SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. J. J. HICKEY, a Senator from the State of Wyoming.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of all wisdom, away from the confusion of tongues, at the week's beginning, we turn to this quiet pavilion of prayer where the bewildering voices of the busy world, and the clamor of wordy arguments, are hushed.

When the reality behind all shadows—Thy presence in all things and behind all things—captures our awareness, then our arrogance is rebuked, our pride is mocked, and we confess that our knowledge is only partial and our judgment fallible.

May all narrow barriers be burned away that shut us out from fellowship and understanding with any of Thy other children. And may the decisions made here in this forum of the Republic conform to Thy will, as to those who look and listen for Thy guidance are revealed the things which belong to our peace and to the peace of the whole world.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1961.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. J. J. HICKEY, a Senator from the State of Wyoming, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HICKEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 25, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 544) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1962, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Operations and the Judiciary Subcommittee on the Committee on the District of Columbia were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia be permitted to meet this afternoon. I have cleared the request with the Republican member of my committee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the minority leader. All we seek to do is to get a bill out of the subcommittee to the full committee. The meeting will require only a few minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

On request of Mr. MAGNUSON, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Commerce was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF JULY 21, 1961

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 21, 1961, and for other purposes (with an accompanying bill); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS BY OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by that Office, for the quarter ended June 30, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS, OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, on Federal contributions, for the quarter ended June 30, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the 30th Infantry Division Association, at Charleston, S.C., relating to the preservation of the prestige of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 557. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended (Rept. No. 792);

S. 560. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925 (Rept. No. 790);

S. 563. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended (Rept. No. 791);

S. 1328. A bill to authorize the establishment of a junior college division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 793); and

H.R. 7154. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to regulate the keeping and running at large of dogs (Rept. 789).

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 1529. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia," approved June 1, 1910, as amended (Rept. No. 796);

H.R. 6495. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 799);

H.R. 7044. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 798); and

H.R. 8032. An act to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1938, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 797).

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 2356. A bill to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940 (Rept. No. 800).

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H.R. 3222. An act to amend section 4(a) of the act of April 1, 1942, so as to confer jurisdiction on the municipal court for the District of Columbia over certain counterclaims and crossclaims in any action in which such court has initial jurisdiction (Rept. No. 795); and

H.R. 6798. An act to amend the act of incorporating the Washington Home for Foundlings and to define the powers of said corporation (Rept. No. 794).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H.R. 256. An act to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (Rept. No. 806).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

H.R. 5486. An act to prohibit the examination in District of Columbia courts of any minister of religion in connection with any communication made to him in his professional capacity, without the consent of the party to such communication (Rept. No. 805).

By Mr. PROXMIRE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S. 902. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 801).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

H.R. 32. An act authorizing the establishment of the Fort Smith National Historic Site, in the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 803).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 1098. An act to amend section 901 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that a flag shall be furnished to drape the casket of each deceased veteran of Mexican border service (Rept. No. 804).

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 802)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 836) to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with the individual views of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive J, 87th Congress, 1st session, a Treaty of Friendship, Establishment, and Navigation Between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Belgium, together with a related protocol, signed at Brussels on February 21, 1961 (Executive Rept. No. 9); and

Executive L, 87th Congress, 1st session, A Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations Between the United States of America and the Republic of Vietnam, signed at Saigon on April 3, 1961 (Executive Rept. No. 9).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

David H. Douglas, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the U.S. Coast Guard.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 2473. A bill for the relief of Jen Cheng Shao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 2474. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not exceeding $175,000 with which to make a survey of proposed national parkway extensions or connections to Blue Ridge Parkway, Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Foothills Parkway, Mammoth Cave National Park, and Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S. 2475. A bill to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Midwest City, Okla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 2476. A bill to amend section 207 of the Military Construction Act of 1960 in order to clarify the authority granted under such section to the Secretary of the Navy to exchange certain lands owned by the United States for lands owned by the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2477. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Defense shall furnish assistance in connection with the 1962 world aviation championships and the General Conference of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 2478. A bill to amend section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to residence requirements for voting in presidential elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

ENDORSEMENT OF WORLD ECONOMIC PROGRESS EXPOSITION

Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 41), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the encouragement of private and public participation in international economic development is vital to the achievement of a free and democratic economic growth process, and the responsibility for stimulating international economic growth, and especially the growth of those nations in the less developed areas, must be shared and supported, in accordance with their capacity, by the peoples of the world, whether as individuals or through their private organizations and their government ; and

Whereas the Government of the United States and its people have consistently endorsed the aspirations of all peoples and nations to realize a free and prosperous society and have, towards these ends, actively supported and participated in programs for free economic development whether designed to meet the needs of groups, cities, states, nations, or global areas, and whether carried forth by private individuals, institutions, private business and industry, or by national, regional, or supranational government agencies or organizations; and

Whereas the success or failure of these objectives and the freedom of the individual, his nation, and the world, depends upon the scope and quality of public understanding and the ability of the individual to focus on this historic movement of our century, and is dependent upon the ability of the leaders in the great endeavor to understand each other and each other's efforts and thus find ways by which mutual efforts can be joined for the good of all mankind; and

Whereas in order to assist in bringing about a greater understanding and acceleration of this effort, a World Economic Progress Assembly and Exposition, privately organized, financed, and sponsored, will be presented in November 1962 in Chicago, Illinois, at the new exposition center known as McCormick Place; and

Whereas the purpose of this Assembly and Exposition is to bring together for the first time a world assembly to examine and explore the many diverse elements of mankind's struggle to assure to itself adequate food, clothing, shelter, health, education, and other elements of its well-being and to provide the means through exhibits, meetings, and special events to translate what is now a vague topic to many into an understandable reality; and

Whereas further purposes of this assembly and exposition are to provide the opportunity to bring to the United States, which has spearheaded the effort for the betterment of mankind, representatives of national governments and international and national government and private agencies, including foundations and educational, religious, labor, banking, and business organizations and institutions and the general public, to enable them, and their American counterparts, to come together to report, explain, and evaluate their progress, roles, and operations, catalog needs as yet unmet, exchange views and plan within a coherent framework the new opportunities for private and government cooperation, chart new and mutually productive and advantageous paths into the future, and achieve a closer understanding and collaboration in this great and essential endeavor; and

Whereas it is the declared policy of the United States to encourage the contribution of United States enterprise toward economic strength of less-developed countries, through private trade and investment abroad and exchange of ideas and technical information, and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries, using to the maximum extent practicable the facilities of private agencies, and the World Economic

Progress Assembly and Exposition will provide a unique and effective means of carrying out these objectives; and

Whereas the President of the United States recognizing that the Assembly and Exposition provide a response to the urgent need to broaden understanding, at home and abroad, of the progress and challenge of international economic development and that the participation of the American people through various United States Government programs in the development of the economies of other nations and in the evolution of international economic growth is an integral part of the story to be projected at the proposed assembly and exposition has therefore instructed the various agencies and departments of the Government concerned to assist in every way possible in contributing to the success of the event: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the World Economic Progress Assembly and Exposition is consistent with the objectives of the Government of the United States and represents a significant contribution to the objectives of the United States and to all who seek to realize a society in which man and nations can realize his potential in freedom and peace.

SEC. 2. The President of the United States and the departments and agencies of the United States Government with an interest in activities included within the subject matter of the World Economic Progress Assembly and Exposition are requested to devote such resources and personnel as may be necessary to assure that the United States Government's participation will adequately reflect the important role of our Nation in contributing to the economic growth of other nations.

SEC. 3. The President of the United States is requested to issue a proclamation reciting the purposes of the World Economic Progress Assembly and Exposition and inviting participation by all concerned with international economic development.

REMOVAL OF $5,000 LIMITATION IN SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr KERR], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to remove the present $5,000 limitation which would prevent the Secretary of the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of a very tragic accident which occurred in Midwest City, Okla., last Friday. Last Friday afternoon an Air Force fighter aircraft on a training mission refueled at Tinker Air Force Base. Immediately after takeoff the airplane caught fire.

The pilot, very bravely, and, I think, using great presence of mind, jettisoned his fuel tank over an uninhabited part of the area surrounding the field, and, according to regular procedures, attempted to return to the field. As the fire grew worse and broke out in another place, the pilot stayed with the plane and endeavored to bring it in for a landing. While he was only seconds away from reaching the field, the fire burned out the controls of the aircraft and he was forced to eject himself with his parachute, and did succeed in landing safely. The airplane, being slightly off course because it was without controls either when the pilot was in it or later, crashed in a densely populated area of Midwest City and created a large fire. Regrettably, two children were killed and another child and the mother of the three children were seriously injured. She was flown to the Air Force hospital at San Antonio, where she could receive specialized treatment for the extent of the burns she and the surviving child had suffered. A number of houses and automobiles were completely destroyed by the fire, and others seriously damaged.

The bill which I have introduced is a duplicate of the bill, S. 3338, of the 86th Congress which was favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee after the equally tragic crash of an Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Ark. As in the case of the Little Rock accident, there will be a number of claims arising out of this accident in excess of the $5,000 limit. Enactment of this bill is necessary to permit the Air Force to adjudicate this latter class of claims on a prompt basis.

If it were not for this bill, all those who suffered serious and tragic damages would have to go to the Court of Claims, and perhaps wait 3 to 5 years for the adjudication of their proper claims, when, with the authority contained in this bill, the Secretary of the Air Force would be able to settle the just claims, within the limitation of what he judged the damage to be, and offer immediate settlement, if the claimants were willing to accept it.

Of course, there is no way to compensate or repay the families who have suffered these tragic losses. However, the least we can do is settle the claims as fairly and as quickly as possible.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2475) to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Midwest City, Okla., introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ASSISTANCE IN CONNECTION WITH 1962 WORLD AVIATION CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the appropriation to the Secretary of Defense of not more than $450,000 to provide assistance to the National Aeronautic Association in connection with the world aviation championships and the general conference of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale to be held in the United States in 1962.

The National Aeronautic Association is the oldest independent, nonprofit aviation organization in the United States. It was chartered on Otcober 13, 1922, as the successor to the Aero Club of America, which was founded in 1905. The purpose of National Aeronautic Association is primarily the advancement of the art and science of aviation and space flight.

When the National Aeronautic Association assumed the role of the Aero Club of America, it became the sole United States representative for the Federation on Aeronautique Internationale. As such, it is the only organization in this country that can sanction, certify, and register national and world record attempts in aviation by the United States—both military and civilian. Among its many other activities for the past year, National Aeronautic Association sent a large U.S. delegation to the 1960 Federation Aeronautique Internationale general conference in Barcelona, as well as parachute, soaring, and balloon teams to the world competitions in Europe. It issued over 200 Federation Aeronautique Internationale sporting licenses to pilots, sanctioned 40 national and world record attempts, and registered 28 national and world records.

I believe the Senate may be interested in a brief summary of the total flying records held by countries throughout the world, and the comparison of records held by the United States and other countries:

First. Of the 403 aviation records, of all types, held by all countries, the United States holds 98, and the U.S.S.R. holds 108.

Second. Of the 103 speed records for noncommercial aircraft between capitals of countries and cities of international importance, the United States holds only 9, Great Britain holds 78, and the U.S.S.R. holds none.

Third. Only 10 speed records have been established by commercial aircraft, over international scheduled air routes. Of these, Great Britain holds five, Canada two, Spain two, Greece one, and the United States none.

Every 2 years the international aviation sporting events are hosted by one of the 53 member nations of Federation Aeronautique Internationale. The Federation Aeronautique Internationale general conference is hosted by one of the member nations annually. The United States has been the host to the Federation Aeronautique Internationale general conference only twice in the 56-year history of Federation Aeronautique Internationale, and it has never been the host to the international sporting aviation championships.

NAA is very anxious to have the next sporting aviation championships, and the Federation Aeronautique Internationale general conference held in the United States in 1962. The five championships are in parachuting, ballooning, aeromodeling, aerobatics, and soaring. The first of the four championships would be held at Orange, Mass., in August of 1962. The soaring championship is being planned for 1963, probably in August or September, and would be held either in Texas or California. Both of these States have areas where geographic and weather conditions are ideal for such a contest.

It will cost $450,000 to host properly the five championships and the Federation Aeronautique Internationale general conference. National Aeronautic Association does not have the means to provide a sum of this amount. Because of the international significance, and the

national benefits which the United States would receive from being host to these very important events, it seems altogether proper that the Federal Government should help substantially in providing the necessary funds. I understand that the State of Massachusetts will also provide assistance if we are able to bring the championships to the United States.

If we are going to do this, however, the invitation must be extended at a meeting sponsored by the Federation Aeronautique Internationale in Monaco, October 13–20 of this year.

