

upon the time of the gentleman from South Carolina for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion was made that cotton today is in trouble because of alleged mismanagement under the Benson administration. I would like the RECORD to show that cotton indeed was headed down the right road toward a sound and profitable basis under Secretary Benson.

When Secretary Freeman took office as Secretary of Agriculture, he raised the level of price supports for cotton. Under the program inaugurated by Secretary Benson the support levels were moving down toward the market levels, where they should be. This trend was reversed under Secretary Freeman. He saw fit to increase the level of price supports for cotton to 32½ cents a pound. He did this in his first year in office, and he announced just a few weeks ago that he was keeping the level at the same high, unrealistic rate. As a result, today we have more Government cotton in warehouses than we did when Secretary Freeman took office, and by August of this year, it is estimated that warehouses holding Government cotton will have about 10 million bales either owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, or under loan by the Commodity Credit Corporation. In either event, the responsibility and probably the ultimate property of the American taxpayer.

So one could not honestly and properly conclude that the American cotton farmer is in a better situation today than he was under Secretary Benson. He is indeed in a worse fix, and moving in the wrong direction.

The gentleman from South Carolina spoke of the desirability of eliminating the two-price system for cotton. That, indeed, was the objective and the final goal of the Benson program for cotton. Cotton was proceeding in that direction in an orderly manner until the advent of Secretary Freeman.

Since the 1930's, U.S. taxpayers have tried manfully to help the cotton farmer by: first, paying heavy export subsidies to keep U.S. cotton moving in world markets; second, buying, handling, and storing mountains of cotton through Commodity Credit Corporation; and, third, paying premium prices for cotton products.

Despite all this the cotton farmer has severe income problems, textile firms are at a disadvantage, and so are consumers and taxpayers.

Because taxpayers subsidize export prices, U.S. cotton sells much lower abroad than at home. This raw material differential causes U.S. textile firms to lose out to foreign competitors. Meanwhile the cotton farmer has restricted plantings and loses markets at home and abroad to synthetic fibers.

This Committee on Agriculture has considered a proposal which ostensibly would get cotton product prices back where they belong and at the same time help textile firms meet foreign competition.

Known as the Gathings bill, it would set in motion a new round of subsidies. It would let the Secretary of Agriculture pay a subsidy to mills, handlers or retail-

ers in order to make possible a cut in cotton product prices.

Under this proposal the taxpayer would continue to pay out money to keep raw cotton prices high, but would also start forking over—from the same hard-pressed pocketbook—other dollars to bring these prices back down, once the cotton leaves the farm.

Why does the bill specify that the new subsidy must go to somebody other than the cotton farmer?

Certainly, it would be a lot simpler, less costly, and more straightforward to send each farmer a Treasury check for 8½ cents for each pound of allotment cotton he raises. At least Congressmen and other taxpayers would then have a clearer notion of what is going on, and what it costs.

However, if other Congressmen find out this bill actually proposes to use tax dollars to force down prices that other tax dollars are forcing up, I doubt that it will pass. If made to mills, this subsidy would mean huge checks to big non-farm enterprises. Wherever spent, the subsidy would increase Government costs at a time when we are confronted with a budget \$11 billion in the red.

It would leave the small cotton farmer about where he is now.

The bill would permit above-allotment planting only if this does not increase stocks. Consensus seems to be this would rule out increased planting.

In my judgment the proposal is inadequate and ill-advised whether it passes or not. At best, it would leave both the textile mill and the farmer on an artificial base, subject to the changing whims of Government and unable to build a sound future in a realistic marketplace.

It would call for a new army of Federal inspectors, and make the land of cotton's legislative briarpatch even thicker.

HOW TO END THE COTTON HEADACHE

What is needed is legislation which will ultimately:

First. Enlarge income opportunities for the cotton farmer.

Second. Reestablish a one-price cotton market.

Third. Permit the cotton farmer to compete fairly with foreign competitors and synthetics.

Fourth. Get Government out of the cotton business.

To achieve these goals, I propose a 3-year program during which Uncle Sam would, first, sell the cotton surplus back to the cotton farmer at an attractive price in exchange for 1-year land-conserving agreements; second, step down the level of price supports to world price; and, third, increase plantings, with unrestricted planting after 3 years, at which time crop loans would be authorized at 90 percent of U.S. market price.

