

How broad a coverage can be glimpsed by these additional incidents. In early 1963, a Castro agent was apprehended in a New York City apartment possessing a suitcase filled with visa applications and other documents which would aid fellow agents to gain illegal entry into the United States.

From Caracas, Venezuela, in February of this year came news of another type of smuggling operation which again pointed toward the activities of U.S.-based Castro agents. By accident, on board the U.S.S. *Santa Rosa* were found 1,000 mail pouches filled with pro-Castro literature. The literature had been printed in and shipped from Miami, Fla.

Just as Puerto Rico has served as an important way station for Castro agents to enter the United States, it has also served as a transit point for still another sort of smuggling—that of narcotic drugs.

In December 1964 three Castro agents were arrested at Miami Airport—one of them a Cuban, Mario Carabeo Nerey. Treasury officials in Puerto Rico said Carabeo Nerey was engaged in drug traffic. How large the traffic is can be measured by the fact that between January and November 1964, narcotics agents seized 697 pounds of drugs being smuggled into the United States from Cuba. This was an increase of over 450 pounds seized during the previous year. Included in this amount was heroin, shipped to Cuba from Red China.

In January 1965, a New York police inspector, Ira Bluth, was quoted as saying: "Marihuana used to come to New York almost entirely from Mexico, but recently large amounts of the drug have been discovered coming from Cuba."

On January 15, 1965, Oscar H. Reguera and Elidoro Martinez were taken into custody in a New York motel with \$3 million worth of cocaine in their luggage. Martinez is believed to be a Castro agent.

Aside from the obvious harmful effects addiction to these drugs creates, the major purpose behind the smuggling of narcotics into the United States by Castro agents is to raise money to finance an insurrection in Puerto Rico.

Castro's DGI is working in concert with Puerto Rican Communists and militant splinter factions of the Puerto Rican independence movement, accelerating their attacks against the social and governmental structure of the island. Since 1961, a number of Castro-supplied arms caches have been uncovered. Gun battles have been fought between the police and insurrectionists, and Castro agents have infiltrated both exile and student groups, their purpose to stimulate the kind of rioting which would require armed intervention. Should this happen, the cry for independence, which 97 percent of the Puerto Rican electorate rejected in the November 1964 elections, would take on a more critical meaning. This is so because the strategy of the movement is tied directly to the November 20, 1964, vote of the United Nations Committee on Anticolonialism. The Committee voted 17-6, in direct violation of a 1963 General Assembly ruling, to place the demand for Puerto Rican independence on the U.N. agenda (WR 65-4).

This act played directly into the hands of Castro's DGI and Puerto Rican extremists—two of whom are presently members of the Cuban U.N. mission.

When the General Assembly convenes again, there is little doubt that agitation and propaganda will be stepped up in New York and San Juan, with the possibility of more violent actions erupting in Puerto Rico.

SCOPE OF THE EFFORT

Recently, the Puerto Rican newspaper *El Mundo* estimated that since 1960, 12,000 Americans and Puerto Ricans have received subversive training in Cuba.

We cannot attest to the accuracy of the figures nor can we say how many of that number are under the orders of the Cuban

Directorate of Intelligence. Although we do not have Castro-trained guerrillas operating in our country as a number of the Latin American countries presently do, we can say that intelligence and law enforcement agencies here and in Puerto Rico take the efforts of the DGI most seriously.

Of course, the publicly known cases outlined in this report can only give an indication of what is afoot. Hoary historians such as Toynbee may look down upon the world and view it from the vantage point of centuries. Unfortunately, we who have to live in the world from day to day and face its reality cannot afford cute analogies of mice and elephants with regard to Castro and ourselves.