A bill identical to the one I now introduce was introduced in the House of Representatives earlier in the year by Representative TEAGUE of Texas. That bill is H.R. 6068. It is now before the House Armed Services Committee. I believe this proposed legislation deserves prompt and careful attention by both Houses of Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2477) to provide that the Secretary of Defense shall furnish assistance in connection with the 1962 world aviation championships and the general conference of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR VOTING IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and myself, I introduce a joint resolution, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

Our joint resolution liberalizes residence requirements for voting in presidential elections. It is a modification of previous resolutions introduced by the Senator from Tennessee and myself. We believe that it incorporates the best features of both, and represents a particularly effective approach to the problem of residency disqualification in presidential elections.

Let me briefly describe our proposal. It sets a maximum residence requirement of 90 days for presidential elections only. It further requires that any voter, who was otherwise qualified to vote in the State or election district from which he moved, shall be permitted to vote, even if he has resided at his new residence for less than 90 days. This, of course, is providing he meets all of the other qualifications to vote in his new election jurisdiction. For example, he would be required to register prior to the close of the legal period of registration and to file an appropriate affidavit that he is qualified, on all other counts but residence, at both his new and old residences.

Our amendment will permit almost every citizen to vote in presidential elections, regardless of where he lives. I want to take this opportunity to commend and thank my colleague, Senator KEFAUVER, for his fine cooperation and assistance in preparing this proposal. As the chairman of the subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary, he has shown a real and serious interest in the need for this and other electoral reforms. He has generously given of his time and effort to permit experts in this field to appear before his subcommittee and place their views in the record. I am pleased to be working with him on this amendment.

Mr. President, one out of every five Americans move every year. Many find themselves voteless in their new homes. It is estimated that between 5 and 8 million Americans could not vote in 1960 for this reason. They are every inch as much Americans as the next fellow, but because they moved from New York to Chattanooga or from Tulsa to Walla Walla, they cannot vote for President and Vice President.

Five States have already taken steps to lower residence requirements for voting for President and Vice President below 90 days. They are: Wisconsin, Missouri, California, Ohio, and Oregon. Wisconsin, in fact, has adopted language very similar to that of our amendment. Six States, including New York, have legislation pending to liberalize residence requirements for presidential elections. This progress is encouraging, but there is much that remains to be done.

It is our deep conviction that the role of the Federal Government should be limited to Federal elections. The amendment which we submit today would not affect State and local elections in any way. However, in presidential elections, there is no justification for disenfranchising otherwise qualified citizens just because they move from one place to another shortly prior to the election.

Senator KEFAUVER and I sincerely believe that this amendment represents a long step forward in liberalizing our Nation's election laws. It is our hope that we can bring about favorable congressional action on this amendment in the 87th Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of our joint resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 128) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to residence requirements for voting in presidential elections, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years of the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No citizen of the United States who is otherwise qualified to vote in any election held in any State or in the District constituting the seat of Government of the United States for the purpose, in whole or in part, of choosing electors of President and Vice President shall be denied the right to vote for such electors in such election because of any residence requirement of such State or such District, as the case may be, if such citizen has resided in such State (or the political subdivision thereof with respect to which the requirement applies), or in such District, as the case may be, for a period of at least ninety days preceding such election.

"SEC. 2. Any citizen of the United States who has been a resident of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States for a lesser period than that required for voting in an election for electors of President and Vice President, and who is otherwise qualified to vote in such election, shall nevertheless be entitled to vote in such election, if he was either eligible to so vote in another political subdivision of the same State, or in another State, or in such District, immediately prior to his change of residence, or if he would have been eligible to so vote if he had continued to reside in such place until such election."

THE WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM—AMENDMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, a number of amendments have been filed to S. 174, the wilderness bill, which is shortly to come before the Senate for consideration. Among them is an amendment by my colleague the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] intended to put the High Uintas Primitive Area into the wilderness preservation system without further review by the National Forest Service.

I shall put in the RECORD a letter I have received from the Forest Service, confirming my understanding that some alteration of the boundaries of the High Uintas area, a wonderful 240,000-acre tract of great scenic beauty, is desirable.

The letter from the Forest Service, and an accompanying map, indicate that the forest supervisor in charge of the High Uintas area favors the removal of about 40,000 acres of the present primitive area from the reservation, because it contains certain reservoirs and structures which impinge on the wilderness character and can best be maintained if outside of wilderness. He has also recommended inclusion in the final wilderness area of tracts which would include the crest of Uintas lying just north and east of the present area.

Mr. President, this situation illustrates the wisdom of proposed wilderness legislation, and gives the Senate an example of the care with which it has been drafted.

There were created in the twenties and thirties about 80 so-called primitive areas. They were not carefully surveyed. As the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] told the Senate last Thursday, 43 of the primitive areas, since their original establishment, have

been carefully reviewed by the Forest Service. Acreage not of preponderant wilderness value has been taken out of them. Some contiguous area of greatest value for wilderness has been added. When finally carefully reviewed, the 43 areas have been reclassified as "wild" if under 100,000 acres, and "wilderness" if more than 100,000 acres.

There remain in the national forests about 40 primitive areas on which review has not been completed, including the High Uintas. It had been my understanding that some adjustment of boundaries was contemplated before it was reclassified as a permanent wilderness area, which the Forest Service letter verifies.

The High Uintas are an outstanding scenic area. But, in my judgment, their final inclusion in the wilderness system should await the Forest Service review, and adjustment of boundaries, contemplated in the wilderness bill.

I hope that my colleague will not call up his amendment, which would freeze the boundaries of the area and preclude review. It will be necessary for me to oppose it.

I have on my desk a map of the area. It cannot be put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Members' inspection. I shall be pleased, however, to show it to any of the Senators who want more information on this matter and want to see the nature of the changes in boundaries which are under consideration. It is my understanding that there is no agreement yet even among Forest Service people on the precise changes which should be made. In my judgment, it is an excellent example of the need for review which the bill has wisely provided.

The situation illustrates a second feature of the proposed legislation. The changes in the boundaries tentatively suggested would make a net increase in the High Uintas area of about 24,000 acres. S. 174 provides that when primitive areas are finally recommended to Congress, after review, they should not exceed their original size.

It may be possible for the Forest Service to include sufficient of the crest of the Uintas in a final wilderness area without exceeding the original size. If not, any addition will have to be authorized by an affirmative act of Congress.

Under the provisions and procedure of S. 174, the establishment of wilderness is going to be carefully done, with Congress, right to pass on expansion of the total areas carefully guarded.

In my opinion, the existence of wilderness areas, as the splendid committee report on S. 174 stated, is going to act as a magnet for tourists in the years ahead.

The High Uintas will be but one area of great natural grandeur available to the people of the Nation within the boundaries of my State. There will be other great scenic areas, unduplicated anywhere in the world—in Bryce Canyon National Park, Zion National Park and the Arches, Capitol Reef and Dinosaur National Monuments, and, I hope soon, a Canyonlands National Park.

I want the citizens of the United States to know about these areas so even more of our citizens will come out and visit Utah. Consequently, I am filing and intend to offer an amendment to the bill to provide that the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior shall annually report to Congress on the status of the wilderness system, including a list and general description of the areas included in it so folks back East will know the attractions we have to offer in the West—especially Utah.

In providing for the maintenance of detailed descriptions of wilderness areas to be available to citizens, the committee, I believe unintentionally, struck out a sentence calling for such annual reports, which my amendment will restore.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the desk.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter I received from the Forest Service.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1961.

Hon. FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: This is in response to your telephone request of August 26 for a letter on the status of the High Uintas Primitive Area.

This area in due course will be proposed for reclassification by the Secretary of Agriculture as a wilderness area under the procedures prescribed by secretarial regulation.

Preliminary studies toward such reclassification have been made to the local forest supervisor and recommendations submitted by him to the regional forester in Ogden. The regional forester has not completed his consideration of the forest supervisor's recommendations. When this has been done, public notice will be given and a hearing held if there is a demand.

When the regional forester reaches a conclusion as to what boundary changes, if any, should be made in the primitive area when reclassified as a wilderness area, his recommendations will be made to the Chief of the Forest Service who in turn may accept or modify them and he in due course will recommend a course of action to the Secretary of Agriculture. Thus there are several major steps still pending before reclassification will be completed under normal procedures. These can be expected to take considerable time.

You inquire specifically as to the nature of the forest supervisor's recommendations regarding boundary adjustments. These include two major additions along the high mountain crest of the Uintas which, if activated, would mean the area would encompass five of the six highest mountain peaks in the State. Also proposed by the forest supervisor is one major elimination along the southern boundary of the present primitive area. This recommendation is made in part, at least, because of heavy insect infestation of lodgepole pine timber in the area. These three proposals by the forest supervisor would result in additions of about 70,000 acres and an elimination of about 45,000 acres or a net increase of about 25,000 acres.

I wish to again emphasize that these proposals have been neither accepted nor rejected by the regional forester; and the Chief's Office has given no consideration to them.

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD C. CRAFTS,
Assistant Chief.

PRESERVATION OF INDIANA DUNES AND RELATED AREAS, INDIANA—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. METCALF, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. MOSS) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1797) to provide for the preservation of the Indiana Dunes and related areas in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

DEFENSE OF CERTAIN SUITS AGAINST FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT

Mr. KEATING submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 2883) to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ISSUANCE OF GOLD MEDAL TO DANNY KAYE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 25, 1961, the name of Mr. LONG of Missouri was added as an additional cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 127) authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to Danny Kaye, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators) on August 25, 1961.

NOTICE OF CHANGE OF HEARINGS ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on Friday I announced that the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights would begin holding hearings tomorrow on the constitutional rights of the American Indian. At that time, I stated that the hearings would begin at 10 a.m. Since making this announcement, it has come to my attention that the Judiciary Committee has scheduled an executive session for 10:30 tomorrow. In view of this development, I am rescheduling the subcommittee hearings to begin at 2 p.m. on August 29, in room 357 of the Senate Office Building. The hearings will continue through September 1. The witness list for this series of hearings is as follows:

August 29, 1961, 2 p.m.: Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, accompanied by Philleo Nash, member of the Secretary of the Interior's Task Force on Indian Affairs.

August 30, 1961, 10 a.m.: William Zimmerman, Jr., member of the Secretary of the Interior's Task Force on Indian Affairs; Henry E. Hyden, Associate Solicitor in the Division of Indian Affairs, Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior; Selene Gifford, Assistant Commissioner, Community Service Division,

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

August 31, 1961, 10 a.m.: Homer B. Jenkins, Chief, Branch of Tribal Programs, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; Delbert H. Bruce, Chief, Branch of Realty, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; William B. Benge, Chief, Branch of Law and Order, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

September 1, 1961, 10 a.m.: John W. Cragun, general counsel for the National Congress of American Indians; Arthur Lazarus, Jr., general counsel for the Association of American Indian Affairs.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT:

Address by Hon. BEN REIFEL, a Representative in Congress from the State of South Dakota, before the South Dakota Young Republican Convention delegation luncheon, at Brookings, S. Dak., on August 26, 1961.

"CAPITOL CLOAKROOM" BROADCAST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last Thursday, August 24, I engaged in a broadcast known as "Capitol Cloakroom" with three correspondents of the Columbia Broadcasting System—Bill Downs, Neil Strawser, and Wells Church. I ask unanimous consent that the broadcast be printed in the RECORD.

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

"CAPITOL CLOAKROOM"

(As broadcast over the CBS Radio Network, August 24, 1961)

Guest: The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Senate majority leader, Democrat, of Montana.

Correspondents: Bill Downs, Neil Strawser, Wells Church.

Producer: Ellen Wadley.

Mr. DOWNS. Senator MANSFIELD, will the United States fight to preserve our rights in Berlin?

Mr. STRAWSER. Will the Senate pass legislation to limit debate this year?

Mr. CHURCH. How do you assess the legislative record of this Congress to date, Senator MANSFIELD?

Mr. DOWNS. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, welcome to "Capitol Cloakroom." We feel fortunate indeed to get the Democratic leader of the Senate at this crucial period in international diplomacy, and when the Congress is now driving for adjournment, while you are pressing for passage of important sections of the Kennedy administration program.

Senator, the Russians have made new charges that the West is misusing its air corridors into Berlin, by flying in saboteurs and espionage agents, heading at a new blockade. Will the United States use military force if necessary to preserve our rights and communications with West Berlin?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I would assume that we would use whatever means would be necessary to preserve our rights in Berlin, and also to preserve our rights of access into West Berlin and out of West Berlin into West Germany.

Mr. STRAWSER. Well, there comes a question, Senator MANSFIELD, just where do we draw the line? The things that have been going on in the past several days have all been piecemeal and chipping away at our rights as we define them. Where do we draw the line?

Senator MANSFIELD. That is something which the President would have to decide, because he is in charge of the foreign policy of this country. I don't think, though, that we should be surprised at the fact that this chipping away has taken place. The surprising factor to me is that it has not occurred sooner than it did. And as long as they are just chipping away as they are, I would say that while tension would mount, that the immediate difficulty would not become too apparent.

Mr. STRAWSER. What is your personal feeling about where we should draw the line?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, the line has already been drawn, and that is the border between East and West Berlin, and the routes of access into and out of Berlin.