HOW IT WOULD WORK

Before planting time each year, the Secretary of Agriculture would make contracts with farmers owning allotment land. This would be on a voluntary basis—first come, first served.

The contract would entitle the farmer to buy at harvest time a quantity of Government cotton equal to his own annual production of allotment cotton.

The price—just low enough to get the desired participation—would be specified in the contract, with allowance for grade, condition, and location.

At harvest time the farmer would receive a cotton certificate. He would either sell it, or use it to claim the cotton at the designated place of storage.

In return for the attractive price, the farmer would agree not to raise any cotton that year, and to put to soil-conserving uses an acreage sufficient to produce a like amount of cotton. This acreage would be in addition to land he would normally leave idle or fallow.

The Secretary could not sell in any one year a quantity of cotton greater than 30 percent of the U.S. annual production would minimize hardship on industries and services dependent upon the cotton farmer.

Present estimates indicate the August 1 Government carryover of cotton will be over 9 million bales. Total Government commitment today is 8.2 million bales—4.7 owned, 3.5 under loan. Present production of cotton is about 14 million bales.

I propose that the surplus cotton be sold back to farmers at the rate of about 3 million bales a year.

In order to ease the transition from the present artificial pricing to competitive levels, I suggest these changes in price supports and acreage limits:

Crop year	Price support	Acreage limit
1963.....	30 cents.....	16 million.
1964.....	28 cents.....	17 million.
1965.....	26 cents.....	18 million.
1966 and after...	90 percent of market price. ¹	No limit.

¹ Ultimately a 3-year U.S. market average.

ADVANTAGES

Farmer income would be protected during the transition period, and after 3 years he would have the opportunity to compete fairly for expanding markets. He would no longer be hobbled with acre limits and artificial pricing.

The cotton farmer would, for the first time, be able to compete efficiently and effectively with synthetics.

Cotton mills would no longer be placed at a disadvantage by an export subsidy.

Today's surplus cotton would be converted to cash.

Government would be out of the cotton business in 3 years.

The heavy tax cost of buying, handling, and storing cotton would end.

Cotton supplies would not be disturbed during the sell-back period. Government cotton would not enter market channels until harvest time, and each bale entering then would be matched by a bale cutback in production.

Government domination of cotton would end. This proposal would grant no authority for Government to dump cotton on the market. It would place the marketing of Government cotton where it belongs: in the hands of the cotton farmer.

Taxpayers would have more money in their pocketbooks, and consumers would find shelf prices lower.

THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN'S ACT OF 1963

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing for appropriate reference and improvement of State programs of special education and related services for exceptional children through Federal financial assistance to such programs; to assist colleges and universities to provide special courses of instruction and scholarships; to establish research grants and special projects; and for other purposes. The short title of this bill is the Exceptional Children's Act of 1963.

If enacted into law, this bill would meet a long apparent and pressing need by making it possible for States and local communities to provide more adequately for the special education of their exceptional children—the physically and mentally handicapped and the gifted. In short, it would provide for a comprehensive program for the special education of physically and mentally handicapped children similar to the comprehensive program for handicapped adults already established under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act for many years.

We all know the outstanding record of the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program over the years, and we are justifiably proud of the accomplishment of this partnership between the Federal Government and our respective States in restoring a steadily growing number of our handicapped citizens to the working force of the Nation as useful and productive citizens. We know that this program has paid for itself many times over in terms of tax dollars these individuals gladly pay and in terms of welfare payments they do not have to receive. In calculating the true value of this program to our Nation, we must not overlook the rapidly increasing demand for skilled manpower which the technological age is making. Now and increasingly as we progress, the need for highly skilled workers regardless of physical handicap, will be great; and the vocational rehabilitation program is doing its part to fill this need.

Yet, we seem to have overlooked a vital step in this entire process—the provision of an adequate basic education to large numbers of physically and mentally handicapped children, so that they can progress into the vocational rehabilitation program with the fundamental education and skills which can be built upon through advanced education and training programs to provide the kind of productive people who have made our country grow and prosper.