In part II of "Castro's Subversion in the United States" we will show how Castro's American supporters, by using the techniques of agitation and propaganda; by forming front groups; by infiltrating the civil rights movement; and by attacking our foreign policy are winning important victories in what can best be termed the psychological hot war.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, over the last 2 or 3 years, many concrete and constructive proposals in this field have been made by Members of both Houses of Congress. Unfortunately, the Johnson and Kennedy administrations have chosen to ignore them completely. This is most unfortunate, for the simple fact is that the longer we procrastinate in establishing a specific policy to eliminate communism from this hemisphere, the more difficult it will be to bring about such an accomplishment.

One year ago, I stated that the time was coming very quickly when we would be forced to take more positive action than had theretofore been the case, or else we must stop talking about the preservation of freedom and liberty. In recent weeks, our Government has seen fit to take firm and resolute steps in the Dominican Republic, and in this action has received strong support from the overwhelming majority of the American people and their elected Representatives. This action is, at best, only a stopgap measure, however, for the preservation of freedom in the Dominican Republic, and in itself will have little effect upon the Cuban Communist Government.

The need still exists, and grows more urgent each passing day, for this administration to develop a positive policy with regard to the Castro government, to inform the American people of that policy, and to move resolutely to implement it. We have committed our young men, our national prestige, and our military and economic might to the preservation of liberty in Asia. Just recently, we have shown a willingness to prevent the establishment of a second revolutionary Communist government in Latin America. These are positive steps. Now let us follow through, and assert our leadership in the development and augmentation of a policy not only to stop the growth of communism in the Western Hemisphere, but also to reestablish throughout this hemisphere the right of self-determination. The administration will have my support, as I am certain it will have the wholehearted support of all other Members of Congress, in any such positive action it undertakes to reinstate freedom and independence to the long-suffering Cubans.

WHY MUST THE TAXPAYER SUBSIDIZE IMMORALITY?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, an interesting article appeared in the April 1965 issue of the Reader's Digest entitled "Why Must the Taxpayer Subsidize Immorality?" The article was written by Mrs. Juanita Kidd Stout, the first elected Negro woman judge in the United States. I ask unanimous consent that this informative, thought-provoking, and challenging article be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Reader's Digest, April 1965 condensed from Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin magazine]

WHY MUST THE TAXPAYER SUBSIDIZE IMMORALITY?

(By Juanita Kidd Stout)

During the years I have been a judge in the Philadelphia County Court, I have learned a great deal about people on relief and about the people who hand out their checks. Frequently I have been outraged by both.

Last year there appeared before our court a child of 13 years who shortly was to be delivered of a baby fathered by her uncle. For at least 10 years her family had been on relief—with a succession of men fathering a succession of children. The girl's 14-year-old sister had produced an illegitimate baby at 13; another older sister had borne an illegitimate child at 14.

But nothing had been done by welfare workers to take these girls, their brothers and sisters from their depraved home. In fact, one caseworker had filed a written report with the court stating that the mother was providing a "fairly adequate home" for her seven children.

On another occasion, a young man was brought before me on a charge of not supporting the child he had sired out of wedlock—nor was he contributing anything to the support of his own wife's five children. He had not held a steady job in 10 years and had been on and off the relief rolls. I asked his caseworker if anyone had insisted that this healthy man find work. The answer was, "It is not our job to insist."

I said, "This man has completed 11th grade. He is neither stupid nor incapacitated. In the last 10 years a great deal of grass has grown, a good many snows have fallen. Has no one directed him to a lawn mower, a snow shovel?"

The caseworker said no.

I then told the young man that if he failed to get a job in 2 weeks, or to prove that he had tried to get work by visiting 25 places of potential employment, he was going to jail. Four days later he reported back. He had a job.

In another case, a man brought before my court on the charge of failing to support three illegitimate children told me he had been "permitted" by a relief worker to set up a household with another woman. I didn't believe him, but investigation proved he was telling the truth.

The man was a part-time chauffeur and a partial relief recipient. Both women involved were receiving grants. When I called on the caseworkers of the man's two paramours for testimony, I learned that they indeed had knowledge of the situation. Not only that, but a supplementary grant had been approved for paramour No. 2, reimbursing her for \$45 in "household money" she had used as bail to retrieve her lover from behind bars.