Mr. CHURCH. Senator MANSFIELD, how do you assess the value of the Vice President's trip over there?

Senator MANSFIELD. I was one of those who was somewhat perturbed at the fact that the Vice President was going over to Berlin and Bonn, evidently in response to allegations made by the Germans, both in West Berlin and in West Germany itself. I for one did not like the statement made by Mayor Willy Brandt about politics, and that actions were needed and not words. I did not like the idea of these German students in West Germany sending an umbrella to the President of the United States. I was a little apprehensive even of the convoy of 1,500 combat troops from Helmstedt to West Berlin. But my worries were needless, because the Vice President was tremendously successful in what he was able to accomplish, along with Ambassador Bohlen and General Clay in West Berlin, and I think that by and large it was a successful venture in diplomacy, and had the affect of creating psychologically, at least, a good feeling and a feeling of security.

Mr. CHURCH. I take it you don't think that he went too far in promising all the way up to our sacred honor in defense of West Berlin?

Senator MANSFIELD. The Vice President did not go too far, because, despite the stories carried in the newspapers, he did not carry to the Germans any commitment which had not already been made to them.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, he is alleged to have recommended to President Kennedy that we should send more troops into the West Berlin garrison. Would you go along with that?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I don't think that that allegation is correct, because, as I understand it, the total which we are allowed under the agreement in West Berlin is 6,000. We had 4,500 prior to the bringing up of the 1,500 over the Autobahn. So now we have our full total of 6,000. I dare say that the French and the British are perhaps a little understrength at the present time, and that may be where the reference is.

Mr. CHURCH. There has been some water over the dam, Senator MANSFIELD, since you first made your suggestion for a free city of Berlin. How do you feel about it now?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I don't feel as good about it now as I did then, because since that time the East Germans have taken over control of East Berlin, erected a wall of sorts, and created certain points of entrance and egress. Up to that time, and for the 2 years previous, I think that the idea had much in the way of merit. It may not have been the answer, but certainly somebody has got to get off dead center. If we keep on going as we are now, it is like two trains coming together from opposite directions on the same track. And if a third way, or a way out is not found, those two trains are going to collide and the whole world is going to pay part of the price.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, Senator, you mentioned the fact that the French and the British seem to be understrength in their garrisons in Berlin. There have also been suggestions they are dragging their feet on this entire crisis situation, President de Gaulle particularly.

Senator MANSFIELD. I understand that the British are fairly anxious along with the Americans to undertake negotiations, but that President de Gaulle seems to think that all we have to do is to remain firm and that conditions will work out. I do not think that we should be guided in our policy by President de Gaulle, any more than I think we should be guided in our policy by Mayor Willy Brandt or Chancellor Adenauer. We have to do what we think is best, pick out a time which is propitious, and then get to work.

Mr. CHURCH. Do you feel that same way about resumption of nuclear testing—do it when we think it is right?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes, I think we have to chart our own destiny. We have to figure out just what course we should pursue. We have to recognize the fact that we have carried on negotiations, that we are trying to do the best we can to arrive at an accommodation. When you reach a point where that is no longer possible, then I think a decision must be made, and if one is to be made, it should be made by us.

Mr. DOWNS. You are not saying, sir, that our destiny is not tied up with the destinies of the entire free world.

Senator MANSFIELD. Not at all. But I do not think that we ought to hold back always and make sure that our allies will come around to our way of thinking, because we have something to perform in the function of leadership, and I think that we ought to assume that responsibility.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, I would like to get back to this question of what they call the undeclared policy of Britain and France. It was mentioned by Walter Lippmann. It has been mentioned in the European press—that the division, permanent division of Germany is not entirely a bad thing. And as one London newspaper put it, after fighting a bloody war to remove the Germans as a threat to the peace, we are not going to fight another war to unify them. And this seemed to be a very popular concept among the people at least of Western Europe. We call for reunification. Aren't we out in left field alone on this?

Senator MANSFIELD. That is right. And I daresay that the French and the British are not too dissatisfied with the present division of Germany. Maybe they have got something from their point of view. Our policy has been, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, to at least pay lip service to the idea of a reunified Germany. But I would point out that when we speak of a reunified Germany, we speak of East and West Germany primarily. The West Germans themselves refer to East Germany as Mittel Deutschland or Middle Germany, meaning, of course, that beyond the Oder-Neisse there is another Germany which has been occupied by the Poles and which in time may well have to be faced up to, because of the influence it may have on the history of Europe and the world.

Mr. DOWNS. You don't think we are going to come out, though, for a readjustment of that line at this particular time.

Senator MANSFIELD. Not at all. As a matter of fact, I think that insofar as the unification of Germany is concerned, which we have advocated consistently, that it is not in the immediate offing.

Mr. STRAWSER. Senator MANSFIELD, in exerting this Western leadership goal that you think we have, where do you think we

should go in this question of Berlin? What steps should we take now?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I think that what we ought to do now is to call Mr. Khrushchev to task on the basis of some of the statements and assertions he has made in his various speeches in recent weeks. He has said that he would—that he was going to negotiate a treaty with East Germany. Well, he can do that. There isn't a thing we can do to stop him. He has said that he would guarantee our access in and out of Berlin. How? Under what means? What guarantees will we have and how good will those guarantees be? What I think we ought to do is return to old-fashioned diplomacy and put our Ambassadors to work in a private way, away from the glare of publicity, give them authority and responsibility, and see if some way could not be found whereby we could both get off the main track on which we are coming together at the present time, some way in which an honorable, negotiable solution could be found which would protect the people of West Berlin, which would protect our right of access in and out of the city, and give some hope to the people of Middle Europe and the world of a peaceful future.

Mr. CHURCH. Senator MANSFIELD, why aren't we doing these things? What are we waiting for? What is the roadblock?

Senator MANSFIELD. I don't know. We may be doing them. But if we are, I have no knowledge of it. But it appears to me that the Soviet Ambassador, for example, is still in Moscow. We have a good Ambassador over there in the person of Ambassador Thompson. I see no reason why he couldn't carry on conversations with the Soviet Foreign Office, and Mr. Menshikov or his successor here carry on conversations with the State Department.

Mr. DOWNS. You seem to be dissatisfied with the recent course of American foreign policy. You feel that it has been too passive and not positive enough?

Senator MANSFIELD. I think we have been reacting for the past 10 or 12 years.

Mr. STRAWSER. Senator MANSFIELD, part of the fencing that is going on in this Berlin situation now is done with the uncommitted watching world in mind. And we have been quite shocked here in the West, I think, recently, by this statement by Nehru that our rights in Berlin are a concession from the Soviets. What suddenly happened in this fight for Nehru's mind?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, this appears to be opposite to what Nehru said last week, so I would expect him to reverse himself again next week. Those are things you have to expect. He has no immediate interest, though he does have, as all neutrals have, an indirect interest in what happens in Berlin.

Mr. DOWNS. There has been one suggestion that followed up your original one of several months ago, to make Berlin a free city, that perhaps they move the United Nations there as the capital of the divided world, perhaps as a third way of preserving the integrity of Berlin.

Senator MANSFIELD. That wouldn't be a bad idea—anything which would bring about the unification of Berlin, both East and West. And what a lot of people don't seem to realize is that the capital of East Germany is in Pankow, which is a part of East Berlin. It is an idea which I am sure that Mr. Ulbricht will never accept, which Mr. Khrushchev will never allow. But we have got to throw the ball back to them some way or other, and this is one way to put them, perhaps, on the defensive for a change.

Mr. CHURCH. I asked you about nuclear testing a moment ago, Senator MANSFIELD. What about disarmament? I suppose it seems to a good many of the people listening to you today that talking about disarmament under these Berlin conditions is kind of silly. How does it strike you?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I think there is a reason for the administration, and some of our best minds, thinking that the proposition of a disarmament agency ought to be given consideration at this time. Whether or not that is true, I am not prepared to say. But I do know this—that the executive branch does have a disarmament agency of sorts in operation under Mr. McCloy, and that if there is any need in the minds of the executive for a continuation of this kind of an agency, that can be done very well in the foreseeable future at least in the executive branch of the Government under Presidential order.

Mr. DOWNS. We seem to be having, or you do, at least, seem to be having a little trouble with the President's foreign aid program. What is going to come out of this House-Senate conference?

Senator MANSFIELD. That is hard to say. They tell me they have come to an agreement on 16 points of difference, and that 116 points of difference still remain. But I would hope that out of it would come a 3-year Treasury financing plan, and that the difference in the first year in funds between those allowed by the House and Senate would be split, so that the President would have something on the order of a little over $4 billion to inaugurate his program.

Mr. CHURCH. As I understand Mr. HALLECK of the House Republican leadership, he won't stand still for that.

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. HALLECK is only one House Member, though he does control a lot of Republicans and controls them quite well, on the basis of his record to date. But we will see what the conferees do, and then what the House will do if it has a chance to vote on a different proposition.

Mr. STRAWSER. Senator MANSFIELD, as the Democratic leader in the Senate, you promised to see that there is a chance to vote on further limiting debate in the Senate before this year is up. What do you think will be the chances for passage of such legislation?

Senator MANSFIELD. I couldn't say. We have reported out the change in rule XXII, out of the Rules Committee. It will be on the calendar shortly. It will be brought up before the Senate to work its will on as the last measure this session. Now, what the outcome will be, I cannot say. But I intend to do my best in line with the pledge made last January to bring about a change which would call for three-fifths of those present and voting instead of the two-thirds of those present and voting as is the case at the present time.

Mr. CHURCH. Has there been any pressure that you could relate or speak of in any way whatsoever put on you to back away from your cold promise?

Senator MANSFIELD. There have been some members who have come to me with the proposal that this matter could be put over until next January. I have stated that I have given my word, I intended to keep it, and unless they can unanimously agree to do so, the change in rule XXII will come up this session.

Mr. CHURCH. Would you be inclined, Senator MANSFIELD, to call a halt to the whole session if you should run into a bona fide long discussion of this matter on the floor—on the Senate floor—what is the word I am trying to find——

Mr. STRAWSER. Filibuster.

Mr. CHURCH. Filibuster.

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, yes, indeed. I think we ought to try and invoke cloture, and if cloture wins or fails, then I think we ought to, after a reasonable time, quit and go home and be ready for next year.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, how do you regard the Senate's failure to renew the fiat for the President's special Commission on Civil Rights? Is that a defeat for the Democrats, or did he want this Commission particularly?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, yes. The President wants the Civil Rights Commission extended. We have suffered a temporary setback, not a defeat. And I anticipate that before we close up shop for this session, that we will have extended it—that Commission.

Mr. STRAWSER. How will you arrange this?

Senator MANSFIELD. We will probably tie it to the State, Justice, and judiciary appropriation bill again, and ask permission to suspend the rules.

Mr. STRAWSER. What makes you feel this time you will be able to pass it?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I think in time we will win.

Mr. CHURCH. Senator MANSFIELD, we have been talking about a lot of individual pieces of legislation here, or possible legislation. Take a good, long breath and assess the legislative successes of the Congress from the Democratic standpoint.

Senator MANSFIELD. I can only speak for the Senate, Ted, and I think that on the whole we have had a fairly successful record. We have had a lot of cooperation, a lot of luck, and we have had a President of our own party in the White House, and all those amalgamated together spell a degree of success. But I think that one of the real reasons why we have been able to achieve a creditable record is because of the groundwork laid by LYNDON JOHNSON as majority leader over the past 3 or 4 years. He laid this groundwork, or he laid these foundations—what we have done is to build on them. And we get the credit but he has really done the work.

Mr. CHURCH. I can't help but inject a little bit of political thinking into this. Do you suppose the rank-and-file voter would agree with you?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes, if they knew the circumstances.

Mr. DOWNS. But the President still—for example, the medical aid to the aged, which was one of his big campaign issues and promises—that is dead for this session, isn't it?

Senator MANSFIELD. That is true. We can do nothing in the Senate, because of the appropriation responsibility of the House. So we have to wait for the House to take action. And that will be next year.

Mr. DOWNS. What kind of a school bill is going to come out? I mean what are you going to end up with?

Senator MANSFIELD. I wish I knew. We passed four school bills out of committees, passed one of them through the Senate. But we are just marking time to see what the House will do, and that will determine in large part what we will do.

Mr. STRAWSER. Senator MANSFIELD, what are you and the other Senators hearing from back home?

How is this getting across to the voters? We hear that the Republicans think they are going to make big gains in 1962.

Senator MANSFIELD. I think the Republicans have been strengthened since the November election. The proposal that this is a spending Congress and a spending administration is achieving some headway. The Republicans are saying it is all right to spend as much as you want on defense, but go slow on the domestic spending. They are operating in a way which I think will be politically advantageous to them. I don't blame them. It is a good tactic. But I think we have to take care of both the domestic and the foreign fronts at the same time if we can, and it is going to take money to take care of both.

Mr. CHURCH. Were you saying then, sir, that the Republicans are right when they say they will pick up some seats in 1962?