Briefly, my bill would do the following: First, establish a program of Federal grants-in-aid to the States on a matching fund basis to assist them to establish and operate programs of special education for handicapped and gifted children; second, provide for extension and improvement grants to the States for special education programs;

third, provide for a program of grants to colleges and universities as well as to State educational agencies for scholarships and fellowships to train teachers and other specialized personnel needed in the education of exceptional children; and fourth, establish in the Office of Education a research and demonstration projects program in the education of exceptional children.

Most of these provisions embody the essential elements which have made the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program so successful for handicapped adults. In fact, the scholarship and fellowship provisions merely extend provisions of existing law to train teachers and leadership personnel needed in the education of mentally retarded and deaf children to cover teachers and other specialized personnel needed in the education of all types of exceptional children. I was pleased to be able to play a part in the enactment into law of these programs for mentally retarded children in 1958 and for deaf children in 1961; and I am proud to be associated with this equally meritorious effort to extend these programs to the blind, the orthopedically disabled, and other types of exceptional children.

The Council for Exceptional Children, in consultation with the major national organizations devoted to the welfare of specific disability groups played a major role in developing the provisions of this bill. Thus, the bill has extensive support from most of the national organizations concerned about the education of exceptional children—and their numerous local affiliates—interested in the special educational problems of handicapped and gifted children.

I commend this bill to all of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives as one worthy of the support of every Member in meeting a serious nationwide need.

BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Title I contains general provisions and declares that the maximum development of the potentialities of exceptional children through adequate provision of special education and related services is in the national interest. It further declares that Federal assistance in these programs is necessary and in the national interest but prohibits any Federal control over the curriculum, instruction, administration, or personnel of any education system or institution.

The term exceptional children is defined to include blind, partially sighted, deaf, hearing impaired, speech defective, crippled, cerebral palsied, mentally retarded, emotionally handicapped, and gifted children.

Special education is defined as the provision of special educational materials, facilities, testing and evaluation, and special courses of instruction conducted by personnel with special qualifications to meet the special needs of exceptional children.

A State allotment percentage and the Federal share are determined by formulas based on the State per capita income related to the national per capita

income. The Federal share ranges from 50 to 70 percent of the cost.

The bill authorizes an additional Assistant Commissioner of Education and other personnel to carry out its provisions. It establishes in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Special Education for Exceptional Children consisting of 15 to 25 members. The bill also directs the Commissioner of Education to establish technical advisory committees and authorizes appropriations to carry out the provisions of title I.

Under title II, covering financial assistance to the States for special education and related services, the bill authorizes an appropriation of \$1 million for the fiscal year 1964 to develop State plans. The bill authorizes appropriations of \$20 million for the fiscal year of 1964, \$30 million for fiscal 1965, and such sums as the Congress may thereafter determine for payments to the States to provide special education and related services for exceptional children.

States desiring to receive Federal payments for special education and related services must submit State plans including provisions that funds will be spent solely for special education and related services by public elementary and secondary schools for exceptional children and for residential school and preschool services, whether provided directly by the public schools or through contracts with public or other nonprofit organizations. Among other provisions, State plans must provide for financial participation by the State after the close of the fiscal year 1965.

Title III of the bill authorizes appropriations of \$3 million for the fiscal year 1964, \$4 million for the fiscal year 1965, and such sums as the Congress thereafter determines to be necessary for extension and improvement grants to State or local school systems for extension and improvement grants to finance improvement of special education projects for a specific period of time.

Title IV of the bill authorizes appropriations of \$12 million for fiscal 1964, \$12 million for fiscal 1965, and such sums as the Congress may determine thereafter to be necessary for personnel training and special projects. The Commissioner of Education is authorized to make grants to public and other nonprofit colleges and universities to provide training of special education teachers and other specialized professional personnel. To receive grants, colleges and universities must be accredited for the training offered and must offer fellowships and stipends for the training.

The Commissioner is also authorized to make grants to State educational agencies to improve the qualifications of personnel engaged in, or preparing to engage in, administration or supervision of special education and related services. These grants may be used for scholarships and fellowships with appropriate stipends and for seminars and other special trainings programs.

