriminately." I may be a pretty bad fellow—and the Post seems to think so—but I am certainly not that bad. I never made any such suggestion, and the Post knows this. However, when considering the character of journalism usually resorted to by the Post, no one would suspect it of pursuing a policy of accurate reporting. And I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that I am flattered not to be within the realm of its favor.

I did suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Public Safety Director Murphy forced the police to play it "soft." His own testimony reflected as much. He never denied it. His policies left this city and its people at the mercy of the hoodlum element and it also left them endangered to a renewal

of the riots, looting, and arson. If there is any doubt that Mr. Murphy stands at the bottom of the totem pole with the police and the people of this city then the Post editorial writers and others who may be in doubt need only take a look at my District of Columbia mail and answer the telephone calls made to my office.

Most of the people realize, whether the Post does or not, that they are living under very dangerous circumstances and in a very tense situation. Millions of dollars worth of property and lives are endangered. The economy of Washington has been stagnated as a result of the recent riots and the method by which they were handled. Hotels are not near to capacity as ordinarily at this season of the year. Restaurants are suffering from the same lack of business. We used to see thousands of young high school children going through this magnificent building at this time of year, so heavy that you could hardly go from one end of this Capitol to the other. The hallways are empty. Conventions are being canceled, up through the year 1969. This is all because the policy of Mr. Murphy, who carries the title of Public Safety Director, is such that the public does not feel they are safe on Washington streets.

Everyone in this city, except possibly the Post, knows this city is in deep trouble. This we all regret. We ought to be ashamed of it. For one, I am, although I am not in the slightest responsible for it. Who could be proud of the opinion which the rest of the Nation and the world have of this city at this time? The Post might be, but indeed no one else is.

I simply want to see a safety policy adopted here where people will feel that their lives are safe and their property will be protected.

I must say to the Post that the hoodlums may burn Seventh Street, 14th Street and U Street today, but they could burn the Post tomorrow, and they just might do it.

Then the Post will be crying out in agony "Where is the law?"

Cuba CUBAN INDEPENDENCE AND CASTRO'S CUBA

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on Independence Day, it is customary to evoke memories of the patriots who risked life and fortune to secure their nation's liberty. The hardships they bore are recalled, with gratitude for the legacy of freedom that their courage and convictions made possible.

CUBA'S REVOLUTIONARY HERITAGE

Today is Cuban Independence Day. The long and bitter struggle to rid Cuba of Spanish tyranny is rich with the heroism of such leaders as Maximo Gomez, Antonio Maceo, and Jose Marti, and countless ordinary citizens endured several decades of strife so that future generations of Cubans might be free to forge their own destinies.

In the bloody but unsuccessful Ten Years War which lasted from 1868 to 1878, 200,000 lives were lost. But the Cuban people refused to accept Spain's arbitrary rule. In 1895 they revolted again. This time Spain resorted to herding thousands of men, women, and children into concentration camps to prevent them from aiding Cuba's rag-tag guerrilla forces. In Havana Province alone, 50,000 died in the infamous camps from inadequate food and disease. Still the Cuban people fought on against Spain's massive and better-armed forces.

UNITED STATES AND THE CUBAN REVOLUTION

Deeply moved by the writings of Jose Marti, Cuba's great "apostle of freedom," Americans felt a special affinity and compassion for the Cuban people. Marti, after taking refuge in New York in 1881, worked unceasingly to rally his countrymen against Spain's arbitrary rule, to raise money for arms, and to win understanding among Americans. His eloquence helped to arouse strong sympathy in the United States which was instrumental in America's decision to intervene against Spain.

According to the current Cuban regime, U.S. intervention was designed to steal Cuba's freedom at the very moment victory was in sight. But the facts belie Castro-Communist attempts to denigrate Cuban-American friendship by rewriting history. When the U.S. Congress did call for intervention in 1898, the Senate passed without debate the Teller amendment, which declared:

That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over the said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

Certainly, U.S. economic and strategic interests were considerations in the intervention. But the temper of the American people, as reflected in the Teller amendment, was antimperialistic. In fact, the United States did withdraw from Cuba and did set up an independent state, a remarkable demonstration of altruism in an epoch when the principal powers of the world were scurrying to extend their holdings in the backward and weaker regions of the world.

When, at last, the flag of the sovereign Republic of Cuba was unfurled in Havana on May 20, 1904, the event was greeted joyfully throughout the Western Hemisphere for it marked the eradication of the last vestige of Spain's colonial power in the Americas.

On the anniversary of that joyous day, this House of Representatives has traditionally paused in its deliberations to join our Cuban neighbors in celebrating their victorious battle for independence, in which the United States played a role, albeit small in comparison to the sacrifices and heroism of the Cuban people.

CUBAN INDEPENDENCE DAY STILL RELEVANT

With Castro in the saddle and the Cuban people again deprived of control of their beautiful homeland, it may seem ironical, even irrelevant, to commemorate Cuban independence.

Indeed, Cuba no longer is an independent nation. Castro can rail against the Soviet Union's tactics of "peaceful co-existence" in Latin America. He can denounce the Kremlin's attempts to trade with Latin American countries whose governments Fidel regards as enemies. He can demonstrate his contempt for Soviet policy by sending a low-level delegation to Moscow for the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. He can boycott the Kremlin-sponsored Budapest Conference last February where the Soviet Union hoped to line up supporters against Peking. He can imprison old-guard Cuban Communists caught complaining to Russian envoys about his erratic economic policies and revolutionary adventures. But for all Castro's bombastic show of independence, Cuba remains perilously dependent upon the Soviet Union. By simply dallying on the shipment of petroleum, the Kremlin could paralyze the Cuban economy.

With Cuba converted into a Soviet satellite, Cuban Independence Day is no longer an occasion for rejoicing. Nevertheless, Cuba's struggle for independence from Spain remains pertinent today. In that prolonged battle, the Cuban people proved their mettle. They demonstrated that they will not long endure tyrannical rule, and that they are prepared to make great personal sacrifices to achieve freedom.

Despite all Castro's efforts to indoctrinate the young with totalitarian Communist doctrine, I am confident that Cuban pride in Cuba's own ideals and martyrs will eventually cause a revulsion against the foreign dogmas and the gallery of imported gods—the German Marx, Russian Lenin, Argentine Che Guevara, and Vietnamese Ho Chi Minh—which Castro has imposed on the anguished Cuban people.