Senator MANSFIELD. I would say that things look a little more encouraging for them now than they did last November.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, you seem to have gotten over the economic hump, and the recession that we heard so much about at the beginning of the year is rapidly disappearing. How much can this be claimed as the achievement of the Kennedy administration, or how much is this just a momentum of our own economy coming back?

Senator MANSFIELD. I think that some of the measures taken by President Kennedy in his position as the Chief Executive did help to slow the downturn in the economy. However, I do not think that we have recovered purely because of Democratic policies. It is the way the economic cycle works. I think there is credit enough to go all the way around. I think that the President, though, made a significant contribution.

* * * * *

Mr. DOWNS. Well, there was some talk that when LYNDON JOHNSON stepped upstairs to the Vice-Presidency, that he was going to continue to operate the Senate. This has not been true. You have been the operating man on the floor.

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, LYNDON JOHNSON, in my opinion, was the greatest majority leader the Senate has ever had. I don't operate the Senate. I try to do what I can on behalf of my colleagues, both Democratic and Republican, in accord and cooperation with HUBERT HUMPHREY, who is the majority whip and GEORGE SMATHERS, who is the secretary of the conference. And then, of course, we have a very good sidekick on the other side in EVERETT DIRKSEN who, in my opinion, is one of the outstanding leaders the Senate has ever had, too.

* * * * *

Mr. DOWNS. Well, to get back to this campaign, the 1962 campaign, which is going to be an interesting one, because the policies of the New Frontier administration are going to be tested, what do you foresee as the major issues?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, next year it will be foreign policy. For the next decade it will be foreign policy and I think we might as well recognize that, and prepare ourselves accordingly. If some accommodation is not reached, we are going to have to continue to spend tens of billions of dollars in our defense, and in the promulgation of our foreign policy. Of course, you cannot disassociate domestic policy from that. But the prime factor is going to be our relations with other countries overseas and most importantly with the Soviet Union.

Mr. DOWNS. Have you been satisfied with the cooperation and contacts with the White House? For example, under the Eisenhower administration the Republicans were screaming that they often felt cut off and isolated. Are you advised in advance of policy? Are you called in and asked for your advice?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, sometimes; very rarely.

I think that is the way it should be, because under the Constitution the responsibility is the President's or through his agent, the Secretary of State. As far as the Congress is concerned, both Republicans and Democrats, I think, have had a good deal of easier access to the White House under President Kennedy than they ever did under President Eisenhower.

Mr. STRAWSER. You are an independent thinker in many ways, Senator MANSFIELD, and so is Chairman FULBRIGHT, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Do you think your independent and sometimes differing views are appreciated by the White House?

Senator MANSFIELD. I think so.

Mr. CHURCH. That is quite a spread sometimes there between you and Mr. FULBRIGHT. How could they be happy about two such important Members of the U.S. Senate, the majority leader and the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I think that President Kennedy has served long enough in the House and Senate, 14 years, to understand the practical situation as it applies to the Congress, and he doesn't expect to have things all his own way. He recognizes points of differences. But he realizes, and so do we, that he and he alone makes the ultimate decisions.

* * * * *

Mr. DOWNS. Thank you very much for appearing on "Capital Cloakroom."

BERLIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted at this point in the RECORD a statement I made to the press on August 26 relative to the Berlin situation.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD

The situation in Berlin seems to be edging toward the point where either a collision or an explosion can take place. The collision could be brought about by the Soviet Union and the Western powers keeping on the same track until they come together, and the explosion could be generated through an incident, an accident, or a provocation.

As I have indicated previously, a possibility for a "third way" must be found; a possibility which does not endanger our rights in West Berlin on our rights of access to and exit from West Berlin to West Germany. Beyond the defense of those rights against unilateral change by others, as I have said many times, I am not wedded to any particular situation at Berlin.

I am of the belief that other situations, other ways can be found which are better than those which have now existed for so many years despite the changes which have occurred since the end of World War II.

Mr. Khrushchev, in his public statements, has insisted that the situation in Berlin must be changed. He has also stated that the changes will not infringe upon our rights in that city, including the rights of access to West Berlin. While he has indicated the changes which he desires, he has not set forth in specifics how Western rights would be protected.

What we need, if there is to be peace as well as change at Berlin, is an elaboration of what the changes which Khrushchev proposes may mean. For example:

1. Mr. Khrushchev has contended that the East Germans can succeed to Soviet occupation rights in East Berlin by unilateral action. Does he recognize equally, then, that West Germans can succeed to Western rights of occupation in and access to West Berlin by unilateral action of the Western Powers?

2. Mr. Khrushchev insists that the routes of access to Berlin will remain open after he signs a peace treaty with East Germany. He says that there will be "any" guarantees necessary to achieve this end. But what kind of guarantees? Will East Germany have control of the routes of access after a peace treaty is signed? Will Russian forces remain in control of them? Will they be transferred to the Western Powers whose forces remain in West Berlin, which would be most logical inasmuch as the Soviet Union is the nation which desires to withdraw from its occupational responsibility? Or, if control is transferred to the East Germans, will the Soviet Union recognize and support the right of the Western nations to use whatever means may be necessary to guarantee access to Berlin if it should subsequently be impeded?

These are some of the questions which must be faced and answered soon. These are questions which can be discussed through negotiations at the ambassadorial level or, if need be, at a foreign ministers conference. Mr. Khrushchev has stated that we should sit down at a table and negotiate. These questions can form the substance of negotiations. They should be considered in private, without benefit of publicity and with a desire to avert a collision or an explosion. It is not so important who many initiate negotiations or in what circumstances they may be initiated. The people of the world would be grateful to whoever had the courage to initiate negotiations. It is not a question of negotiating through fear. It is not a question of giving up our rights in West Berlin and the routes thereto. It is a question of the substance of the negotiations and the sincerity of the desire to find mutually satisfactory answers to the kind of questions which I have enumerated and the skill of the diplomacy by which these answers are sought.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in previous comments on the Berlin situation, going back to early 1959, I have emphasized time and again that we needed to stand firm on our rights and the rights of freedom in Berlin. At the same time, I have suggested that changes in the situation in that city were likely whether we pursued them or not, but with an effective diplomatic initiative the changes might be turned to the advantage of all the parties concerned, toward peace rather than war.

As the Senate knows, Mr. President, one suggestion for a diplomatic initiative, for negotiations, was built on the concept of the international control of all Berlin—free West Berlin and Communist East Berlin—under effective guarantees, as an interim measure until such time as all of Germany might be unified.

For a complex of reasons, Mr. President—perhaps very valid and unavoidable reasons—a change of that kind was never pursued by a vigorous Western diplomacy. We are now confronted with the actuality of change at Berlin, a unilateral change on the part of the Soviet Union within their zone of occupation. This change, Mr. President, creates a situation of far greater tension than that which previously existed and very dangerous to the interests of all concerned—including the Soviet Union, whether Mr. Khrushchev realizes it or not. For it has brought closer than ever before, not a durable peace, but rather the danger of nuclear war by collision or explosion.

The recent closing of the Berlin border, Mr. President, would seem to make improbable the effective pursuit of a policy of internationalizing all of Berlin—Communist East and free West Berlin—such as was proposed more than 2 years ago and reiterated in June this year.

The question remains: Are any negotiations, now that this possibility has receded, compatible with the concept of standing firm on Western rights and the rights of freedom in what has become, by unilateral Communist action, a deeper truncation of Berlin? I still believe that any lasting progress toward a solution of the problem of peaceful unification of Germany must encompass the peaceful unification of Berlin, all Berlin. But what of the interim? What, if anything,

is there to negotiate now that the wedge of division has been driven deeper into Berlin? If Western rights to be in and to have access to that city, if the right of freedom to be present in Berlin, are not negotiable—and they are not—what, then, is there to negotiate?

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the only point on which negotiations are admissible is the "how" of these rights. How is the position of freedom to be protected? How are Western rights of access and presence to be safeguarded if the Soviet Union withdraws from its occupational responsibilities as it insists that it will do in the near future?

The important point is not who may initiate negotiations in a search for answers to these questions. What is important is the substance of negotiations. The Soviet Union has undertaken unilaterally to revise the situation at Berlin and contemplates revising it throughout East Germany, along the routes of access, by signing a peace treaty with the East German Government. So far the changes have affected only the zone of its own occupational responsibilities. But if the Soviet Union means to have peace, the responsibility rests with that nation to spell out in particulars how it means to safeguard the rights of the Western Powers of presence and access and the rights of freedom in Berlin before it proceeds with further changes in this situation. If the Soviet Union is prepared to do that then there is a function for negotiation. If they are not, there is a place only for propaganda and posing in any meetings which may take place at whatever level.

The point of no return is very close at Berlin and along the routes of access. The danger of the explosion or collision is real. It may still be possible to check or reverse the trend which has now begun but time is running out. There is no room left for bluff; there is only room for blunder. The responsibility of every responsible leader is to seek through sober negotiations to forestall a worldwide catastrophe.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR BUSH

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Farmington Valley Herald, of Farmington, Conn., which appeared in its August 10 issue. The editorial is a very fine analysis of the services in the Senate of our colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and is also a tribute to his qualities as a man. I know it will be read with great interest by many people throughout the country who know Senator BUSH personally or who know of his distinguished career, and the editorial will be read with particular interest by the Members of the Senate, both Republicans and Democrats, because they will know it reflects accurately their judgment of his service in the Senate and his character.

We know that Senator PRESCOTT BUSH is one of the ablest and most effective Members of the U.S. Senate. He is respected in the Senate for his ability and his leadership and for the qualities of integrity and courage which are manifest in everything he says and does.

We have no doubt that he will continue to serve his State and country in the Senate.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. The qualities which have made Senator PRESCOTT BUSH so able and so valued a Member of the Senate are those which have earned for him the respect of all his colleagues, on both sides of the aisle. He has been an able, thoughtful, earnest, and well-informed Senator; his services are of great value to this body; and his interest in his home State of Connecticut and its welfare and its problems has been demonstrated throughout his term here, and will continue to be of value to Connecticut and to the Nation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. It has been my pleasure to have served with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] during the entire time of my tenure as a Member of the Senate; and I have found him to be not only a faithful and valuable friend, but, more important, a valuable Member of this body.

Through my friends in Connecticut, I know that they realize his great worth, and I am certain that Senator BUSH will be returned by the people of Connecticut at the next election.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very glad the able Senator from Arizona has spoken in regard to this matter.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am honored to associate myself with the coments made by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and the other Senators who just now have spoken.

It was not very many days ago that the Senate engaged in a debate in regard to the level of expenditures recommended by the administration in the field of housing; and it was the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] who stood on this floor and led the fight in favor of holding the line. The House conferees had demanded that the Senate bill be increased by $1,200 million, above what the administration itself had asked for. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], with courage and clarity, led the fight against such fiscal irresponsibility. The Senator from Connecticut performed a brave, valiant, and patriotic service on that occasion, and on many others. I hope the people of Connecticut and the people of the United States may enjoy his honorable and constructive services to this Government for many years to come.

I thank the Senator from Kentucky for yielding to me.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to join with all the other Senators who have spoken in regard to the character, the ability, and the fine service Senator PRESCOTT BUSH has rendered to the State of Connecticut and to the Nation. I could speak at length and in detail in regard to his outstanding service, altough I am sure it is not necessary that I do so at this time. I hope the people of his State will realize that his service here has been most constructive and has been the kind that makes a real statesman.

So I am very glad to join with all the other Senators who have spoken in saying thanks for a good man.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

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

THEN WE'RE IN TROUBLE, TOO

The weekend news from Washington carried a statement by Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, chairman of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee, to the effect that Senator PRESCOTT BUSH had been warned that he was in trouble with his bid for reelection to the U.S. Senate. While such statements, and many more besides, will be made to generate interest in the 1962 elections, it seems to us that such a statement carries a disturbing element.

At the present time, Senator BUSH has no opponent, either in the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. After the political conventions have been held, there will be a Democratic nominee to oppose him, chosen possibly from the field of hopefuls that includes Lee, Kowalski, and Ribicoff.

But much more important than the caliber of the opposition is the character, the service, and ability of PRESCOTT BUSH during his tenure in the U.S. Senate. Most of us in the valley got to know him shortly after the floods of 1955, when we found him to be a man of deep compassion, boundless energy, and an unquenchable thirst for service to his State and constitutents.

In the 6 years that have intervened, Senator BUSH has demonstrated many times over that he possesses ability, understanding, integrity, dedication, and energy to a remarkable degree. No person is too small for his attention, nor too big for his stature. On top of everything else, he's got guts, too.

HARTKE has to be talking through his hat, for if the man who is one of the most able men in the entire Congress of the United States is in trouble, then the United States itself must be in dire straits, indeed. Since Oliver Ellsworth first represented Connecticut in the U.S. Senate in 1789, few of the 49 men have served her as well as PRESCOTT BUSH. We're not in trouble so long as men of BUSH's caliber represent us, and he won't be in trouble so long as we can see the difference between night and day.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Senator BUSH, of Connecticut. I believe he represents a very effective point of view in the Senate, aside from his individual effectiveness as a Senator, to which reference has been made today.