The bill also authorizes the Commissioner to make grants to public and other nonprofit agencies or organizations for special short-term training projects

needed in the education of exceptional children.

Title V of the bill authorizes appropriations of \$5 million for fiscal 1964, \$10 million for fiscal 1965, and such sums as the Congress may thereafter determine to be necessary for research and demonstration grants to State agencies, colleges and universities, or public and other nonprofit educational or research organizations for projects which hold promise of improving special education and related services to exceptional children.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD of yesterday, Wednesday, March 6, be corrected in the following respects:

Page 3359, "recently" should be "recently"—add colon.

Corrections for: Minnesota Taconite, pages 3380-3384.

Page 3387, "department of taxation" should be capitals "D and T".

Page 3381, "taxation"—should be capital "T".

Page 3381, "makes" should be "make".

Page 3382, "whom" should be "which".

Page 3382, "Anderson" should be "Andersen".

Page 3384, "a" should be "at".

Page 3384, "told" should be "said".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT OF 1963

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill entitled the "Presidential Transition Act of 1963." This is similar to H.R. 12479 which I introduced in the 87th Congress.

This bill was introduced by me to carry out a recommendation made to the Congress by President Kennedy on May 29, 1962, along with certain other proposals dealing with the financing of presidential election campaigns. The various proposals resulted from a study and report prepared by the President's Commission on Campaign Costs. This was a bipartisan committee made up of members with varied and extensive experience in political finance, such as Alexander Heard, Chairman; V. O. Key, Jr.; Dan Kimball; Malcolm C. Moos; Paul A. Porter; Neil O. Staebler; Walter N. Thayer; John M. Vorys; and James C. Worthy.

My bill deals with the transfer of executive power when there is to be a change of administration. It is related to the problem of campaign financing because it was estimated by the Commission that in 1952-53, the cost to a special Republican committee of the transition period between the election and the inauguration of President Eisenhower exceeded \$200,000. In 1960-61 the cost to the Democratic National

Committee for the transition period preceding the inauguration of President Kennedy totaled at least \$360,000.

These figures cover only a proportion of the costs involved in the transition period between changes of administration. During this time the President-elect must select his Cabinet, the Ambassadors to man diplomatic posts all over the world, top echelon administrative officials, as well as key personnel to staff governmental and White House executive offices.

Some of the individuals chosen by the President-elect to fill crucial roles in the construction and maintenance of the new administration, in the past, have been able to do so only at considerable personal sacrifice. Transportation of such individuals is in itself an expensive item. Housing during the conference period is also costly. When the conferences end in an appointment, the new appointee in most cases must incur hotel expenses until permanent housing is procured. The requirement to work without pay for 2 or 3 months while incurring the increased personal expenditures is an unreasonable demand upon persons of limited means. Some of the special studies requested by President-elect Kennedy were produced through the generosity of his consultants, not only with respect to their own time but with respect to the substantial clerical and administrative costs as well. Such costs in 1960-61 totaled almost \$1 million, in addition to the \$360,000 payment by the Democratic National Committee.

The time is long since past when an American President may dispense with all but a few preliminaries in assuming office. The size and complexity of today's Federal Government, the pressing domestic and international problems facing the President, all combine to make it imperative that the machinery of transition be as efficient as possible and sufficient resources available for the required orientation of the new leader.

This orientation can only be provided by the outgoing administration. Therefore, it must be recognized as a legitimate function of government and a legitimate expense of government. Under present conditions, a new President, in one sense, begins working for the Government the morning after the election.

It is understood that both President-elect Eisenhower and President-elect Kennedy were given the cooperation of their predecessors and access to needed information. This is a tribute to the intelligent and friendly attitude of all these gentlemen. But at this period of our history, I believe it more fitting that we establish a formal process supported by law. Rather than leave this important matter to the discretion or whim of the individuals concerned, it would seem wisdom to guard against the dangers of noncooperation, remote as they may be. Under certain circumstances, such as a campaigning incumbent defeated by the President-elect in a hard fought campaign, such dangers could arise.

I submit that the vital transition of Executive power from the outgoing to the incoming administration is a matter of

bipartisan national interest. The use of political party funds for such an activity is not desirable. Nor can we escape the fact that there is a lack of dignity in a system which requires party solicitors to seek out private funds to support the necessary activities of the President-elect of the United States.