UNITED STATES CANNOT REMAIN ALOOF

Meanwhile, the United States cannot remain aloof from the Cuban tragedy. As long as Castro and his Communist cohorts retain power, Cuba will remain a threat to the Western Hemisphere, for two reasons: first, because of Castro's determination to spark guerrilla warfare in Latin America; and second, because of the possibility that the Soviet Union may again, in presently unforeseen circumstances, deem it advantageous to install nuclear armaments in Castroland.

Then, too, there is the question of the Cuban people. The inter-American regional security system was organized and designed to prevent the domination of a member state by a foreign government. It is futile to play the game of hindsight, and even now it is not at all clear that the Organization of American States could have prevented Castro, then riding a wave of hysterical popularity, from marching Cuba into the Communist camp. Nevertheless, the Organization of American States, and the United States as a member of the OAS, cannot evade their responsibilities to the Cuban people. Our policies, therefore, must be designed not only to prevent Cuba from becoming a military threat to the Western Hemisphere and to block Cuban-based subversion of other Latin American coun-

tries, but also to quicken the day when the Cuban people themselves oust the tyrant.

U.S. POLICY OBJECTIVES

I believe that U.S. policy toward Cuba has been well formulated. Our policy objectives are aimed at achieving the following objectives:

First. To see that Cuba does not menace our strategic power, as during the October 1962 missile crisis;

Second. To strengthen the Latin American nations, through collective political, military, and economic measures, so that they may resist Communist subversion;

Third. To limit Cuba's ability to subvert Latin America;

Fourth. To increase the cost to the Soviet Union of maintaining a Communist outpost in the Western Hemisphere;

Fifth. To demonstrate to the peoples of the American Republics that communism has no future in the Western Hemisphere; and

Sixth. To deny the Castro regime the wherewithal and success it requires to consolidate itself firmly within Cuba, thus making clear to the Cuban people and to elements of the power structure in the Castro regime that the present government cannot serve their interests.

POLICY HAS BEEN EFFECTIVE

To date, our Cuban policy has been remarkably effective.

To guard against any attempt to re-introduce offensive weapons into Cuba, the Strategic Air Command's U-2's continue to overfly Cuba as needed. Also, radar and photographic reconnaissance is carried out along Cuban coasts. These operations, as well as our steadfast refusal to deal with Castro, constantly remind the Soviets that the United States considers its vital interests to be a stake in Cuba and will not tolerate any threat in the Caribbean to our total defense posture. The message seems to be getting through loud and clear to the Kremlin. We must keep signaling the Soviets lest they forget the lesson of the missile crisis and again underestimate our resolve in that area.

TERRORIST-INSURGENCY CAMPAIGNS STIFLED

Meanwhile, our policies with respect to limiting Castro's ability to subvert other countries in Latin America have been demonstrably effective. The United States has worked continuously with individual governments in the region to help them to improve the ability of their police and armed forces to deal with terrorism and insurgency. In addition, the United States and Latin American governments are cooperating with increasing effectiveness in exchanging intelligence on Castroite subversive activities and improving communications between their security forces.

The capture and execution of Che Guevara by Bolivian counterinsurgency forces last October was a devastating blow to Castro's plan to ignite violent revolutions throughout Latin America. Che was the most renowned Latin American theoretician on guerrilla warfare. His treatise on do-it-yourself revolution was the bible of young malcontents and

May 20, 1968

self-styled messiahs throughout Latin America. When Guevara dropped from sight, international speculation as to his whereabouts heightened his mystique. Given Che's stature in the world of violent revolutionaries, his capture in Bolivia by what had widely been regarded as the most feeble armed forces in South America was a humiliating defeat.

But Che's ignominious end was only the last of a long line of Castro-inspired failures. Guerrilla campaigns in Guatemala, Venezuela, Colombia, and Peru, which the Cubans hailed with a fanfare of extravagant propaganda, have been wiped out or reduced to marginal proportions.

OLD-GUARD COMMUNIST PARTIES BACK OFF FROM CASTRO

Meanwhile, the stiffened resistance to terror and insurgency on the part of Latin American governments has had an important side effect. As it became increasingly clear that guerrilla-terrorist campaigns were not going to succeed, were frequently suicidal and was antagonizing the masses, the leadership of the old Soviet-oriented Communist parties in Latin America backed off from supporting Castro's revolutionary strategy. This has infuriated Castro. He now argues vehemently that armed warfare against the "imperialists" is the only test of a person's revolutionary ideology.

Castro's thesis, which challenges the right of each national Communist Party to decide its own strategy and tactics, has sharpened dissension between him and old-guard Communist parties in Latin America. Their marriage has soured to the point where none of the experienced Communist leaders showed up last August in Havana for the meeting of the Latin American Solidarity Organization, Castro's vehicle for aiding and abetting revolution in the hemisphere.

The falling out among thieves does not mean an end to robbery. Nevertheless, Castro's split with the old-guard Communist parties in Latin America does deprive him of the Communists' organizational skills, their manpower, and their financing. Castro is thus thrown back on his own resources to realize his dream of turning the Andes into a vast Sierra Maestra.

POLICY OF ECONOMIC DENIAL EFFECTIVE

Those resources, thanks in part to the United States and hemisphere policy of economic denial, are now practically nonexistent. Our blacklisting of ships that call on Cuban ports, the OAS sanctions against any trade with Cuba, and our own efforts and those of a number of Latin American countries to persuade nonhemisphere countries to refrain from trading with Cuba, have been devastatingly effective.

Cuba is particularly vulnerable to this type of pressure. Prior to the Castro regime, Cuba's imports from the free world—principally the United States—represented more than 30 percent of its gross national product. These imports were vital components of Cuba's economic prosperity, consisting primarily of industrial goods and equipment, fuel, raw materials, and foodstuffs. Furthermore, Cuba's industrial installations, its

powerplants, sugar mills, and transportation equipment all were of Western origin. Without replacement parts, Cuba's industrial plant has rapidly deteriorated.

The much publicized sales of British buses, French locomotives, and Spanish boats are annoying, but these are infrequent departures from the rule. In fact, a large number of sales to Cuba have been blocked, a fact which we can't broadcast without offending the involved countries. But Castro himself is painfully aware of the effective economic blockade hemming him in. In a speech at Havana University on March 14 he complained:

There is no single country whose trade relations with the rest of the world have been cut to a higher degree by the imperialists [that's us]. Many times it is not even a question of having the reserves. Sometimes the reserves are available and there is no place to buy, or one must buy at much higher prices.

This "imperialist" says, "Great." The policy of economic denial is hurting the Cuban regime, and hurting badly. But what is the policy meant to accomplish and are its ends being achieved?

The policy has several goals. It is aimed at tarnishing Castro's image in Latin America as a revolutionary hero who can bring the millennium by clubbing up with the Communist bloc.

