

University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

---

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

---

10-8-1962

### Correction of the Record - Mt. Dams and Power Projects

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

#### Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Correction of the Record - Mt. Dams and Power Projects" (1962). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 474.

[https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches/474](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/474)

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@mso.umt.edu](mailto:scholarworks@mso.umt.edu).

October 8,  
1962

However, in compliance with the commitment which I made, I have placed the RECORD the letter from the Department of State.

Secondly, Mr. President, a story appeared more recently charging that the U.S. labor attaché in Rome had brought pressure to bear on the Italian Government to induce it to compel the striking crew members of Cuba-bound Italian ships to return to work. The State Department denied this report promptly, categorically, and in considerable detail. I rejoice that there was no truth to this report and I congratulate the State Department on its immediate effort to clarify the situation.

I ask unanimous consent that that letter may also be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, D.C., September 25, 1962.  
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I understand that you are anxious to learn the circumstances behind the front-page story in the Washington Daily News of Friday, September 21, 1962, which quotes the National Maritime Union as alleging that our labor attaché in Rome had brought pressure to bear on the Italian Government to induce it to compel the striking crew members of two Cuba-bound Italian ships to return to work.

I am happy to be able to supply a full report. Our Embassy at Rome has denied the allegation and informed the press that it was "obviously nonsense." A senior official pointed out that under Italian law it Marine has categorically denied to the Embassy that the Italian Government, for its part, had in any way attempted to induce the striking crew members of the two ships to continue the voyage. The Ministry official pointed out that under Italian law it was administratively impossible to force seamen to sail on a merchant ship, since hiring and firing of seamen is a matter strictly between the seamen, their unions, and the operators.

The only involvement of the labor attaché was to inquire of an official of the leading Italian free labor union, which is not a party to the dispute, what was happening in the affair of the two ships, which had been reported in the Italian press. He did not in any way attempt to persuade the Italian Government to force Italian seamen to sail on the ships. On the contrary, the Embassy had occasion earlier to point out to a representative of the company which operates one of the ships that any cargoes, even nonmilitary ones such as that involved in this case, were of assistance to the Soviet-run Castro regime.

You may also be interested to hear that on September 9, the Under Secretary of the Italian Ministry of Merchant Marine issued a strong public statement that supplying strategic Soviet material to the Communist dictatorial regime in Cuba would be in contempt of the obligations of Atlantic solidarity and in violation of Italy's adherence to NATO. The statement also warned that the Italian Government would take necessary action against anyone who violated the duties of the alliance in collusion with the enemy.

I hope this information will be of interest to you.

Sincerely yours,  
FREDERICK G. DUTTON,  
Assistant Secretary.

#### CORRECTION OF THE RECORD— MONTANA DAMS AND POWER PROJECTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on page 20991, the last column of the RECORD for October 4, the statement as contained by me relative to what I said on the proposed Knowles Dam, in referring to the Cabinet Gorge and the Noxon Dams which were built in Montana, reads:

Every single bit of power generated in Montana goes out of the State of Montana.

The RECORD should read:

Every single bit of power generated in Montana at the Cabinet Gorge and Noxon Dams goes out of the State of Montana.

I ask unanimous consent that this correction be made in the permanent RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be made, as indicated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as long as I am speaking about the proposed Knowles Dam, I wish to state that in addition to my support of a multipurpose dam, on the same basis as the Hungry Horse Dam which was built in the Flathead country, that the following have been the stipulations which my colleague, the present presiding officer of the Senate and I have laid down as basis for our support of any Federal multipurpose project in the State of Montana. As I stated on Thursday last in the debate on the proposed Knowles Dam:

First. If the Senate and the House eventually authorize a proposal, it is the intention of my distinguished colleague and myself, as well as the Representative of the Western District of Montana in which the project is located, to see to it that a preferential proportion of the power generated in western Montana is kept in western Montana for the benefit of the people of the whole State. I wish to reiterate what I said then and to emphasize my position in this respect as strongly as I know how.

Second. The project must be feasible—I think it is feasible, but authorization of Knowles will call for more detailed planning and any doubt which may exist as to its feasibility will, I am sure, be then removed.

Third. People in the area directly affected must be in favor of the proposal.

Fourth. The present level of Flathead Lake must be maintained and nothing must be done to change the position of the inlet at Flathead Lake.

Fifth. The rights of the Indians must be protected and adequate compensation given for any rights or any loss which they may incur.