Briefly, the bill I am bringing before you does the following:

Section 1 gives the title: "The Presidential Transition Act of 1963."

Section 2 declares its purpose to promote the orderly transfer of Executive power during the several months of transition from one administration to the other.

Section 3 authorizes certain services to be provided by the General Services Administration to President-elect and Vice-Presidents-elect, such as office space, compensation for staff personnel and experts, travel expenses, and so forth.

Section 4 authorizes necessary services, office space, and so forth to outgoing Presidents and Vice Presidents for 6 months following the expiration of their terms.

Section 5 authorizes the Congress to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention to the fact that this bill to provide Federal Government funds for the vital transition of Executive power from the outgoing to the incoming administration has received the endorsement of President Kennedy and former Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower, as well as former presidential candidates Thomas E. Dewey, Adlai E. Stevenson, and Richard M. Nixon.

John M. Bailey and Congressman William E. Miller, the chairman of the two major political parties, have also lent their full endorsement and support.

Mr. Speaker, I can see no valid reason why this body should not enact the necessary legislation to meet this kind of transition as a matter of organized procedure and as a matter of law in order to orient and in order to effect the orderly transition of power into the new Government, particularly, Mr. Speaker, at a time when it is extremely necessary for a new Government taking over this Government of ours to be able to meet almost immediately the challenges which are constantly hurled at us, the American people, every hour of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

[Mr. LIPSCOMB'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CUBAN CAVES

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

RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, I made a statement concerning Cuban caves which appeared on page 3086 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At the time, I stated I had written to the Legislative Reference Service asking for any available information on Cuban caves. The information I received was fragmentary and inconclusive.

At the end of my statement, I called upon the administration to release any information it possessed concerning Cuban caves. I did this because the administration had set a precedent in releasing aerial photographs of missile sites last fall. Also, the gravity of the situation led me to believe that the American people should know—one way or another—about Cuban caves.

This morning, the Chicago Tribune has a large headline, Cuban Caves Hide Arms." The article was written by the distinguished journalist, Willard Edwards, of the Chicago Tribune press service. The Edwards article is based on testimony by Army Intelligence Chief Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch before the Senate Armed Services Committee yesterday.

Mr. Edwards says in the article:

Aerial photography has further revealed the building of new roads to cave locations, Major General Fitch testified, and it is considered highly probable that much military equipment and supplies are being stored underground.

I wish to insert the complete Chicago Tribune story at this point in my remarks:

CUBAN CAVES HIDE ARMS—AERIAL PHOTOS BARE BUILDING OF NEW ROADS—RUSSIAN TROOPS SHOW MUCH ACTIVITY

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, March 6.—The Army's intelligence chief reported to Senate investigators today that Russian troops in Cuba are showing much activity in connection with caves throughout the island.

Aerial photography has further revealed the building of new roads to cave locations, Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch testified, and "it is considered highly probable that much military equipment and supplies are being stored underground."

MISSILE CREWS LEAVE

"To date, there are no indications that Russian ground force units have departed from Cuba other than those associated with the missile systems which were removed last fall," Fitch said.

This information was contained in a statement released as Fitch went into a closed session with the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, headed by Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, which is probing all angles of the Cuban threat.

"Cuban refugees continue to report that strategic missiles were not all actually removed from Cuba and that they have been stored in caves and underground installations," Fitch stated.

"While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis, it is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time of the quarantine last October 22.

"From the large volume and frequency of reports concerning the underground storage of ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft, it is certain that there is con-

siderable activity in connection with underground installations throughout the island.

"In numerous cases, reports indicate that this activity is being carried out solely by Soviet personnel and that Cubans, including highly paid military, are not permitted access thereto."

AIR-CONDITIONED CAVES

"There are several thousand caves in Cuba and many have been used for storage over the years. With the reported addition of dehumidification and air-conditioning equipment, many would be suited to storage of both large and delicate electronic items."

Fitch said there had been "a substantial increase both in quantity and quality of heavy military equipment in Cuba in the last year.