It is intended to cripple the Cuban economy to the point where Castro has no handy cash with which to engage in subversive activities elsewhere in Latin America.

It is designed to put the full burden for subsidizing Castro's follies on the Soviet bloc in order to dampen Russian enthusiasm for underwriting any new Communist revolutions in Latin America.

Finally, it is directed at denying the Castro regime the success it needs to consolidate itself in Cuba.

The economic denial policy, along with Castro's own spectacular mismanagement, is proving remarkably effective. The Cuban economy is in dire straits. The forced industrialization by which the Castro regime was going to free Cuba from dependence upon sugar failed when Castro's theoreticians discovered that Cuba lacked the basic raw materials. So it was back to the drawing board, and Castro's planners made the brilliant discovery that Cuba's future lay in its agricultural resources, particularly sugar production.

You will remember that early in the Castro regime, Castro and his associates floated the canard that the United States was responsible for Cuba's lopsided dependence upon sugar, because we had made sugar production so attractive by allotting the island a huge sugar quota at above world market prices. By their cockeyed definition, that was "imperialism." But by 1964, Castro was promising that Cuba would produce 10,000,000 tons of sugar by 1970. Since then, he has promised all manner of goodies by 1970: to abolish rent and housing payments; have half a million students above the primary grades; have 40,000 agricultural technician graduates; even to abolish money.

But the economy cannot even run

without a Soviet subsidy, calculated at \$350 million a year. Cuba needs a minimum of about 1.5 million tons of sugar in free market exports to pay for purchases like a recent \$48 million fertilizer plant from Great Britain. It needs another 400,000 tons for home consumption. That means that Castro must subtract about 2 million tons from the crop before he can meet his commitment to Iron Curtain countries for bartered items, chiefly heavy machinery and oil. Most experts agree that this year's harvest will not top 5 million tons. Since Cuba already owes the Soviet Union about 2½ million tons for past transactions, Castro is going deeper into hock to Russia and will not have much sugar, if any, with which to earn hard currency on the open market to buy other essentials.

Can Cuba meet Castro's promised 10 million ton annual sugar harvest figure? It is highly improbable. Planned mechanization has failed. Soviet canecutters have been producing less than one-sixth their estimated daily quota. After the machines got into operation last year with great fanfare, the Cubans found that they were not suitable. Furthermore, they took far more support equipment than needed to serve human canecutters. And all that mechanized equipment burned oil. In addition, the new "reception centers" Castro's planners set up in the fields to collect, clean, and chop the cane before it is sent to the mills all burn oil. When these tasks were accomplished in the mills, they were often done by steam power from boilers heated by bagaz—dried cane.

Meanwhile Cuba, as Fidel Castro was forced to announce on the January 1, 1968, anniversary of his takeover, is confronted with a paralyzing shortage of petroleum products. In an uncharacteristically short speech—only 1 hour and 40 minutes—a subdued Castro told his audience: "The Soviet Union has made a considerable effort to keep us supplied with fuel"—to the extent that in 1967 162 tankers arrived in Cuba, one every 54 hours—"but all appearances indicate that the possibilities of this country supplying us with fuel at the rate of increase of our necessities are limited."

Castro claims that the direct petroleum shortage is due to increased domestic consumption. It is more likely that inefficient consumption in Cuban industry has contributed to the shortage, while known refinery breakdowns have helped. Metal fatigue and corrosion have made the three U.S.-built Cuban refineries run a combined breakdown rate of about 60 days per year. For over a year and a half, Cubans have been frantically shopping in Canada, Japan, and Europe for replacement parts.

Just how disastrous the fuel situation is was revealed by Raul Castro in a May Day speech, when he declared:

The party Central Committee this year decided not to have the same mobilization as the previous ones but to carry it out by using the civil defense organization system for the purpose of giving a practical test to the plans prepared for wartime. To this end, a pilot plan was organized at No. 8 people's farm in Bayamo, in which tractors and trucks were replaced by plows, teams of oxen, and farm wagons, eliminating all kinds of machinery

May 26, 1968

and transportation vehicles that consumed fuel . . .

Based on this experience we will copy this system on a local basis and in the various agricultural activities throughout the nation until we get the most precise idea possible of how much we can produce without a single drop of fuel or with an indispensable minimum of fuel if it became necessary.

Stripped of jargon, Raul is telling the Cuban people that he and his brother have succeeded in moving Cuban agriculture back at least one-half century, under the pretense of practicing for wartime.

In similarly whacky terms, the Castro regime seems to have solved the problem of unemployment. In 1957, the sugar harvest took 93 days. In 1967, the harvest was spread over 129 days, with a massive mobilization of manpower. Schools were let out so that young people could help cut cane. Women were encouraged to take men's jobs to free the men to work in the fields. The militia and reserves were mobilized to haul cane. Some 40,000 political prisoners were pressed into service. What matter that Cuba produced 22 percent less per day in 1967 than a decade before, everybody in Castro's Communist paradise was working hard for the fatherland—or so says Castro's script.

Is everybody in Cuba happy on a daily diet of exhortations and slogans?

Food is stringently rationed in a land where it had been plentiful. Per month, people are allowed only 3 pounds of rice, 1 pound of beans, 1 pound of lard, one-fourth pound of butter for children under 8 years of age. The meat ration is one-fourth pound per person every 2 weeks when available, and one chicken per family every 3 months. The coffee ration is 1½ ounces per person per week. Only children under 6 years and the very old are permitted fresh milk, 1 liter of skimmed milk a day. Recently, a ration has been set at one beer or one soft drink per month.

The clothing situation is equally disastrous. Women may buy one dress, one petticoat, three pairs of stockings, and two brassieres per year. Men get only one pair of trousers, one shirt, one undershirt, two undershorts per year.

Signs of real trouble for Castro are appearing. There have been continuous food riots from one end of the island to the other. In some cases, the armed forces have had to be called in and, in sympathy with the people, have shown a real reluctance to bring force to bear. In one instance, in February, about 70 stevedores in Havana refused to load food and powdered milk aboard a Soviet vessel destined for Vietnam and were hustled off to prison by soldiers. Recently, horrendous graffiti are being scrawled in public restrooms. Among the nonobscene appear: "Hunger," "Fidel, traitor," "Down with Russian imperialism."

There is as yet little tendency toward organized sabotage or resistance. The more dispassionate observers report that the Cuban people seem to be in a stupor. But individual Cubans now and then vent their feelings by dropping a wrench into machinery; sailors and railroad men urinate in the bulk sugar. Another telling sign is reported by incoming Cuban refu-

gees. Members of the Committees for Defense of the Revolution, the neighborhood block spy system, have begun to tell refugees departing Cuba words to the effect, "Remember, I never mistreated you."