I find that his views on money and credit, with which I sometimes do not agree, are nonetheless so informed as to make me feel that the mosaic of information and expert advice available to us in the Senate is, because of men like PRESCOTT BUSH, one of the best in existence in any legislative body in the world.

I think the State of Connecticut has done us all a service in sending him to the Senate. He has as fine a body of information, as interesting and provocative an outlook on the way in which the economy of our country and of the world should be organized, as any Senator. As for me, I think to lose Senator BUSH would be an absolutely irreplaceable loss to the Senate. I hope very much the people of Connecticut will send him back to us. I am proud to be a witness to his capacity, his skill, and his real contribution to the Senate.

NEEDED: NEW DYNAMIC-PSYCHOLOGICAL OFFENSIVE AGAINST COMMUNISTS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the morning newspapers state that Premier Khrushchev says he is ready for talks on Berlin. As I read the articles, I remembered there was a man named Chamberlain, the head of the British Government, who had a talk with Hitler, and Hitler sold him a "bill of goods." Then Hitler broke his word. So, instead of "peace in our time," there was "war in our time."

In our negotiations with Khrushchev, we must bear in mind that Chamberlain-Hitler incident.

Shortly we shall have a report from the conference committee in relation to the funds that are being made available for Latin America. The conference at Punta del Este resulted in noble ideas and far-reaching promises. It was an attempt to achieve an orderly revolution in Latin America. Now, in spite of the terms of the foreign-aid bill, we know that the real responsibility for making progress will be that of the people of South America and their leaders. Right now, Brazil is having her troubles. The trouble with South America, of course, has been between the "haves" and "have-nots." The Latin Americans themselves will have to take hold of their economic and social problems. Upon their shoulders rests the responsibility to marshal their resources, bring about equitable tax laws, and see that there is expansion, agriculturally and industrially.

Unless this is done, our aid will be of no avail. If we shove this economic aid into South America without there being cooperation in the direction that I have suggested—I mean fundamental reforms as indicated—then our aid may aggravate social and political tensions. We seem to have little choice, however, but to go ahead. Unless you are able to guide the forces toward the values that we have suggested, Moscow will take a hand and channel the political and social structure into its way of thinking and living.

The world situation is such that, while we cannot intervene in South America, we do owe an obligation to ourselves and the South Americans to see that our resources that we pour in there are being well used, and not wasted on unsound projects, or shipped off, by the "haves," to bank accounts in other lands.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time available to the Senator from Wisconsin in the morning hour has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed for 3 more minutes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the free world—indeed all the people of the globe—have a great stake in peaceful settlement of the Berlin crisis.

To successfully meet and triumph over the challenge laid down by the Reds, the Western alliance, serving as the standard bearer of freedom, must maintain, of course, a maximum degree of unity. However, I believe this must be active, not inactive, unity. In Berlin, for example, Khrushchev is running with the ball, militarily, psychologically, economically, politically.

Meanwhile, the West appears to be too greatly preoccupied with just keeping its team organized.

In my judgment, however, we must get up off our sedentary solidarity and, shoulder to shoulder, march forward to undertake a dynamic diplomatic-psychological counteroffensive; continue to maintain, of course, a strong military deterrent against massive attack; and flexibly parry the jabbing harassments of the Reds.

Within the past days, Mr. Khrushchev has violated standards of international conduct in the following ways:

Broken postwar agreements by slamming shut the Iron Curtain.

Engaged in provocative acts on the border between the East and West Zones of Berlin.

Committed economic aggression against West Berlin.

Denied the rights of self-determination to the people of East Berlin and East Germany.

Challenged legitimate rights of the West to free access to the city, and other misdeeds.

Meanwhile, he has falsely accused the West of a wide range of provocative acts. And he gets away with it.

Is the West tonguetied? Must we stand idly and silently by while the Reds themselves commit dangerous threats to peace—brand us as black provocateurs threatening peace?

Now, it is true that from time to time the West "talks back." All too often, however, these are indistinct, weak-voiced rebuttals to Red charges, often cloaked, or lost in hypercomplex diplomatic language.

Strangely, the Western nations, many priding themselves on long traditions of high standards of diplomacy, find themselves handicapped in this crisis by loss of voice, by lack of ingenuity in proposing counterattacks, by ineffective counterpunching, by general inability to meet the Red tactics and maneuvers, particularly in propaganda.

The United States, for example—in its free enterprise system—has reflected a genius for salesmanship for such things as: soap, cigarettes, automobiles, cosmetics—you name it.

Paradoxically, however, we have not created successful enough techniques for selling: principles, ideals, legal facts, or truth—certainly not to the degree necessary to cope with the distortions created by the Red propaganda machine.

If we are not to be made the silent villian of the Soviet-staged power play in Berlin, then we need a stronger, clearer voice for Western policy. Among other things, this necessarily includes:

First. Presenting our case—right and just—to the court of world opinion.

Second. Baring flagrant violations of international good conduct by the Communists.

Third. Reemphasizing—harping upon, if necessary—the need for self-determination by the Berliners and all Germans on, for example, such questions as: The status of the city of Berlin; and unification or nonunification of Germany.

Day by day, there is a dangerous heightening of tensions—a pillbox hardening of East-West positions—advancement toward a military showdown—with all its dreadful implications for peace and the survival of humanity.

Between now and such a military showdown, however, there is time—precious time—which can, and should, be utilized by the West: First, to undertake a more dynamic, psychological, diplomatic, political counteroffensive; second, refute Red propaganda; third, muster support for the Western position among the nondirectly involved nations of the world; and fourth, create constructive alternatives for solution of the crisis.

The time to act is now—not after the nuclear-warheaded rockets are firing.

Yesterday, I was privileged to discuss other aspects of this challenge is a broadcast over radio station WGN, Chicago. I request unanimous consent to have excerpts from this address printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS OF HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

Day by day, the Communists attempt to carry out new types of harassment to the West. The first steps in the Kremlin's dangerous campaign included: slamming shut the Iron Curtain between East and West Berlin; challenges to utilization of the air corridors by the West; and other provocative acts.

Now, let's face it: Mr. Khrushchev is dead set on attempting to choke off West Berlin. From all evidence, he is willing to push the world to the brink of a third world war.

In the harrowing days ahead, then, we can expect more border incidents; deliberate attempts to delay, or obstruct, access to the city by the West; interference with the internal life of the West Berliners; and other efforts to snuff out the light of this beacon of freedom within the Red orbit.

The Red campaign, too, includes threats of signing a separate peace treaty between the Soviet Union and East Germany. Realistically, this would—if it occurs at all—only be a deceptive ritual. For Khrushchev will still be pulling the strings; and the East German puppet government will be dancing to the tune played in Moscow.

To withstand such a barrage of provocation, however, we will need to be alert, strong, but not trigger happy. Khrushchev would probably like nothing better than to have us take countermeasures that would provide justification—in the eyes of the world—for further Communist aggression.

In attempting to cope with such threats to peace, the West, unfortunately, finds itself in an extremely difficult position. Why? Because our posture—now that East-West positions are relatively hardened and deadlocked—is essentially defensive, rather than offensive.

To protect Western rights, obligations, and interests, however, we will need to: stand firm to repel and broadscale attacks by the Communists; utilize flexible diplomatic and military footwork in parrying provocations; and undertake a more dynamic psychological-diplomatic offensive to brand the Kremlin's deliberately created crises in Berlin as a threat and danger to world peace.

Particularly, I believe, we need renewed, more expansive efforts to educate world opinion on the issues at stake in Berlin. Why? Because the weight of global opinion—bearing on an East-West deadlock—may well be a strongly influencing factor in determining the outcome.

On global broadcasting systems—as well as behind the scenes—the Communists are busy telling their story—and distorting the Western position.

What are we doing? Is the West being left at the post?

For our own security, this had better not happen. Why? Because in the event of a showdown, this could do immeasurable damage to our cause. It could affect not only the outcome of the Berlin crisis, but, if war is averted now, future contests between freedom and communism.

Fundamentally, the Western position is morally and legally right. But we must not hide our light under a bushel. We cannot, for example, take it for granted that less directly involved nations will automatically know, and understand, the true facts involved in the crisis. Rather, we must clearly present the picture for comprehension by the global mind.

To succeed in Berlin, then, our actions must equal—and surpass—the ingenuity of the many-pronged political, psychological, military, economic Red offensive.

REMOVING THE SAFEGUARD

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, recently the Senate had before it the question of mutual security legislation. The President of the United States requested that the program for the Development Loan Fund be authorized for 5 years, and that Congress write into the proposed legislation authorization for Treasury borrowing, or what is more popularly known as back-door spending. Some of us in the Senate contended that Congress ought not to abdicate its constitutional responsibility. We opposed what the administration requested. Some of us who have favored mutual security in the past, and who do so today, urged that the administration be given long-term authorization, but that Congress continue to discharge its constitutional obligations of determining each year the amount of money to be expended by the administration in the entire mutual security program, precisely as is the rule generally with respect to the laws which govern this country.

On August 18, the Los Angeles Herald Express published an excellent editorial on this subject entitled "Removing the Safegard." The editorial indicates that Congress ought not to abandon what the Founding Fathers gave to this legislative branch with respect to authority over the purse strings. I agree.

This is not the first time that this problem has been before us. In 1959, under the administration of President Eisenhower, certain Senators wanted Congress to abandon its control over the purse strings in a fashion somewhat similar to that recommended this year by the Kennedy administration. Some of us objected to it in 1959. We object to it again in 1961.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMOVING THE SAFEGUARD

President Kennedy asked authority from Congress to be allowed to borrow $8.8 billion over the next 5 years to finance long-range development loans as a part of the foreign-aid bill.

But why for 5 years or even 4 years? There is no assurance that Mr. Kennedy even will be President then. Someone else might be elected; someone else will have hold of the purse strings.

The President's argument is that he wants the 5-year term authority, because it would enable the administration to undertake long-range projects on a businesslike basis without the danger of interference by Congress, which might decide not to advance the money.

But that is what we would not like to see, the abandonment by Congress of its power to carefully oversee, and to deny, the squandering of billions of dollars if it feels such expenditures are not in the people's interest.

It would be a complete surrender of Congress power to check extravagances. It would be a givein to dictatorship at the top.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, proposed an amendment to the aid bill which would flatly prohibit any assistance to Communist regimes behind the Iron Curtain.

In this connection, Senator DODD declared:

"Aid to the Communists, in whatever guise, strengthens their war machines, reinforces their reign of terror against their own people, helps them to hide their failures, lends them respectability, breaks the spirit of underground resistance, and weakens the free world by diverting our resources from our own vital needs."

Our principal fear is that if the long-range bill should be passed, there might be wrongful diversion of the taxpayers' billions, without the safeguard of congressional approval.

No matter how much the committees or Congress might oppose any of these loan proposals, they would have no power to stop the spend boys, even when the spenders are dead wrong.

Although we know this is a period of emergency, there is no good reason for Congress to abandon its power to hold the Nation's purse strings.

CONCERN FOR THE CONSUMER

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it was interesting to me to note in this morning's issue of the Washington Post that the National Association of Manufacturers is now coming over to a point of view that many Senators have long espoused, and that is concern for the consumer. However, the editorial to which I have referred indicates that the NAM is taking a positive tack. They now fear the consumer may suffer from a labeling provision that is suggested regarding some of the plastic and plywood uses of wood.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SIMULATED PERIL

A new threat to the spirit of free enterprise has been lately discerned by the National Association of Manufacturers. Several Congressmen are attempting to require labeling of products that may be painted to look like wood but, like the wolf in grandmother's bed, are not quite what they seem. If a table is made of plastic or tin printed to resemble mahogany, it would have to be marked "simulated." This, according to the NAM, would lead to widespread deception of the public.

The very word "simulated" carries a connotation of trashiness, the NAM fears, calculated to blight the sale of goods that, in the larger design of things, are perhaps better made of hardboard and sheet steel than oak. The public would be misled into thinking there was something the matter with these articles. A warning of this sort would only create more problems for the consumer than it solves, according to the association. For one thing, it would make him wonder what he was getting for his money. That thought always creates problems among consumers, as the NAM knows.

On the other hand, behind these bills one can perceive the same generous and competitive spirit that for years lobbied diligently to prevent manufacturers from coloring margarine yellow. This is one of the rare instances in which one is quite justified in permitting himself the luxury of opposing both sides of the question.

AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION BY JUDICIAL FIAT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, an interesting discussion of the Supreme Court decision in the school desegregation cases of 1954, commonly referred to as Brown against Board of Education, by a very distinguished constitutional lawyer of Seattle, Wash., the Honorable Alfred J. Schweppe.

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

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF ALFRED J. SCHWEPPE, OF SEATTLE, WASH.