"Modern tanks, artillery mortars, and motor transport vehicles have been noted, including the free rocket overground [Frog] missile which has a nuclear capacity," Fitch reported. "Other missiles and armored personnel carriers are similar to those in use by American forces," he said.

INCLUDES T-54 TANKS

"Other modern items in Cuba include the T-54 tank with a 100 mm. gun, similar to our M-60 main battle tank with 105 mm. gun," he told the committee. "There are also medium tanks, truck-mounted multiple rocket launchers, and amphibious personnel carriers.

"With the introduction of this equipment into Cuba, the potential firepower and mobility of ground forces has been increased considerably. We do not believe any of the sophisticated equipment—rocket launchers and tanks—have yet been turned over to the Cubans.

"Training activities have been intensified, improving the capabilities of Cuban personnel to utilize Soviet equipment. No nuclear warheads are believed to be in Cuba although it is possible that they could be used by some of the weapons systems there."

Today's Washington Post & Times Herald carried an article on page 2 entitled "Army Gives Report on Cuba Caves." Staff Reporter John G. Norris quotes Major General Fitch as saying:

Cuban refugees continue to report that strategic missiles were not all actually removed from Cuba and that they have been stored in caves.

General Fitch goes on to say:

While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis. It is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time the quarantine was imposed.

Although General Fitch conceded that "ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft" might be stored in "several thousand caves," he was unable to confirm or deny that Soviet missiles had been completely removed from Cuba.

The complete Washington Post article follows:

ARMY GIVES REPORT ON CUBA CAVES

(By John G. Norris)

The Army's intelligence chief testified yesterday that thousands of caves in Cuba are being used to store Soviet weapons. But he voiced doubt that the hidden war stocks include offensive missiles or bombers.

Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch, reporting to the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee in its investigation of the Russian military buildup there, gave the most detailed official report yet on what American intelligence knows about underground weapons storage in Cuba.

A censored version of his testimony in

closed session, released to the press, also declared that:

To date there are no indications that Soviet ground force units have left Cuba other than those associated with the withdrawn missile forces.

No nuclear warheads are believed to be in Cuba, although they possibly could be used by some of the Soviet weapons systems now there.

REFUGEE REPORTS

In his discussion of the underground weapons storage, Fitch said that "Cuban refugees continue to report that strategic missiles were not all actually removed from Cuba and that they have been stored in caves."

"While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis," he went on, "it is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time the quarantine was imposed."

But Fitch said that in light of the large volume and frequency of intelligence reports about the underground storage of ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft it is certain that there is much activity in connection with the several thousand caves in Cuba.

Reports indicate, he said, that such underground storage is handled by Russians and that Cubans—including high-ranking military men—are not allowed access to the caves.

SUITABLE FOR STORAGE

Intelligence reports tell of the use of dehumidification and air-conditioning equipment in the caves, which would make them suitable for storage of both large and delicate electronic items. Aerial photography, Fitch reported, has revealed that roads have been built to both known and suspected cave locations.

In the 6-month period before the mid-October Cuban crisis, Fitch said, military intelligence received about 3,000 reports that were evaluated and coordinated with the data obtained from aerial reconnaissance.

Fitch listed the following heavy modern army equipment introduced into Cuba: T-54 tanks mounting a 100-millimeter gun; SU-100 assault guns of similar caliber on tracks; truck-mounted multiple rocket launchers; Snapper wire-guided antitank missiles; new (1961 model) 8-wheeled armored personnel carriers; Frog missiles, similar to the U.S. Honest John rockets, with a nuclear capability; artillery mortars, and amphibious personnel carriers.

This equipment, Fitch said, increases considerably the potential firepower and mobility of Communist forces in Cuba. But he added that it was doubted that any of the more sophisticated weapons had as yet been turned over to the Cubans, although training to this end has been intensified.

Major General Fitch's testimony before the Armed Services Committee yesterday gives us little to be happy about. However, I applaud the fact that this administration has seen fit to tell the American people just what it knows about Cuban caves.

I hope as time goes on that we will have more precise information concerning Soviet weapons in Cuba. The American people have a right to know the nature and extent of the Cuban threat to this hemisphere.

HOW STRONG IS THE DOLLAR?

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