Mr. President, I repeat, this has been my position and the position of my colleague [Mr. METCALF]; and our colleague in the House, Representative OLSEN on any Federal multipurpose project in my State and will continue to be our position on any proposals of this nature brought before the Senate or its committees for consideration.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Reader's Digest contained an article entitled "We Can Be Proud of Our Foreign Service." This is a readable article which sets forth a great many facts regarding our Foreign Service and some of the conditions of living and work which our Foreign Service personnel must endure.

I have often thought that those who are perhaps among the least appreciated in the service of this country are the Foreign Service people, including the Foreign Service officers themselves, and certainly including their wives and children, who spend many years at hardship posts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

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

WE CAN BE PROUD OF OUR FOREIGN SERVICE  
(By Charles D. Lewis)

(It's not all striped-pants and cocktail parties, and service in a hardship post means exactly what it says. A businessman gives a carefully considered report.)

I was down on my farm in Virginia when one of my business friends telephoned from Florida to congratulate me: "I read in the papers that you're going to Washington to look over the State Department, Charlie. I hope you fire half of the sons-of-guns."

I laughed. "I'll do my best," I promised, and I meant it.

I'm a businessman. For the last 15 years I've been in the tobacco business, for five of those years as president of the American Sumatra Tobacco Corp., of New York. Now the State Department had invited me and five others—two businessmen, two labor leaders, and a university professor—to serve as public members on the 1961 Foreign Service Selection Boards.

The Foreign Service is the body which largely mans the policy offices of the State Department as well as our embassies and consulates overseas. It was going to be our job on the 1961 Selection Boards to study the record of every one of the 3,700 Foreign Service officers and to report what we found.

Over the years the talk among my friends and business associates has always been pretty much the same: the State Department in an ivory tower, full of dreamers, eggheads, incompetents. So I went to Washington expecting to find that a lot of bureaucratic heads should roll.

A few days later I was sitting at a stark metal table in an office of the State Department, with the other members of the board. Piled before us were 357 folders with Foreign Service performance stamped on them in big red capitals. These were the confidential personnel files on Foreign Service officers.

I eyed the files hesitantly, wondering what shocks they would contain. And they did contain some shocks, at least to my ideas of the Foreign Service. Later, I found that all the other public members had suffered a similar blow to their cherished conceptions.

When we compared notes, we found that the main ideas we had come to Washington with were these:

Idea: "Let's face it, the diplomatic life is pretty soft."

The files quickly dispelled that illusion for all of us, for good. Foreign Service officers regularly and cheerfully take their families to live for years in places where I would hate

**PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND WATERSHED PROTECTION PROJECTS**

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Public Works Committee, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and in order that the Members of the Senate and House, particularly the Appropriations Committees, and other interested parties may be advised of projects approved by the Committee on Public Works, under the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, and the Watershed Protection and Flood Presentation Act, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information on this subject.

The first is a list of eight public buildings projects, six projects for new buildings, and two projects for alterations to existing buildings.

Approval of these building projects is based on prospectuses submitted to the committee by the Administrator of General Services, or reports on surveys of Federal building needs, in compliance with the provisions of Public Law 294, 86th Congress. All these projects have been discussed with representatives of the General Services Administration, who justified the need for these buildings.

The small watershed protection projects were approved under the provisions of Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended.

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

**NEW BUILDINGS**

Location and project	Date of approval	Estimated cost
San Diego, Calif., Court-house and Federal Office Building.....	Sept. 18, 1962	\$22,584,000
Akron, Ohio, (2) Court-house and Federal Office Building, and Post Office.....	Aug. 22, 1962	11,693,000
Tulsa, Okla., additional court facilities to authorized building.....	do.....	1,699,000
Ft. Snelling, Minn.....	Sept. 18, 1962	16,419,000
Knoxville, Tenn., Federal Office Building.....	do.....	8,262,000
Washington, D.C., office building for HHFA.....	Sept. 27, 1962	32,000,000

**ALTERATIONS**

Washington, D.C., South Building, Agriculture Department.....	Sept. 18, 1962	\$600,000
Washington, D.C., Old Post Office Building.....	do.....	718,000
Total.....		93,965,000

**WATERSHED PROJECTS**

Brandywine Creek, Del.-Pa.....	Aug. 22, 1962	\$2,080,978
Tobesofkee Creek, Ga. (supplement).....	Oct. 2, 1962	964,358
Twin Caney Creek, Kans.....	Aug. 22, 1962	2,843,300
Cottonwood Creek, Okla.....	Oct. 2, 1962	3,837,355
Delaware Creek, Okla.....	do.....	1,117,684
Sandy Creek, Pa.....	Aug. 22, 1962	785,393
Salada Creek, Tex.....	do.....	3,484,298
Valley Creek, Tex.....	do.....	2,023,951
Boulder Lake, Wyo.....	Oct. 2, 1962	420,700
Total.....		18,068,017

**ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR**

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar, under the rule, was dispensed with.