(Partial dissent from report of the standing committee on the bill of rights of the American Bar Association presented at the annual convention at St. Louis, Mo., August 1961.)

While I agree with the committee's statement that during the past year "the most conspicuous constitutional problem has involved the 14th amendment and race relations," I cannot subscribe to the statement "that the outcome of the public school cases of 1954 was by no means surprising to one who evaluated the preceding series of adjudications."

Being on the public record with the opposite opinion (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 11, p. 14380), I am unable to endorse that statement. To one who, both academically and professionally, has closely followed the course of the Supreme Court for many years, the Brown and Bolling cases and the rationale of those decisions as judicial rulings under the Constitution came as a tremendous shock.

I disagree strongly with those who claim that the Brown and Bolling cases were foreshadowed in such cases as *Sipuel* v. *Board of Regents of the Univ. of Okla.*, 332 U.S. 631 (1948); *Sweatt* v. *Painter*, 339 U.S. 629 (1950); and *McLaurin* v. *Okla. State Regents*, 339 U.S. 637 (1950). The cases just cited were based squarely upon the separate and equal doctrine under the equal protection clause, in that in those cases equal facilities in certain institutions of higher education had not been provided at the time the Negro students applied for entrance to exclusively white State-supported universities.

Those decisions, dealing with equal facilities at the college level, can hardly be said to be a precedent for the radical change in constitutional doctrine contained in the Brown and Bolling cases in 1954, dealing with elementary and secondary educational systems which had been set up at great cost over many decades in reliance upon what appeared to be a constitutional pattern that was thoroughly and unanimously settled at the Federal level as late as the Gong Lum case in 1927 and fully recognized in later cases, unless Congress, exercising its legislative grant of power under the 14th amendment, should otherwise declare.

Congress under section 5 of the 14th amendment had "power to enforce, by appropriate legislation," the equal protection clause contained therein. That body had the primary constitutional duty to carry out the intent of the amendment. The very Congress that proposed the 14th amendment, from the beginning, and all subsequent Congresses down to the date of the school decisions in 1954, had expressed their intent as to equal protection by providing for separate but equal schools in the District of Columbia and for equal treatment in the States.

The 14th amendment, adopted July 28, 1868, was proposed by the 39th Congress on June 16, 1866 (14 Stat. 358). On July 23, 1866, the same 39th Congress passed a bill requiring school moneys in the cities of Washington and Georgetown to be divided proportionately between white and colored schools (14 Stat. 216), and on July 28, 1866, it passed a bill setting aside certain lands in Washington, D.C., for colored schools. Separate schools for colored children in the District of Columbia were provided by the act of July 11, 1862. In the tough Civil Rights Act of 1870 imposed by a punitively minded North-dominated Congress and subsequent statutes enacted in the seventies to enforce the 14th amendment, no provision was made for integrated schools. On March 3, 1873, Congress reenacted an act governing colored schools in the District of Columbia (17 Stat. 619). As late as 1946 in the school lunch legislation (42 U.S.C. 1760) Congress provided that if a State maintained separate schools for minority and majority races the money should not be available "unless a just and equitable distribution is made within the State." Without cataloging all of the enactments, it is utterly unthinkable historically that the framers of the 14th amendment intended white and colored schools to be integrated, and that the identical Congress and subsequent Congresses completely misinterpreted that intent by passing unconstitutional legislation for almost a hundred years. Yet the intent of the framers of the amendment was the only question before the Court in 1954.

My views on the Court's conduct in these 1954 public school cases are set forth in U.S. News & World Report, October 24, 1958, pages 110–112, in part, as follows:

"When the Court, in the first *Brown* v. *Board of Education* school-segregation case, in 1954, found the history of the 14th amendment to be inconclusive—which was, I believe, an understatement—one would think a court, acting judicially, would have said that, 'there being no persuasive evidence of intent of the framers of the amendment that the prior decisions of the Court are wrong, those decisions must stand, with the subject matter left to Congress or the amendatory process, as the Court has so often heretofore said about policy matter.'

"Just a few words about the prior decisions to illustrate my point. There were a number of applicable earlier precedents, the first in 1896, the last in 1950.

"By way of concrete example, in the Gong Lum case of 1927—a school case from the State of Mississippi, in which both the question of equal protection of the laws per se and the separate-but-equal question under the 14th amendment were directly raised—the Supreme Court, then composed of Chief Justice Taft and Justices Holmes, Brandeis, Stone, Van Devanter, McReynolds, Sutherland, Butler, and Sanford, unanimously decided both questions in favor of the segregated schools provided for by the constitution of the State of Mississippi (see detailed comments, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 11, p. 14380).

"Indeed, Chief Justice Taft, writing the opinion of the unanimous Court, said: 'Were this a new question it would call for very full argument and consideration, but we think that it is the same question which has been many times decided to be within the constitutional power of the State legislature to settle without intervention of the Federal courts under the Federal Constitution.'

"Thus in 1954 the present Supreme Court reversed precedents upholding segregated-school legislation not written alone in 1896, although the Court in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was much closer in time to the intent of the 14th amendment than it was 60 years later, but a decision rendered unanimously in 1927 by a great Court headed by Chief Justice Taft, and including among its membership Justices Holmes, Brandeis, and Stone, whose names are commonly associated with a liberal view of the Constitution in the field of individual rights.

"It will be especially noted that the distinguished 1927 Court considered itself bound by the long-established precedents, and that it was not within judicial competence to upset a constitutional interpretation so long settled.

"There is no question that the decisions in the Brown and Bolling cases in May of 1954, giving a completely new meaning to the Constitution, were a violent shock to those who believe in constitutional stability and constitutional precedent, and who look upon the judges of the Supreme Court as declarers of law rather than as social engineers, since changes in the social order, insofar as they fall within the Federal domain, seem clearly to have been left to Congress or the amendment process by those who wrote the Constitution and its various added provisions.

"Chief Justice John Marshall said in the great case of *Marbury* v. *Madison:* 'It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is.'

"There is no doubt what the law was at 11:59 a.m. on May 17, 1954. It had been definitely settled in Gong Lum in 1927, and in other cases. In 1938, Chief Justice Hughes, speaking for a majority of himself and Justices Brandeis, Stone, Black, Reed, and Roberts, had said in Missouri *ex rel Gaines* v. *Canada* (305 U.S. 337): 'The State has sought to fulfill that obligation by furnishing equal facilities in separate schools, a method the validity of which has been sustained by our decisions. *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U.S. 537, 544); *McCabe* v. *Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Co.* (235 U.S. 151, 160); *Gong Lum* v. *Rice* (275 U.S. 78, 85, 86). Compare *Cumming* v. *Board of Education* (175 U.S. 528, 544, 545).'

"In fact, in *Sweatt* v. *Painter*, 339 U.S. 629 (1950) the identical Court that decided the Brown case in 1954—substituting only Chief Justice Vinson for Chief Justice Warren—namely, Justices Black, Reed, Frankfurter, Douglas, Jackson, Burton, Clark, and Minton, rested the decision squarely on the separate-but-equal doctrine.

"But on May 17, 1954, at 1 p.m., all this was changed—changed by a judicial amendment of the Constitution—by a court that, instead of declaring 'what the law is,' declared what, in the personal opinion of the then-incumbent judges, the law ought to be, in spite of a hundred years of Federal and State legislation to the contrary, and contrary to judicial decisions long accepted by the Court itself as conclusive.

"How far the Court went overboard in 1954 is most luridly demonstrated in the companion case—*Bolling* v. *Sharpe*, a case amazingly overlooked most of the time by Court critics—in which the Court flagrantly amended the due-process clause of the fifth amendment by converting it into an equal-protection clause.

"If the *Brown* v. *Board of Education* case was startling, the companion Bolling case, invalidating the segregated-school statutes of Congress in the District of Columbia almost 100 years old, was even more startling.

"The Court decided the Brown case under the equal-protection clause of the 14th amendment, saying: 'We hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated, for whom the actions have been brought, are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment. This disposition makes unnecessary any discussion, whether such segregation also violates the due-process clause of the 14th amendment.'

"But in the companion case of *Bolling* v. *Sharpe*, decided the same day with reference to the District of Columbia's segregated-school statutes enacted by Congress, the Court faced the dilemma that the Federal Constitution contains no equal-protection clause as a limitation on the Federal Government. The 14th amendment contains both a due-process and an equal-protection clause, the due-process clause having been taken over verbatim from the fifth amendment, and adds purposefully an equal-protection clause, because that concept was deemed and construed not to be embraced in due process (see *Hurtado* v. *California*). But the fifth amendment, applicable to the Federal Government, contains only a due-process clause.

"However, the Court that had made the psychological ruling in the Brown case was equal to the dilemma that it faced in the Bolling case. It held that the due-process clause of the fifth amendment should be deemed also an equal-protection clause as respects the Federal Government—a clear case of judicial amendment of the Constitution

"When the fifth amendment was adopted in 1791, at the instance of the very first Congress, importation of slaves was expressly protected in the Federal Constitution until 1808—article I, section 9—and slaves were then considered property protected by the due-process clause of the fifth amendment.

"Thus a provision of the Federal Constitution which when adopted in 1791 did not prohibit but protected slavery, is now construed in 1954 to prohibit segregation in the public schools of the District of Columbia. The present Court no longer concerns itself with the intent of the Founding Fathers or the framers of the 14th amendment, but substitutes its own (see Ralph T. Catterall, 'Judicial Self-Restraint,' American Bar Association Journal, September 1956, p. 829).

"While I can agree with Bancroft that a court decision that violates the Constitution is just as void as an act of Congress that violates the Constitution who will settle the

question? The Bolling case, for example, in my opinion, flagrantly and by illogical and ludicrous reasoning violates the Constitution and indelibly highlights how far the Court was making policy in the Brown case and changing the 5th amendment to conform to the 14th in the Bolling case (see comments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 11, p. 14380, especially p. 14381).

"Obviously the Court, having made up its collective mind to outlaw State statutes and constitutional provisions, did not face up to the completely different constitutional situation in the District; so the judges closed their eyes to the text and history of the due-process clause of the 5th amendment—and as interpreted in the 14th—and completely rewrote it, I think, inexcusably."

The Court, apparently without realizing it (it had expressly decided the Brown case under the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment) actually rendered the equal protection clause of that amendment pure surplusage, because, notwithstanding the contrary history, it found that the equal protection concept is embodied in the due process clause of the 5th amendment; and as everybody knows, the due process concept of the 14th was bodily adopted from the 5th. As now construed by the present Court, we have never needed an equal protection clause in the 14th amendment, although hundreds of decisions are based on it. This is the sort of thing that happens when a court abnegates the judicial function and undertakes to legislate.

Having been born and reared in Minnesota, I grew up in an atmosphere free of legal restrictions on race, and am in accord with the State policies of nonsegregation which prevailed in the schools and colleges I attended in the Middle West, though I have never felt that I should force my opinions on southerners who have a different viewpoint and possibly a different experience. However, as a lawyer I have been deeply concerned over the legal processes by which desegregation has been arrived at by the Supreme Court in the State and Federal segregation cases decided in May 1954 and 1955.

I had thought long prior to the school cases of 1954, that the continued pressure of the separate and equal doctrine as declared by Congress and by the Supreme Court, the high cost of maintaining segregated schools of equal stature, the more rapid emergence of the colored race under better schooling, and the cooperation of the intelligent persons of both races might in foreseeable time bring about substantial progress in this sensitive area, without the violent reactions that have since ensued. To me it was a problem to be solved by orderly evolution, not by a judicial explosion.

As a matter of principle, I believe that nonsegregation is sound and a proper goal to be effected by appropriate constitutional means—by the Congress or by constitutional amendment at the appropriate time when the requisite majorities approve; but I deny that the Court had the constitutional competence to effect the change.

I do not subscribe to the theory that the end justifies the means, however desirable the end.

The committee report mentions President Jackson's attitude toward nullification. In an earlier period we might have seen a demonstration of the attitude toward unpalatable Supreme Court decisions ascribed to President Jackson, who was both a lawyer and an ex-judge of the Tennessee Supreme Court. He said: "John Marshall wrote it; let him enforce it."

But then is not now.

The course pursued by the Supreme Court in the school cases may properly be described as unconstitutional. Mr. Justice Brandeis in *Erie Railroad* v. *Tompkins* 304 U.S. 64, 77–78, so described a long series of decisions beginning with *Swift* v. *Tyson*, 16 Pet. 1, written by Justice Story and followed in dozens of later cases. Mr. Justice Holmes spoke of "an unconstitutional assumption of powers by the courts of the United States." (Ibid, p. 79.)

While the foregoing is a tenable viewpoint with respect to the school decisions, the acceptance by the Congress, the Executive, and the majority of the people and their enforcement by the lower Federal courts at least in the Federal system have the practical effect of making it the law of the land, and lawyers in any event, as officers of the court, must accept the result, though reserving the right to criticize the Court's adjudicatory processes.