Castro, in a kind of stream-of-consciousness passage in a speech at Havana University on March 14, indicated that even he is beginning to harbor doubts about Marxism-Leninism. With a weird plaintiveness, he said:

We must say that many militant revolutionaries went through the so-called revolutionary instruction schools, which were in fact schools for the purpose of revolutionary instruction. Philosophical matters were taught—the elements, the fundamentals of Marxism—and of course this is useful, it is necessary, and good. But there was also something that the revolution has taught us, since the revolution is, after all, the most formidable teacher for revolutionaries, and that is the abyss, the enormous abyss that at times exists between philosophy and reality. Above all, it has also taught us to what extent the manuals are becoming antiquated, are becoming something anachronistic, since often they are incapable of saying a single word on the problems the masses ought to know about.

Often they become abstract generalities, vague and without content. You think you have a really trained militant and what you have is a militant who is ignorant about many of the most serious problems of the contemporary world.

It must also be said that there is much of cliché, little stereotyped phrases, and something more . . . some lies. This is something which unquestionably has had an influence on that certain weakness in training—instruction—to which our masses are still subjected. We understand that a more complete and better understanding of these problems would be helpful. Of course there is not much literature within Marxism on these problems. It would be well if those who in some way can do something, those who in some way can tell something, would ponder in what problems and in what manner we must give our people more profound revolutionary training.

But if Castro had any doubts about the Communist path he had led his countrymen down, later in the same speech he plunges ahead anyway, more papal than the Pope.

There still remains among us—

Said Castro—

a real scum of privileged persons who live on the work of the others and who live considerably better than the rest. We believe—

He went on to the cheers of the audience—

that we must firmly propose to put an end to every parasitical activity that still remains in our revolution.

Who were these scum, these parasites, living in luxury? They are, it turns out, street vendors and the owners of small bars and hole-in-the-wall businesses.

If the situation were not so tragic, Castro's speech would be hilarious, a perfect script for an Alex Guinness lampoon of a beserk tropical dictator playing at being a Communist. According to Castro, and I quote:

A series of investigations and statistical analysis were ordered, for the party's benefit, of the material different comrades had gathered to acquaint ourselves and give us a concrete knowledge of the problem and to undertake solutions involving the social and

economic nature of our revolution. This study was made by CTC (Central Committee of the Communist party) militants . . . For this study the CTC members undertook all types of research with the cooperation of the comrades from the vigilance front of the CDR's (the neighborhood spies).

What kind of research? With respect to the bars, Castro enumerates the following:

Who they are, who buys where they buy, how much they make, what they do, who frequents them, and what they discuss. They themselves cannot even imagine. We have their names and everything else.

And what did the loyal Communist militants turn up in their investigations of the Cuban bars? Castro tells it with a straight face:

The outstanding type of sale is alcoholic beverages . . . Seventy-two percent of them are opposed to our revolutionary process. Sixty-six percent of the customers who frequent these places are antisocial. None of these businesses provide any social benefits for the people.

It would be of interest to social scientists to know how the militants determined if a customer was antisocial. I can see one of the investigators slipping on to a stool beside some poor guy and asking him, "How goes it, Chico?"

The man replies, "Well, not so good. It's been a bad day?"

"Why, what's the matter?" the secret investigator asks companionably, as strangers are wont to do when sipping a drink side-by-side at a bar in old Havana.

"Well," the unknowing victim responds, "that wife of mine is giving me a hard time. Gripe, gripe, gripe. No meat, after waiting in line 3 hours, no medicine for her mother; no shoes for the kids. As if I can do anything about it." Out comes a black notebook, into which the investigator chalks up the customer's crimes: antisocial; counterrevolutionary.

Castro went on to inform his audience that an investigation was made regarding the "political integration" of 2,056 owners of private businesses in Havana Province and metropolitan Havana. Then he declared:

The greatest percentage of those who were not participating in the revolution was among the owners of fried food stands, where out of 41 individuals who reported the information, 39 of them, 95.1 percent, were counterrevolutionaries.

Castro then proceeded to relate what he called a "specific analysis of the fried food sellers." Here I must quote Castro at some length, for if I paraphrase, you will think I have got to be kidding. Said Castro:

In this work a special study was made of a group of individual stand operators who sell fried and other food. The most widely sold article is egg omelet, generally bread with egg omelet. Of the 50 establishments investigated, 43 of them sold omelets. This is due to the easy acquisition of the materials. In second place are fish croquettes and rolls. After these come French fries. Sold in lesser amounts are stuffed potatoes, fritters, and sardines. In others, shrimp, fish, squid, hamburgers, sugarcane juice, cigars, matches, milkshakes, candy, coffee, and soft drinks are sold. The study made in these cases was made by a group of extraordinarily interested militants. These studies bring into prominence the political importance of finding a solu-

tion to the problems created by this mercantile infrastructure, one which appears where the state organizations do not give adequate service to the people. The lumpen find suitable means for making profit and living from all vices, exploiting the rest. We have 10 cases which clearly illustrate these problems.

The upshot of this incredible parody of social science research was Castro's decision to shut down 57,600 little businesses. But he gives no inkling of how he intends to replace their services which he himself admitted sprang up "where state organizations do not give adequate service to the people."

Castro is right on one score. He desperately needs some guidance to bridge, in his words, "the enormous abyss that exists between philosophy and reality." But that bridge in communism has yet to be built and probably never will be. So at this stage Castro could use a psychiatrist.

Why, Castro-watchers speculate, did Castro close the little shops and street stands? Certainly, their expropriation could bring nothing of economic value to the regime—a mess of pots and pans, some irons, perhaps a cache or two of pre-Castro scotch.

Most observers think Castro needed a new whipping-boy to spur flagging revolutionary fervor. He had to make a speech on March 14, the 11th anniversary of the assault on the Presidential Palace. But everything was wrong. The economic screws stayed tight on the island. The economy was paralyzed. His Soviet mentors, while not cutting back on petroleum shipments, had refused to step them up to bail Cuba out of its ominous petroleum shortages. His goal of 10 million tons of sugar in 1970, now only 2 years away, looked less promising than ever of fulfillment. Then there were all his other promises, also unfulfilled and each year obviously less likely to materialize. Even Castro, in his speech, mentions for the first time, "a certain unrest and spreading of rumors." Then, too, there was the end of his pretensions to lead all Latin America in a glorious Communist revolution. With Guevara's death, the Soviets backing off from violent tactics in favor of peaceful coexistence, and young Castroite adherents from Latin America dropping down to a trickle, Castro was deprived of his rallying cry to the Cuban people that they would show Latin America the way. He could still dredge up the Bay of Pigs and the threat of a U.S. invasion, but after 7 years, and no subsequent fireworks, this was getting to be a rather stale substitute for meat and bread. Castro needed to create a new enemy of the revolution, hence the crackdown on the hole-in-the-wall businesses.