**BASIS LAID FOR OBTAINING BALANCED POSTAL BUDGET BY 1965**

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, before this current session of Congress is adjourned, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the basis laid in the postal rate and pay bill, H.R. 7927, for obtaining a balanced postal budget by 1965. I shall ask to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement concerning this matter which should be heartening to every Member of Congress.

As Senators will see from this statement, once the postal rate bill has run its course, the revenues and expenditures of our great Post Office Department will be in balance. It is my sincere hope that we shall be able to keep it in balance for many years to come.

It seems to me that, with the proper use of modern systems, we should be able to develop the efficiency necessary to increase volume and at the same time reduce unit costs. Under a Democratic Postmaster General, we have already made significant strides in the direction of increased efficiency and elimination of frills. I believe that studies to be commenced next year on mail classification, postal costs, and mechanization will go a long way toward attaining a balanced postal budget, and will keep it so in the future.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statement previously referred to printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

**A BALANCED POSTAL BUDGET BY 1965**

H.R. 7927, as amended in the Senate, provides rate increases in excess of those approved by the House committee in September 1961. The Senate version of this measure provides a firm basis for achieving a balanced postal budget by 1965. Recognizing, of course, that volume and expense will increase; nevertheless, as volume increases, so will revenues. Postal efficiency should permit volume increases at lower unit costs.

*An analysis with respect to the deficit*

[In millions of dollars]

H.R. 7927 will produce.....	1 600
Public services allowed.....	2 373
ICC hike in parcel post revenues.....	3 135
Total additional income.....	1,108
Postal deficit, fiscal year 1963.....	832
Additional postal pay (\$363 million less 25 percent, or \$91 million).....	4272
Total additional cost.....	1,104

<sup>1</sup> Any further upward adjustment in postal rates would be contrary to the 1958 act (Public Law 85-426) which provides that revenue and expense should be approximately equal, after adjustment for public services.

<sup>2</sup> Public service estimates adjusted upward resulting from pay modifications contained in H.R. 7927.

<sup>3</sup> Data contained in present ICC parcel post docket.

<sup>4</sup> Sec. 1007 of H.R. 7927 calls for the absorption of pay costs. The total cost to the Post Office of \$363 million is adjusted by approximately 25 percent to allow for absorption. This absorption would be less than 2 percent of a \$5 billion postal budget. Such would appear reasonable in light of the Postmaster General's record to date, and the statement by the Deputy Postmaster General in 1961 that, given time and authority, the Post Office Department could save \$300 million annually.

**STATE DEPARTMENT REBUTTALS**

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, some time ago, there was discussion on the Senate floor with regard to two incidents reported in the press. The first involved an article which appeared early in September by the reporters Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott. The article charged the existence of a note from Khrushchev to President Kennedy the weekend before the 1961 ill-fated Cuban invasion, a note threatening Soviet retaliation in West Berlin if the United States used American forces against Cuba.

At the time of that discussion I stated that I had asked the Department of State for clarification of the extent to which there was a connection between Berlin and Cuba and, specifically, to respond to the inquiry whether there was such a note from Mr. Khrushchev to President Kennedy.

I said that I would place in the RECORD later the reply from the Department of State. The Department of State has replied. It has denied the existence of such a written communication prior to the Bay of Pigs invasion. I ask unanimous consent to have that letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SEPTEMBER 10, 1962.

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING,  
U.S. SENATOR.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: This letter is in further reply to the telephone inquiry from your office this past week as to whether a letter was received by the U.S. Government from Chairman Khrushchev immediately prior to the events at the Bay of Pigs in April 1961, wherein Khrushchev stated, in the words of your secretary, the Berlin issue will be raised if Cuba is invaded. I am informed that no such letter was received on the eve of those events.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, nevertheless, I am assured by the newsmen concerned, who are known as well-informed and responsible observers, that in its basic essentials their original charge was true and that such a message in some form or other was conveyed to the President prior to the fateful decision to withdraw full U.S. support from the invasion.