Moreover, while deprecating any resort to violence, lawyers must recognize that a Supreme Court decision may be opposed "by all lawful means," as resolved by a group of Senators and Congressmen some years ago. Every person in these United States, including any Communist, has the right to seek change "through peaceful and constitutional means." *Schneiderman* v. *United States*, 320 U.S. 118, 143. That is a civil right fully protected by the Constitution.

A legal and social revolution effected by Court decision without legislative concurrence and against legislative precedent of a hundred years is necessarily a different phenomenon from a major social change effected by legislation with Court approval. Especially is this so when the Court reverses its own almost century-old position which was formerly consistent with the viewpoint of both Congress and of the States.

In appraising the public reaction, especially in the South, to those decisions it must be borne in mind that the people are accustomed to important legal changes arrived at by Congress after long open debate and full notice to the public and an opportunity to every citizen to be heard. A social revolution, on the other hand, effected by a Supreme Court decision evolved privately in chambers obviously caught many people with indescribable surprise and unbelief.

With reference to change "by all lawful means," two Supreme Court decisions were upset by constitutional amendment. (*Chisholm* v. *Georgia* and the 11th amendment; *Farmers Loan & Trust Co.*, case and the 16th amendment). Congress has reversed many a Supreme Court interpretation, although in the school cases Congress is apparently stripped of power because its several segregation statutes were held unconstitutional by the nonsequitur reasoning and fifth amendment misinterpretation described above. And there may be areas for State legislation, however narrow, in view of the Court's present position, that will withstand assault under the Constitution. The proponents of such measures are entitled to press them to final Court test.

Resistance to unpalatable law is not an isolated phenomenon of the Deep South. Leaving aside the prohibition experiment and the deep scars left by it on our social order, witness the thunderous reaction to the validity of the Dred Scott decision. Again, witness the history of the fugitive slave law sustained by the Supreme Court and designed by Congress to reduce tension in the days prior to the Civil War by facilitating the return of slaves who had escaped northward. Many Northern States resorted to interposition by enacting State "personal liberty laws," which forbade State courts to take jurisdiction of cases under the fugitive slave law.

In my lexicon there is, of course, no room for violent conduct on the part of the proponents of segregation, just as there is no room for the illegal conduct of the sit-in protestants or freedom riders, who seem to win approval in unexpected places.

My objection to the school cases, as outlined above, is based on principle—namely, that the Court had no constitutional right to decide these cases as it did, after the Court had said in 1927 unanimously (Holmes, Brandeis, and Stone concurring) that the question had been so often decided under the 14th amendment as not to leave any substantial Federal question.

A word about *Mapp* v. *Ohio*, decided 5 to 4 on June 19, 1961, overruling *Wolfe* v. *Colorado*, 338 U.S. 25 (1949) and holding that a conviction obtained in a State court on an illegal search and seizure by State officers violates the 14th amendment.

While again I am in sympathy with the end, I am opposed to this new and unwarranted extension of Federal power by further stretching the 14th amendment. I support the minority.

It has long been the rule of the English courts and of many American courts that the admissibility of evidence is not effected by the manner in which, or the source from which, it is obtained. There is logic in this view. But to paraphrase Mr. Justice Holmes, law is not primarily a creature of logic but of human experience. Our greatest scholar in the field of evidence, Dean Wigmore, a fine logician, characterizes the exclusion by a number of State courts to the "heretical influence of *Weeks* v. *United States*" and as a "contagion of sentimentality in some of the State courts, inducing them to break loose from long-settled fundamentals." (See Wigmore on Evidence (3d ed.) sec. 2184.)

However, I do not agree with Wigmore's view because of the historical background of our constitutional search and seizure provisions, and because of the restraint the exclusionary rule puts on overzealous police activity. Experience, in my view, shows the latter reason at least to be sound. (Fortunately, my own State has long excluded such evidence. *State* v. *Rousseau*, 40 Wn. (2d) 92, 241, P. 2d 447.)

But, as should be apparent by now, I am opposed to the increase of the restraints on the several States by the legislative processes of the present Supreme Court which seems to consider itself a constitutional convention with plenary powers entitling it to rewrite the Constitution in its own image, or "as a third legislative chamber," if I may use the apt phrase of Judge Learned Hand in his brilliant little book "The Bill of Rights."

The conduct of the court makes a travesty of the statement of the majority in *Ullman* v. *United States*, 359 U.S. 422, 428:

"Nothing new can be put into the Constitution except through the amendatory process. Nothing old can be taken out without the same process."

Except as above noted I concur in the report of the committee.

ABSTENTION OF UNITED STATES IN VOTE IN UNITED NATIONS ON TUNISIAN RESOLUTION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am obliged to express my profound disappointment over the abstention of the United States in the vote taken last Friday at the United Nations on the resolution relating to the crisis in Tunisia.

By a vote of 66 to 0, the General Assembly approved the resolution, urging immediate negotiations over the Bizerte dispute, and recognizing Tunisia's right to call for a withdrawal of French troops from her soil. Although 30 countries abstained, among them the United States, not a single vote was cast against the resolution. Even France chose to absent herself, rather than debate the issue before the bar of world opinion.

The failure of the United States to cast its vote in support of the best friend we have in Africa is indefensible. If the

principle of self-determination is right for Germany, it is also right for Tunisia. We cannot have it one way in Europe, and another way in Africa, without being guilty of hypocrisy.

I regret, Mr. President, that I must criticize a decision made by a Democratic administration. Having a high regard for our President, I took the floor only last month to commend him for the promising new African policy he initiated in the opening days of his tenure. I applauded the wisdom of the vote we cast in support of the U.N. resolution on Angola, even though we were obligated to part company with Portugal, one of our NATO allies. Differing with France may be harder, but the issue presented by the resolution on Tunisia was not so removed from that on Angola as to justify our abstention. Each time we permit expediency to override the fundamental principles we proclaim to the world, our cause is weakened everywhere.

So, Mr. President, I protest our abstention. I trust it is only one faltering step back from the hopeful start we have made in the development of an independent policy toward Africa, based upon those just principles we have traditionally believed to be the inalienable rights of man.

POULTRY PRICES

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, earlier this month the junior Senator from Georgia called the attention of the Senate to the dire economic circumstances in which the American poultry industry finds itself as the result of overproduction. In those remarks, I outlined my recommendation that the Secretary of Agriculture act to afford immediate relief to the industry through the purchase of 6 to 8 million laying hens for consumption in the school lunch program.

The underlying reason for the overproduction which has depressed the poultry industry is a practice known in the trade as "vertical integration"—an arrangement through which large feed manufacturers subsidize increased poultry production without regard to the relationship between supply and demand. It is the opinion of the junior Senator from Georgia, Mr. President, that Congress sooner or later is going to have to look into this practice and the effect it is having upon the agricultural economy of the Nation.

The problem was placed in perspective by Farm Editor Harold Joiner, of the Atlanta, Ga., Journal in his column appearing in the Sunday, August 27, issue of that paper. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of it be printed herewith in the body of the RECORD.

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

POULTRY PRICES CONTINUE TO FALL, SOME LOOKING FOR U.S. CONTROLS

(By Harold Joiner)

There have been some serious charges made before a congressional committee recently concerning the important poultry industry of this Nation and the Southeast has looked on with watchful eyes.

For this is bread and butter to hundreds of thousands of persons in Georgia and the surrounding States. The Georgia Crop Reporting Service has just issued its annual survey of 1960 cash income from the farm.

And as could be expected, commercial broilers contributed the largest percentage of the total cash income. The 21.6 percent of the income is nearly twice the share of the next commodity.

So it stands to reason the poultrymen, the processors, and everyone else connected with the industry is concerned with the charges, brought on by the record low prices.

It stems from this business of integration of the industry, something that has concerned many agricultural leaders for some years now. Farmers in the beginning surrendered part of their initiative and say-so by allowing the processor or the feed dealer or some other representative share in the production management because they were going to handle the marketing end.

We have so often said, in this corner that marketing of Georgia farm products is one of the most vital concerns today. But, this is a place to use caution. The marketing should come through the farmers themselves.

To surrender the marketing at this time could lead to something similar to that which has plagued the chicken farmers in the State and around the Nation.

It has been generally conceded for many months now that the feed dealers who have furnished contracts to the broiler grower has been only breaking even or has been losing money on the broilers.

Now anyone knows that a businessman does not lose money on some deal—not more than once. But these same dealers have been continually placing the chickens on the farm.

So they have been making money on the feed then. This is their only chance at a profit and few people can believe they are in the business only to give the man a chance to grow chickens.

But the price of chickens continues to suffer, going down to lower records. The grower cannot survive in a squeeze that has threatened him for many months, but now threatens his dealer who is also feeling the squeeze.

Once again it is the giant in the industry who is feeling the least pinch. Maybe it is because they have guarded against such a moment by building toward it. Then maybe it is an attempt to drive the little man out, some of the poultry people have said.

Georgians are anxiously awaiting the outcome. Many people see a control of some kind in the next few months as the Government begins to police the industry during a time when trouble abounds.

It is another example of what can happen if the farmers themselves do not keep at least a sharing hand in the selling of their own "stuff."

If there is evidence of any attempt to drive the little feed dealer from the scene then every Georgian should be concerned for it could be an indication of things to come in other agricultural pursuits. Let the authorities deal with the responsible persons or clear their name once and for all.

Georgia and the Southeast have a great stake in the broiler problem and the quicker the solution the better it will be for all her citizens.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT TRANSMISSION SYSTEM

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in the month of June a letter which was prepared and sent to me by the director of the Arizona Public Service Co. was never delivered. A copy of that letter was printed in the RECORD by the junior Senator from Arizona, who understood the letter had been delivered.

Since that time I have received the letter from the Arizona Public Service Co., and I have prepared a reply to that letter. Since the incoming letter is in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that my reply be printed in the RECORD, and I also ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 16, 1961, entitled "Public, Private Power Gird for a New Struggle," be printed in the RECORD.

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

AUGUST 21, 1961.

Mr. JOHN M. JACOBS,
Chairman of the Board,
Arizona Public Service Co.,
Phoenix, Ariz.

DEAR Mr. JACOBS: I have now received and read the copy of your letter dated June 22, 1961, which was sent me under date of July 27, 1961.

In your June letter you demand that I apologize for a statement I submitted June 7 to the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee in support of an all-Federal transmission system for the Colorado River storage project. While I can understand that the financial and public relations interests of your company require the submission and exploitation of the communication which you sent me, I can see no reason to apologize for stating facts that are a matter of public record.

First of all, may I say that I did not anywhere imply—or intend to imply—that there is anything "illegal" in the relations between the Arizona Public Service Co. and Ebasco Services, or that the directors of the Arizona Public Service Co. "have acted or will act illegally in collusion with Ebasco Services." If the directors of the Arizona Public Service Co. choose to read this implication into my statement—it can only be because what I said put them on the defensive.

Second, I did not argue that purchasing technical or specialized services from Ebasco Services was not in the best interest of your company. I have no doubt that you are guided by one rule—that your policies must be in the best interests of the Arizona Public Service Co.—as you see those interests.

But I do say that the record makes it abundantly clear that there are close connections between your company and Ebasco, which appear to go beyond the purely technical in scope. For example, in 1960, your company was billed by Ebasco for nearly $1 million in charges. In addition to fees and expenses assessed by Ebasco for work in connection with steamplants, the charges included bills for preparation of Federal income tax returns, rate structure and loan growth studies, sales and marketing analyses, insurance, rate case preparation, financing work, distribution facilities methods assistance, and other services.

Also, the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly has found that by means of contracts made at less than arms length, Ebasco has been able on occasion to dominate the management and policies of its clients and dictate policies and decisions. I do not say there have ever been such contracts between Ebasco and your company—I only point out what is a matter of public record in other instances to illustrate why there is so much concern in this area.

However, I have no desire—nor do I have the time—to engage in a prolonged argument with the directors of the Arizona Public Service Co. over the extent to which the company is—or is not—controlled or influenced by Ebasco.

The existence of electric power monopolies in many parts of the United States over the past years has been well documented by investigations of the U.S. Congress. I am properly concerned, I believe, lest such monopolies should become active in the distribution of the electrical energy derived from the Colorado River storage project. It is my further concern lest such a monopoly distribute the power in a way which would not be in the best interests of my State of Utah.

At the very beginning of the transmission lines controversy, I committed myself to support the course which would develop the power in a manner which would preserve the largest possible amount in the upper basin fund for the development of future Utah water projects. In my opinion, the all-Federal transmission system offers the best assurance that the necessary funds will be available at the proper times to pay out these projects.

Most sincerely,

FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senator.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 16, 1961]

PUBLIC, PRIVATE POWER GIRD FOR A NEW STRUGGLE

Public and private lobbyists are getting ready for another congressional struggle that could make the Hanford atomic power battle look like a mere short circuit.

The second of the two major public power fights of 1961 involves the construction of more than 2,000 miles of transmission lines in five Western States.

The lines would move 1.3 million kilowatts of power from three large Federal dams nearing completion in Colorado, Arizona, and Utah.