Then, again, Castro may just simply be a purist who cannot stand to see 57,600 individuals making a living in Cuba's barren economy.

Whatever the reason, Castro may find that his move was counterproductive. In one swoop, he created an army of unemployed. The able bodied have been carted off to cut cane, but after the harvest? And contemplate, for a moment, those closed bars. Where is a man going to go to blow off steam?

In short, the policy of economic denial is accomplishing its goals. First, Latin Americans can see Castro's Communist experiment for what it is: an absolute dictatorship, with even that cherished right of Latin American students, university autonomy and student representation, eliminated; a nation of conscript labor, the people deprived of individual freedoms and enduring great privation. As a result, Fidel is no longer the "Pied Piper" of the Latin American left.

Second, Cuba's collapsing economy can ill afford to undertake subversion on a scale which could seriously menace Latin America.

Third, there is every indication that the Soviet Union and Eastern European block countries have learned a lesson from their Cuban experience and are not eager to repeat the experience.

Finally, the current dissatisfaction and unrest is a sign that Castro is not firmly in the saddle. The recent trial and imprisonment of some 40 old guard Communists, who were trying to get the Soviet Union to exercise pressure on Castro to get some rationality into his erratic policies, is an additional measure of the growing disillusionment with Castro within Cuba.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

While strengthened security measures in the hemisphere and the policy of economic denial have proved effective in countering Castro's militant subversion, forceful means alone will not safeguard Latin America. The belated impact of the industrial and technological revolutions on traditional societies in the region is ripping apart old institutions, in many cases before new ones can be built to replace them. There may be no completely successful policy which the United States can bring to bear on rapidly moving, unstable situations, but maintenance of the status quo is out of the question.

I am convinced, therefore, that the concept of the Alliance for Progress is valid. The United States must continue to press for the goals of the Alliance for Progress in order to channel revolutionary fervor toward ameliorating intolerable political, economic, and social conditions in a democratic manner—to cut off at the pass, so to speak, the dangerous demagogues and Communist conspirators. While operations of the Alliance for Progress can probably be improved in many ways, the concept still remains the best policy for promoting democratic, stable countries in Latin America, capable of defending themselves.

Clearly, solutions to Latin America's myriad problems will take longer than the 10 years originally stipulated in the Charter of Punta del Este. President Johnson has stated that the United States is prepared to extend the period. I agree. I see no alternative to the multilateral framework for cooperation established by the Alliance except the chaos of more than 20 rudderless countries in the hemisphere, directionless, or even at cross purposes, and easy prey for the determined Communists.

Even though the Alliance for Progress has not attained all its ambitious self-imposed goals, I think it has proved its value. I do not believe its accomplish-

ments can be measured solely by the numbers game, that is, by the numbers of schools, houses, and hospitals built, the per capita rise in GNP, or the number of cooperatives established. Nor can the Alliance be declared a failure by pointing to the white elephants it has promoted. We have to look at the broader picture. Despite Castro's appeal to the downtrodden to grab guns and Molotov cocktails, no Latin American country has suffered a protracted civil war or succumbed to communism. There is, of course, no way to determine what influence the Alliance for Progress has exercised on the situation. But I am convinced that the Alliance has been an important factor in providing some direction and hope in the region, thus blunting the appeal of the extremists.

THE FUTURE OF CUBA

To sum up, I believe that the United States is following the right general course of action toward Cuba. Castro's attempts to subvert Latin America are being frustrated. The Soviet leaders have come to recognize the determined strength behind the U.S. presence in the region. The serious economic and political problems which Cuba has raised for Moscow have dampened the enthusiasm of the Kremlin leadership to defend and subsidize another satellite in the hemisphere. Thus, the challenge once posed by Communist Cuba to the hemisphere has been greatly reduced.

But what about the Cuban people? There are now roughly a half million Cubans in exile. Since the Cuban airlift was established in December 1965, 100,000 people have used that route of escape from Castro's tyranny. Another 120,000 have signed up for the airlift, in itself an act of courage and desperation since all those who register their desire to depart lose immediately their employment and become dependent upon the charity of friends for months, even several years, until they can get space on the airlift. Only those with relatives in the United States can take advantage of the airlift. Other Cubans still are risking their lives on makeshift boats and rafts to find a haven in the United States. Some Cubans make a run to Guantanamo Base through an area heavily guarded by Castro's militia.

There are many Cuban refugees in my district, making a significant contribution to the life of the area. A number of them feel embittered that the United States and/or the Organization of American States have not forcefully removed the Castro regime from Cuba.

While sympathizing with their longing to return to a democratic Cuba, I do not think an invasion from outside will achieve the goals we all desire. Indeed, an invasion might give Castro the rallying cry he needs to unite Cuba's restive and wavering populace. For, however insane Castro's policies have been, Cuban nationalism remains ardent.

Furthermore, we cannot ignore the question of Soviet involvement. The Soviets have a dilemma in Cuba. Moscow hoped to make Cuba an example for other countries in Latin America, as well as a base for propaganda, training of agents, and other subversive activities. But, as we

have seen, Cuba is a poor showcase for communism, and the stiff policy of containment has reduced Cuba's usefulness as a base of subversion. Meanwhile, Castro's insistence on promoting guerrilla warfare throughout Latin America goes against the new line the Soviets want to follow—to keep progressing gradually until conditions for takeovers materialize. Consequently, Cuba has become a political as well as economic liability to the Soviet Union.

But for the time being, Moscow cannot just drop Cuba. Cuba is the only extension of the Communist world not achieved under the shadow of the bayonets of the Red army. It is the only country in the half-century since the October revolution that gives any substance to Communist Claims that the world Communist resolution is inevitable. Furthermore, Cuba represents a great accomplishment for the Soviets in having established a Communist regime only 90 miles from the United States, the heart of the capitalist world. Cuba is also important to the Soviet Union in the context of the Sino-Soviet contest for leadership of the world Communist movement. The Kremlin cannot allow Cuba to slip from its influence to the Peking camp.