This shocks my conscience—moral as well as financial.

The tragedy of relief is that it takes away from people the drive to work. When a person is capable of earning only \$45 a week, he may be all too willing to accept \$45 from public assistance for doing nothing. I have the deepest sympathy for the good mother struggling to bring up her children on a welfare grant, and for the father who wants but cannot find work. But I deplore a system that regards the handing out of checks as its prime function, that subsidizes the lazy and immoral home with the taxpayer's dollar.

Teenage boys have appeared before me on charges of delinquency, and I have asked them what their fathers did for a living. Their answer: "We get a check from the State."

I get a check from the Government, too. But there is one big difference; I work for mine. Too many youngsters in welfare-supported families never learn the value, the joy, the necessity of work—seeing, as they do, their fathers lying in bed until 10 in the morning, and hearing the family finances discussed only in terms of "waiting until the check comes in."

Many social workers contend that the purpose of welfare is to keep families together. In my opinion, a good institutional home would be far better for the growth and development of children than an unfit private home where a child sees promiscuity, crime and vice, where the welfare check is used for everything but the child's support.

It is my suggestion that we provide dormitory facilities for these pitiful children, especially in the urban areas where the need is most acute, and that the public-assistance law be amended to provide grants for the children's support during the period of dormitory living. There our deprived youngsters would get the benefit of the taxpayer's dollar. They could be supervised in their studies and recreation. From there they could attend local schools. Each would have a clean bed, a warm meal and a light to read by—things many of them have never known. In the end, such a plan probably would be less expensive than our present system—or lack of system.

Social workers object to institutional care "because youngsters need mother love." They should sit in court with me and hear, day after day, the stories of some of that love: no genuine affection, no supervision, no conversation—nothing but a succession of "boarder" men.

There might be less need for special facilities if more of those involved in administering relief programs were concerned with seeing that a child has a decent upbringing. Certainly, welfare workers have heavy case-loads. But no achievement of substance comes easily, and the result of the extra effort can be inspiring, especially when you are dealing with human lives.

A few years ago five young girls involved in the slashing of another youngster in school were brought before me on a charge of delinquency. Some were from homes supported by welfare grants. None had had any previous contacts with the court. I decided on an experiment: I made each write an essay on the meaning of being a lady; each was told that she must volunteer 100 hours of work in a hospital, a library or a home for the aged. And each must make a proper skirt, not tight and short like those they had worn in court.

These girls did not only everything the court assigned—but more. They learned the joy of work and of doing for others. They kept coming back even after I had released them from probation, and continually asked me: "What can we do next, Judge Stout?" None has been in trouble since. Two are now married, two are still in school, and one is working.

What these girls needed was helpful direction. Why didn't they receive such aid from a welfare worker before they came before our court?

No child, no adult, can remain on probation in my court unless he learns to read and write. (In Philadelphia we have third- and fourth-generation illiterates on relief.) Moreover, I will not hear the case of any boy, any man, who appears before me with his shirttail out, his hair unkempt. Neatness makes an astounding difference, not only in appearance but in outlook.

Certainly, I have the great prod of a jail sentence to get men to look for work, women to care for their children, and youngsters to keep out of trouble. But those who administer the welfare programs have as great a prod—the check.

It seems to me that attendance at free adult schools, to learn to read and write, should be a prerequisite of getting welfare money. If I can demand that a man bring me a list of 25 places where he has applied for work—or proof that he has enrolled in a training program—before I pass sentence in nonsupport cases, I believe welfare departments also can and should insist that he actively seek employment. If I can make it a part of juvenile probation that every youngster in my court bring me a study record signed by his parents or guardians, and his school report cards, why cannot a case-worker check such things?