Castro knows all this and has taken great liberties in challenging Soviet leadership. The disagreement between Russia and Cuba is now serious. While each country has good reasons to bear with each other a while longer, each seems to have drawn a line and is daring the other to step over. Given Castro's temperament, it is not inconceivable that he will be unable to control himself and will overstep the limits of Soviet patience. Castro, himself, in his Havana University speech on March 14, warned that his Soviet backing is insecure, saying:

We have to think first about ourselves and believe only in ourselves, always ready to sell our lives very dearly without expecting anybody to come to defend us.

In this situation, an invasion of Cuba, with all the preparations such a maneuver would necessitate, would almost certainly force the Soviet Union to give massive support to the Castro regime to avoid being denounced before the world by Peking for deserting a dependent satellite. This would only breath new life into Castro's floundering regime.

But if outright invasion of Cuba is, at least for now, not a recommendable policy, neither do I believe we should let up our pressures on the Castro regime. Occasionally there is some talk about recognizing the regime as a fait accompli, and normalizing our relations with the island. In my view, there should be no resumption of relations with Cuba as long as Castro is in power.

Castro has been in power for 9 years, a long and tragic nightmare for the suffering people of Cuba. But, as the history of the Cuban revolution for independence demonstrates, the Cuban people will not endure tyranny for very long. Castro, thrashing around now for some way to extricate Cuba from the economic morass he created, stripped of all his pretensions to revolutionary leadership, quarrelling with his Soviet mentors, and forced constantly to take more oppres-

sive measures to keep the lid on, will one day know the wrath of an anguished people.

And the spirit of liberty lives on. Dedicated and brave Cubans outside of Cuba have pledged themselves to fight constantly to free Cuba from communism. On January 23, 1966, patriotic and free Cubans reaffirmed their faith in the principles of liberty. In the very same San Carlos club, Jose Marti proclaimed Cuba's independence from Spain in 1893. In Key West, Fla., on that historic day in 1966, 1,500 Cubans gathered to proclaim their new declaration of freedom. Their declaration is a reaffirmation of faith in the principles of liberty which once inspired the people of Cuba to throw off tyranny:

THE DECLARATION OF FREEDOM

In the city of Key West, Monroe County, State of Florida, United States of America, we, the Cuban exiles in the United States, in the name of God Almighty, and speaking both for ourselves and the oppressed people in Cuba, the Martyr Island, do say:

That on January 1st, 1959, the slavery yoke that came from Europe and was extinguished in Cuba at the end of the 19th century, was resumed.

That those responsible for this high treason to our Fatherland and to our People are just a score of traitors who, usurpating the Government of the Country have been acting as mercenary agents for the Sino-Soviet Imperialism, and have surrendered to that imperialism our Freedom and our Dignity, also betraying the American Hemisphere.

That as a consequence of this high treason, those who are usurpating the Power in Cuba (as they were never elected by the People), are imposing a regime of bloodshed, terror and hate without any respect or consideration to the dignity of the human being or the most elementary human rights.

That in their hunger for Power, these traitors, following the pattern of totalitarian regimes, are trying, within Cuba, to separate the Family, which is the cornerstone of actual society, and at the same time, are poisoning the minds of the Cuban children and youth, in their hope of extending the length of time for this abominable system.

That the rule of the Law has been wiped out in Cuba, and it has been replaced by the evil will of this score of traitors, who are acting under orders from their masters, the Sino-Soviet Imperialists.

In view of the foregoing, we declare:

First: That the actual Cuban regime is guilty of high treason to our Fatherland and to the ideals of the Freedom Revolution which was started on October 10th, 1898.

Second: That this score of traitors who have committed treason against our Fatherland, in case they survive the downfall of their regime, will have to respond, even with their lives before the Ordinary Courts of Justice of Cuba.

Third: That as the Noble Cuban People will not ever surrender because that Nation was not born to be slave, we, the Cuban People, hereby make the present declaration of freedom.

We hereby swear before God Almighty to fight constantly, until death comes to us, to free Cuba from communism.

The fundamentals of this Revolution for Freedom are:

First: God Almighty, above all things, in Whom we believe as the essence of Life.

Second: The Fatherland, with all of its Laws, traditions, customs, and history as a spiritual value, only surpassed by the concept of God.

Third: The Family, as the cornerstone of the Human Society.

Fourth: Human Rights, for each and every citizen, regardless of race or creed.

Fifth: The Law, as the foundation for the proper development of the Human Society.

Sixth: Democratic Government, with its three independent branches: Legislative, Executive and Judicial.

Seventh: Representative Democracy, through the exercise of Universal suffrage, Periodically, Free and Secretive, as the expression of Popular Sovereignty.

Eighth: Freedom of Worship, Freedom of Teaching, Freedom of the Press and Free Enterprise.

Ninth: Private Property and Ownership, as the basic expression of Liberty.

Tenth: The improvement of living conditions for both rural and city working masses, with the just and necessary measures, keeping in mind the legitimate interests of both Labor and Capital.

Eleventh: The derogation and eradication of anything which is opposed to the political and religious fundamentals aforementioned, and specifically, the abolition of Communism and any other form of totalitarian manifestation.

Signed and sealed in Key West, Florida, on the 23rd day of January, 1966.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the torch of freedom is passed from hand to hand and many hands shall one day proclaim its righteousness for the Cuban people.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I find it sad and ironic that on this day, the 65th anniversary of Cuban independence, the only Cubans who can celebrate the occasion are the ones not living in Cuba.

The degree of freedom and independence once enjoyed by the Cuban people has declined almost daily since Fidel Castro imposed his Communist government on the people of that island.

He promised them much, in spite of the fact that the standard of living in Cuba was one of the highest in Latin America. Yet he has delivered only poverty and hunger. He has all but destroyed the pride and spirit of the Cuban people.

He promised to turn Cuba into a land of milk and honey. But the fact is, you can hardly get milk in Cuba today. The rationing of food has resulted in an average diet that is below the daily caloric intake recommended as minimum by the World Health Organization.

The people of Cuba are actually hungry. And there is little in sight to indicate the situation will better itself in the near future. People between the ages of 5 and 65 cannot get milk and the ration for children under 5 has recently been cut in half. Bread, meat, and eggs are almost impossible to get.

The rate of stillborn births, mental illness, and malnutrition are rising.

And the people of Cuba are in a state of unrest because of this. There have been incidents of sabotage among the workers and there have been reports that even the students have protested.

The sugar and cattle that have been produced have been marked for export as Castro is more concerned about his image among the Communist nations of the world than the welfare of his own people.

Cuba has become the welfare puppet of the Soviet Union with no hope of breaking the economic strings which control her every move.

May 20, 1968

Castro will eventually go. We do not know when or how. But in the meantime the people of Cuba are the ones paying the price for Castro's personal ambition of joining the leaders of the Communist world on equal footing.

But he has failed here, too. He has taken a once prosperous nation, turned its economy upside down, and converted it into the beggar nation of the Communist world.

I can only say that I join the free Cubans—those who are not in Cuba—in praying that the people of Cuba will one day be able to celebrate a true Independence Day. When that day comes, it will be because the people of Cuba are no longer under the reign of communism.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject on which I have spoken.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WHY NO ROLLCALL?

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

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 16, by an overwhelming voice vote, the House of Representatives passed the central Arizona project bill. In my view it was approved with less than adequate consideration of the consequences of enacting a vast construction project at this time. In addition, the measure so casually passed by the House contains open-ended provisions for future expenditures that could cost billions.

Anytime a major, costly project such as the CAP, which is authorized specifically at \$1.3 billion, plus the indeterminate future provisions I mentioned, is being considered it seems to me a rollcall vote is in order. But when we are faced with the sort of economic crisis that we all know exists, and know must be dealt with vigorously, to refuse a rollcall vote is, in my view, irresponsible.

It should be pointed out that the economy bloc, the Members who invariably press for spending cuts and who are tireless in their opposition to the many programs designed to improve the quality of our life—this fearless band—was silent when the efforts were made to record each Member's vote through a rollcall.

Silent, too, were the liberals who have vowed opposition to a tax increase, tied to a large spending cut such as the one agreed to by the tax conference committee. Their reasoning is that most of the spending cuts will be taken from the very programs I mentioned before, the programs we need to save our cities and to make good our pledge to secure a society of equal opportunity for all. It is probably true that the spending cuts will mostly affect those endeavors, but I would hope that the spending cut burden

can be equitably distributed among all areas of Government spending. But anyone who thinks seriously about our current economic situation concedes the necessity for both a tax increase and spending reductions. What in heaven's name are we doing then, approving without even a record vote a new project that will cost more than a billion for sure, probably much more, while refusing to face the crying need of the economy for stability. To make this costly commitment so easily is irresponsible, and I am dismayed by the willingness of this body to yield to the temptation to add a cost that is surely deferrable to our overstrained budget while resisting every effort by a small group to require that each Member stand and be counted. If we believe in economy, let us show it. If we are for economy for some and not for others, then let us be clear on that too. The Poor People's Campaign will have a new and justified grievance if we can so easily authorize a billion three hundred million for the central Arizona project, and with the other hand cut back on the programs they seek to expand.

Mr. Speaker, had I been permitted to vote on H.R. 3300, I would have voted "No."

SUGGESTIONS FOR RESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include a statement by the Missouri Public Expenditure Survey.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Missouri Public Expenditure Survey, is an organization of responsible citizens, representing the business, professional and civic leadership throughout the State of Missouri, with its headquarters in Jefferson City.

My knowledge of the effective services rendered by this organization dates back some 30-odd years, when I was serving in the Missouri Legislature, and more particularly during the time when I was chairman of the appropriations committee of the Missouri Senate. At that time professional staffs of committees, trained and equipped to do the job of making in-depth studies to justify or deny requests of agencies of government, were practically unknown in our State. The Missouri Public Expenditures Survey, even with a very small staff, which started with merely a staff director and a secretary or two, was able to furnish members of the Appropriations Committees in both the House and Senate with reliable information concerning the justification for requests of boards, bureaus, and departments. They served a very vital need during that period and while I have not been as closely associated with, or as well acquainted with the operations of the organization as I was a few years ago, I was glad to receive in the mail today, a copy of a statement, unanimously adopted by the board of trustees of the Missouri Public Expenditures Survey, setting forth its position on the fiscal responsibility of the Federal Government, which appears to be deteriorating, and pointing up the need for Federal legisla-

tion to evaluate Federal expenditure programs.

Believing that there are still Members of Congress who concur with the views of the MPES, and hoping that other Members may be interested in the views of what I consider to be experts in this field of fiscal responsibility, I am including herewith a copy of the statement unanimously adopted by their board of trustees on May 15, 1968:

STATEMENT ADOPTED BY BOARD OF TRUSTEES MISSOURI PUBLIC EXPENDITURE SURVEY, MAY 15, 1968

The Board of Trustees of Missouri Public Expenditures Survey is seriously concerned over the state of Federal finances.

Another large federal budget deficit can be expected this fiscal year. Such deficits in the past have been contributing to inflation and to an unstable economic outlook. We note a worsening balance-of-payments situation. Attacks on the dollar continue.

Expenditures for domestic-civilian programs, totally unrelated to international and security requirements, have risen at a rate actually exceeding that of defense spending. The question as to whether or not the federal government has the self-discipline to place its fiscal house in order has been frequently raised. Expenditure reduction is generally regarded by economists as a more effective inflation control measure, dollar for dollar, than higher taxes.

While we favor the proposed federal tax increase, it will not constitute an adequate response to the acute federal fiscal problem unless it is accompanied by a substantial expenditure reduction.

We, therefore, support efforts being made in expenditures proposed for the fiscal year that starts July 1 and in those presently authorized for succeeding fiscal years.

Also, for the long run control of federal expenditures proposed for the fiscal year that starts July 1 and in those presently authorized for succeeding fiscal years.

Also, for the long run control of federal expenditures, we urge that Congress enact pending legislation to evaluate federal expenditure programs for the purpose of determining their effectiveness in terms of their present and projected costs, whether they should be continued and, if so, at what level, and the relative priority which should be assigned to programs in the allocation of federal funds with the intention that programs of lower priority be eliminated in the amount (or to the degree) necessary in order to bring non-defense spending in line with income.

IRON AND STEEL ORDERLY TRADE ACT

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, it is most urgent that this Congress enact an Iron and Steel Orderly Trade Act which I am cosponsoring along with many other Members of this House. Unless this Congress expeditiously passes this measure the iron and steel industry will soon be confronted with a situation that they are unable to control. If this Congress is interested in the welfare of one of the basic industries in this Nation and the resulting jobs and economic benefits created thereby it must with dispatch meet this problem head on.

The sharp increase in imported steel for this first 3 months of 1968 exceeds last year's imports for the comparable

period by 41 percent. This alarming increase is seriously affecting employment opportunities in the steel industry in Ohio and is threatening the economy of the Midwest even more seriously than other parts of the Nation.

Foreign steel is making such inroads on domestic production because foreign governments accord certain concessions and subsidies to their industries for exports. As an example, Mr. Speaker, Japan is establishing an export quota for its steel producers and those who do not fulfill their quota are denied the coking coal they need for domestic production or are penalized by \$28 per ton for every ton not exported. Another example is the great variance in trade barriers. It costs \$33.73 in duties, levies, and taxes to ship a ton of auto body sheet from the United States to West Germany. That same product coming from West Germany to the United States pays only a U.S. duty of \$10.59.