Much can be done by welfare workers to lift people from the welfare environment. For example, there is a great need for women in service jobs today, not just in homes but also in hospitals, office buildings, and plants. A program could be developed whereby the best mother in a block—or perhaps the two best—would take on the day care of the small children while the other mothers took training and got jobs. The baby-sitting mothers would be paid by the working mothers, and all would be functioning as a part of our society.

I know as well as any social worker that the deplorable homes in our urban centers are breeding and multiplying indolence, illegitimacy, disrespect for law. I know, too, that the collection of relief checks is becoming one of the big occupations in this country. I believe strongly that a moral atmosphere in the home should be a factor in determining eligibility for welfare. An immoral home should not be subsidized.

I grew up in Oklahoma and earned my first money from prizes for my 4-H vegetable garden. Earning this money was enormously important to me. My mother and father always worked harder than they had to, and they taught me the value of work. To this day, my mother, who is 81, works in her garden. And when I go home to visit, she still repeats to me—although I am now 46—the same maxim she spoke over and over to me as a child.

"Juanita," she says, "make yourself useful."

I want no more and no less for every American than the fulfillment of my mother's advice to "make yourself useful." If we have lost certain parents in this generation because of the dependency bred of our welfare programs, let us not also rob so many of our youngsters of this heritage, this privilege—this right to usefulness.

COMMUNIST PARTY 1956 PLANS FOR VOTING-RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, recently, I called to the attention of the Senate an article written by the distinguished columnist and former Ambassador to Switzerland, Henry J. Taylor, on

the subject of the pending so-called voting-rights legislation. In the article, Mr. Taylor made this statement:

It's astounding, but true, that the Communist Party, U.S.A., actually planned the Johnson administration's Voting-Rights Act of 1965.

He then quoted from a newsletter, printed by the American Flag Committee in December 1956, telling of the Lincoln project, which in the newsletter is described as a "blueprint for chaos." Here is the material which Mr. Taylor quoted from the newsletter:

To implement the Lincoln project, the Communist Party's Central Committee will begin to dispatch agents to 11 Southern States next month (January 1957) to work with local party leaders in surveying 20 counties, any 1 of which might be ideally suited as a target for disorder early in 1965.

This survey will continue through 1957, the Central Committee making the choice of 20 counties * * * with the final selection to be made on the estimated most favorable conditions prevailing in 1965.

The legislation which the party will seek from Congress in 1965 has already been prepared by its legal staff. It provides for elimination of all educational requirements, including minimum literacy tests, as qualifications for voting in Federal, State, and local elections; voids residence with respect to counties, municipalities and other political subdivisions within a State, and establishes a system of direct Federal supervision and control of the local county, State, and Federal elective process.

Since publication of Mr. Taylor's article, I have sought to obtain a copy of the newsletter which was printed in 1956, and which told of a Communist plan to cause a voting-rights crisis in 1965, in order to stampede Congress into passing such legislation. I have now obtained a copy of the 1956 newsletter; and I ask unanimous consent that it, together with the Taylor article, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks. The author of the newsletter has proved himself to be quite a prophet. I understand, however, that he makes no claim to be a prophet, but only states that he reported in 1956 the facts, as given to him by a Communist Party member, about Communist Party plans for 1965.

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

[Newsletter from the American Flag Committee, December 1956]

THE LINCOLN PROJECT—BLUEPRINT FOR CHAOS

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: A Red-dominated and directed third political party, with its ground-base voting strength centered in Dixie and the teaming urban areas of the key electoral States of the North, is the ultimate goal of a long-range operation which the Communist Party, U.S.A., will launch in January.

Details of the plan, if permitted to evolve unhampered, will not become publicly apparent for several years, during which party agents will be laying its groundwork. Its active phase, which will be marked by widespread civil disorder throughout the South especially, has been timed to coincide with the centennial year of the assassination of President Abraham Lincoln, more than 8 years hence. For this reason, it has been referred to as "the Lincoln project," which may or may not represent its official party designation.