Furthermore, the U.S. steel industry cannot compete with foreign wage rates. In 1966, the hourly cost of employment in the U.S. steel industry was over twice as high as the Common Market countries average and over four times that of Japan.

Although the U.S. steel industry spent over \$2 billion last year to modernize and improve its technology and is spending another \$2 billion this year and next, steel technology is international and foreign steel producers have the same technology and equipment.

The Iron and Steel Orderly Trade Act would not shut out imports but would provide a fair share of the market for imports—about 10 percent of consumption—permitting imports to remain at virtually their present percentage level. In addition, the legislation provides for a study of its effect on our national security, employment opportunities, and on our international balance of payments, and the Secretary of Commerce may then recommend that the legislation be repealed, modified, or continued in its present form.

The situation is serious and unless the Congress deals with this problem immediately, hundreds of thousands of job opportunities will be affected in the steel industry alone. Furthermore, each ton of finished steel requires 5 tons of raw materials from the ore and coal mines, limestone quarries; refractory, chemical, and service supplies thus affecting many additional job opportunities.

TRIBUTE TO TUNISIA AND ITS GREAT PRESIDENT, HABIB BOURGUIBA

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include an editorial.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times, it is understandable that the United States must necessarily be concerned with the realities of great power. However, it is also important for us to demonstrate to the world that we sincerely value the warm and friendly ties which bind us to nations and national leaders whose influence is not based on material wealth and military

power, but on the respect they have earned throughout the world for their intellectual, political, and moral integrity. Such a nation and such a leader are Tunisia and its great President, Habib Bourguiba, who is currently visiting Canada and the United States.

His views and the views of his Government were, I think, accurately described in an editorial which appeared in the Tunisian newspaper, L'Action, on the eve of President Bourguiba's visit to this hemisphere. In order that we might better understand our distinguished visitor, I insert a translation of this editorial in the RECORD:

TRANSLATION OF EDITORIAL FROM L'ACTION,
MAY 7, 1968

"Last year at this time President Bourguiba was supposed to make an official visit to the United States and Canada. This visit had to be postponed for reasons of health which each of us would rather forget. Today, President Bourguiba is ready to honor his commitments and his voyage is about to take place under happier circumstances.

To be sure, at Ottawa, a new government has just been installed and, in Washington, President Johnson has decided not to run again and will leave the White House during the first days of next year. But the friendship that ties Tunisia to these two countries is too deep, relations between them are too close, and the confidence which characterizes her understanding with the two capitals is too solid to be affected by such a change of leaders. The recent increase of assistance furnished by Canada to Tunisia, the ceaseless United States support to the Tunisian people during their struggle for independence, and the continuing aid to an independent Tunisia, speaks sufficiently for the permanence of this friendship, now becoming traditional.

The development of Tunisia will no doubt be at the center of conversations between the Chief of State and the Canadian and American leaders. This topic will be that much easier to talk about because, in Tunisia, the record of development is a subject of pride. Foreign assistance is put to good use and an entire people are hard at work, having decided to pull themselves out of underdevelopment at any cost. It is known across the Atlantic that Tunisia considers foreign assistance to be only a small part of its national effort, although it is greatly appreciated. Here, we count first on ourselves and then on our friends.

On the other hand, our constant concern is to promote, with the assistance of all our friends, the harmonious development of our country. There is no need for our leaders to go abroad appealing for arms or the strengthening of our armed forces. The only arms for which we are appealing are those that can aid us in combating underdevelopment, misery, and ignorance.

The conversations with Ottawa and Washington will take place while the negotiations at Paris, the harbinger of peace in Vietnam, are being prepared or underway. The courageous and spectacular initiative taken by President Johnson on March 31 will not fail to be emphasized.

This initiative reiterated the position so often proclaimed by President Bourguiba who has always spoken for a negotiated solution to the crisis.

Another crisis has continued for a year, or rather for 20 years, as a menace to peace in the world. The struggle undertaken by the Palestinian people after the failure of Arab states to reconquer their country puts the problem in its real perspective, that of a war of liberation. No action, no man, as long as he believes in moral values, can remain unmoved at this aspect of the conflict and President Bourguiba certainly will not fail

to make an effort to convince those with whom he has discussions of the justness of the cause of the Palestinian people.

It is thus a mission of good will that the Chief of State proposes to accomplish: to bring peoples together, to make the efforts and the image of Tunisia better understood, to defend the cause of justice and of peace.

Whatever be the misunderstandings and difficulties, President Bourguiba will have the occasion to prove once again that his fidelity to the friends of Tunisia is only equalled by his attachment to moral values."

COOPERATIVE EFFORT IN POWER SUPPLY FOR IOWA

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, this being my first term in this body, I was not an observer of or participant in the sometimes heated debates that have occurred in past years discussing the relative merits of investor-owned utilities as opposed to cooperative or public ownership of energy production and distribution facilities.

However, anyone conversant with national economic issues knows that the advocates of these two different philosophies too often were engaged in a bitter struggle working at cross purposes which distracted each from the primary objective of better and cheaper service to the public. In recent years, there has been an increasing realization on both sides that much more can be accomplished by joining hands in a common effort. This new spirit of friendly cooperation has nowhere been more in evidence than in my own State of Iowa. And today I am happy to report to my colleagues here in the House the formation of a new amicable working partnership between one of Iowa's largest private utilities and two of the largest power co-ops in the State, one of which, the Corn Belt Power Cooperative, with headquarters in Humboldt, happens to be in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. Together they serve over 265,000 customers in the same or contiguous areas in 70 Iowa counties. On Friday, May 10, officials of the Iowa Electric Light & Power Co., Central Iowa Power Cooperative, and Corn Belt Power Cooperative, completed signing of a statement of intent whereby the two cooperatively owned groups will become joint participants with Iowa Electric in the Duane Arnold Energy Center, nuclear powerplant to be built near Palo, Iowa. It will be the first time in the history of the Nation's electric power industry that investor-owned utilities and cooperatively owned power suppliers will share ownership of a nuclear plant.

Duane Arnold, president of Iowa Electric, who joined CIPCC's W. E. Adams and Corn Belt's Richard Buckner in the signing ceremonies, stated:

This is another progressive step toward making modern, abundant, and lower-cost electric power available to as many Iowans as possible, since it will broaden the sharing of the economies of the new 550-megawatt nuclear plant. From the time of their original concept, cooperative power groups