The dams are a $1-billion undertaking comprising the Colorado River storage project. Its primary purpose is to prevent floods and provide water for irrigation, industrial, and municipal uses.

POWER A BYPRODUCT

The power would be a byproduct of the dams and would be transmitted in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, and parts of Nevada and California.

Both Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and his predecessor, Fred A. Seaton, have supported a proposal for construction of all the transmission lines by the Bureau of Reclamation, which is part of the Interior Department.

Five private utility companies that serve the area want to build about two-thirds of the lines themselves. Under the utilities' proposal the other third of the lines, connecting the dams, would be constructed by the Federal Government.

The all-Federal system would cost $189 million and would comprise nearly 3,000 miles of lines. Under their plan the private utilities would spend $100 million to build 2,000 miles of the lines, while the Federal Government would spend $53 million for the rest.

CONSUMER PAYS IN END

The users of electricity in the area would eventually pay for the cost of either the all-Federal or the Federal-private utility system.

There is some dispute over the figures used by both sides. The public power proponents also argue that Government-owned lines could deliver power at less cost to users than could the private utilities.

President Kennedy has asked Congress to appropriate $5.8 million to complete planning for the lines and begin building them.

The request is part of the public works appropriations, which are expected to be reported out by the House Appropriations Committee within a week. The House probably will act on the bill soon after it is approved by the committee.

APPROPRIATION DELAYED

The appropriations measure has been delayed by the illness of Committee Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, and by a decision to keep it in committee until the Hanford controversy was resolved.

A $95-million authorization for the construction of an atomic powerplant at Hanford, Wash., has been the subject of bitter congressional debate and intensive maneuvering for several weeks.

Private power companies, the coal industry, and the House Republican leadership have led an apparently successful fight against the Hanford project, which has been vigorously supported by the same western leaders in Congress who are behind the plans for the construction of Federal transmission lines from the Colorado storage project.

The House has twice defeated the Hanford project, but the Senate has approved it. Although the legislation containing the proposal is still before a Senate-House conference committee, it is considered highly unlikely that Congress will authorize the plant this year.

Although most of the power generated at the Colorado storage dams would go to rural electrification cooperatives, municipally owned power companies and other nonprofit distributors of power, the private utilities want to own the lines for three important reasons:

1. There is, of course, considerable profit to be made in the transmission of power.

2. By introducing the 1.3 million kilowatts of additional power into their lines the private utilities would probably be able to use it to avoid the construction of additional generating facilities of their own for peak periods while still meeting all the needs of the cooperatives and the municipally owned companies.

3. The private utilities fear that, in the words of a recent Council of State Chambers of Commerce bulletin, the Federal transmission lines would be "a giant step toward accomplishment of a nationwide power grid."

PUBLIC POWER VIEW

Public power proponents envision the day when the West is tied together by Government-owned transmission lines. An Interior Department task force is studying a proposal to send power from the Pacific Northwest as far south as Los Angeles.

The three Colorado storage dams that would produce power are Glen Canyon (900,000 kilowatts) on the Colorado River in northern Arizona; Flaming Gorge (108,000 kilowatts) on the Green River in northern Utah, and Curecanti (160,000 kilowatts) on the Gunnison River in Colorado. A fourth dam, the central Utah project, would produce little power.

The Colorado storage project was authorized by Congress in 1956. The first power from the project is expected to be available in June 1963.

The 1.3-million-kilowatt capacity of the project is about 2½ times as large as that of the gigantic Grand Coulee Dam.

FATHER EUSEBIO FRANCISCO KINO

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on April 10 of this year I placed in the RECORD an article by one of our Arizona writers dealing with the history of Father Eusebio Francisco Kino. As I mentioned at the time that the year 1962 will be a special one for Arizona, for Arizona shall have been a State for 50 years and at the same time shall have been a member of the Union for 100 years. In addition to this, 1962 will be celebrated as the 250th anniversary of the passing of Father Kino, one of the most illustrious of the Catholic priests, who dedicated his life to bringing religion into the West. Although 1962 will have in store many events commenorating the State of Arizona and Father Kino, I should like to have the RECORD show that proper recognition was given this man during 1961.

At the Second Annual Arizona Historical Society Convention at Tucson on March 16 through 18 the Arizona Pioneers Society displayed an exhibit of paintings depicting Father Kino's work by Arizona artist, Ted DeGrazia. Also on display was a statue of Father Kino on loan from the U.S. National Park Service, Tumacacori National Monument. On Wednesday, March 15, 1961, a pontifical Mass was celebrated in Father Kino's memory at St. Augustine Cathedral by the Most Reverend Francis J. Green, D.D., bishop of Tucson.

In conjunction with this, the Arizona Pioneers Historical Society published a booklet entitled "Kino—A Commemoration." I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the article, "A Short Assessment," by Patricia P. Paylore, which was written especially for this commemorative booklet, and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of Father Burrus during this Mass, and a paper he prepared and read before the historical society.

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

KINO—A COMMEMORATION—A SHORT ASSESSMENT

(By Patricia P. Paylore)

(His name is legendary. His work is history. He is Kino, padre on horseback, apostle to the Pimas.)

He died 250 years ago this month of March after 24 years in Pimería Alta. We honor him now throughout the Spanish southwest, remembering belatedly the heroic proportions of his frontier life, recognizing at last the historic character of his pioneer career. One has only to turn to the bibliography which follows to become aware of the extent to which new archival discoveries have stimulated research into his life and writings. Translations of documentary material hitherto available only in its original Spanish or German have broadened the general interest in this remarkable man and the geography of his activities.

Although the chronology of Kino's life is now fairly fixed, there is still conflicting evidence concerning the date of his birth. And though his writings are for the most part well placed in time, there are still uncertainties about the details of some of the printed works. While his journey to what is now Baja California in 1683 is documented with official records and Kino's own map, there are still doubts in the minds of some exacting scholars concerning places, distances, nomenclature. In short, there is opportunity yet to do original research into his life, work, travels, writings; and the observance of the 250th anniversary of his death will surely stimulate such investigations.

Many regions, perhaps all, have their heroes. Marquette and LaSalle, both contemporaries of Kino's, are honored in the areas of their activities. Salvatierra and Serra have a secure place in California. Pike and Frémont, Kearny and Carleton and Garcés and Oñate and a thousand others are figures of historical importance and significance for all time to come, and the continuing interpretations of their deeds and influence show no sign of diminishing.

But there are fewer whose imprint was achieved creatively and positively, over a long period of time, in the same place, and of whom little but good can be said, no matter how scientific or factual the literary and historical approach. All men have their shortcomings, most heroes their weaknesses. It is only with a figure like Kino that we begin to approach the dedicated and single-minded giant whose beliefs and their translation into realities have changed the course of history and the face of the land. Kino was such a figure. To live in Pimería Alta two and a half centuries later is to prosper in a civilization which rests upon foundations he laid in the wilderness. Who else but a man of such intellectual and spiritual proportions and physical stamina could have created so much from so little?

While Kino came to Mexico to begin what was to be his true lifework at a time when the Spanish Southwest was still shaken by the terrors of the Pueblo Rebellion of 1680 and the martyrdom of 21 Franciscans in New Mexico, we may be sure that due account had been taken of the causes of that revolt by the Jesuits in Mexico City. There in the Colegio Máximo de San Pedro y San Pablo, the order's headquarters, where the 36-year-old Kino, then just arrived from Europe, was housed, he could observe the Jesuits' power and influence in the affairs of government. Certainly it is likely that a worldly and realistic view of matters which might have parallel effects on their own missionary efforts would prevail. So that when Kino went north in 1687, he undoubtedly had studied this event and was determined that no deed of his should provoke a like occurrence.

He went about his work, albeit zealously, in a spirit of optimism and Christian humility that never wavered or faltered for the next 24 years. While Spanish colonization had failed repeatedly because of the character and conduct of many of the military and the colonists, Kino profited from observation and experience. In Baja California, for instance, where in 1683 he had accompanied the Atondo y Artillón expedition as superior of the missionaries and royal cosmographer, he was on more than one occasion dismayed by severe military measures taken against the Indians; for their behavior, based on a primitive code, could not and should not be judged wholly nor dealt with wholly on European concepts.

Furthermore, he had taken the precaution before leaving for his new mission to obtain Royal provision that such converts as he should make in Pimería Alta be not forced by the Spaniards "to give tribute or to serve on estates or in mines" for a period of 20 years.

His personal conduct during the ensuing quarter of a century was perhaps his greatest asset in the success of his missions, for he labored prodigiously to provide for the temporal needs of his charges at the same time that he was concerned with their spiritual welfare. His daily life, as we know from his associates, was exemplary, nay, saintly. But his belief in the importance of a base of material prosperity for his children indicates that he had noted the causes of Spanish failures elsewhere in the New World.

We know some of this from Manje, the commander of Kino's military escort on several expeditions, who wrote in his "Luz de Tierra Incógnita," concerning the events of 1695 when the Pimas revolted, "From the conspiracy and the burning only the pueblos of Dolores were exempt. This I attribute to the virtue and the continuous and fervent prayers of Father Eusebio Kino, first missionary of that revolted nation, for, since he has been their spiritual father and had wiped their tears in their times of need, affliction and trouble, defending them always, gratitude perhaps kept them from burning and destroying his mission."

Throughout his 24 years in Pimería Alta, especially from 1699 on, Kino found time to continue his interest in Baja California, and it is through his efforts during this period, when he was largely landlocked, that it was proved a peninsula—as he had been taught to believe in Europe—rather than an island —which he himself had come around to accepting after his arrival in America.

The touching story of the blue abalone shells which Kino first found in 1685 on his expedition across Baja California to the shores of the Pacific is resumed in 1699 and thereafter when identical specimens were brought to him from the vicinity of Yuma. In the fall of 1700 Kino made a journey to the juncture of the Gila and the Colorado, and beyond, to see for himself that the head of the Gulf was far to the south and that only land lay to the west, a land over which had come the blue shells.

In his serious preoccupation with the saving of souls, it is doubtful that Kino ever recognized the irony of his final work and its particular location. Since the rediscovery by Bolten early in the century of Kino's "Favores Celestiales," we have known increasingly that this history of Pimería Alta, written at the command of the father general of the Jesuit order by the principal personage in the region during the years between 1687 and 1710, would establish its author as the leading historical character of the area for recorded times. Kino emerges from this work as one who literally created Pimería Alta as a Spanish Province, and who, though six decades were to elapse before this particular dream was realized (and then by the Franciscans after his own order had been expelled from Spanish America), had inspired the occupation of Baja California. It was he who first made known the geography of Pimería Alta, who drew the earliest map extant showing the Gila and Colorado Rivers and southern Arizona on the basis of actual personal exploration, and whose letters and diaries have added to the knowledge of the region's prehistory, ethnohistory, and history.

And yet, we know that Kino wished desperately to go elsewhere than here, when he was finishing the preparation for his missionary career at the Jesuit University of Ingolstadt during the years 1665–78. He had taken San Francisco Xavier as his patron saint following the intercession of the Apostle of the Indies during a near fatal illness in 1663. He thereafter determined to enter the Society of Jesus and become a missionary to the heathen. His letters to the father general during the latter part of this period are filled with importunings, however respectful and pious, to be allowed to undertake a mission "to the Indies, or to China." His reading of the martyrdom of Spinola in the Far East, of the work of his patron San Xavier there, his knowledge of his own relative, Father Martin Martini whose name in China is immortal, all conspired to create in him a really burning desire to go east. In his "Favores Celestiales" he writes: "I have always had an especially strong leaning toward the conversions of Great China. In the beginning I asked to go to the missions there." He applied himself to the mathematical sciences at the university because of the usefulness, already of record, of Jesuit mathematicians at the Chinese court. He speaks of his pleasure in living "in the rooms of our college whose windows looked toward the east, so that I might be comforted by the mere sight of the east."

His anxiety over his final assignment, when orders finally came in 1678, persisted until his destination was settled by lot between himself and another father, Kino losing the Philippines and drawing Mexico instead. Even then he took advantage of various circumstances which prevented his immediate departure for Mexico, to make further attempts to get the assignment altered. While he never once allows himself to be put in a position of rebellion, he nevertheless reiterates his personal desire to be sent east, in the long correspondence which we now have available for study between himself and the Duchess of Aveiro y Arcos, a patroness of Jesuit missions in the Orient.

Even after the long delayed voyage to America finally deposited him on Mexican soil, he persisted in his efforts to change his destiny, trying to get permission to attach himself to an Orient-bound party of missionaries then being made up in Mexico, meanwhile hoping that the serious disposition to mal de mer by one of the chosen would allow himself to be substituted.

To no avail.

Kino was destined for Pimería Alta, and to it he came, and stayed. And for which we give thanks today.

Pimería Alta was a hostile land. Even today it is still so, with its vast waterless distances, its thorny visage, its silent air of eternity. The Papaguería, the Camino del Diablo, even the modern bombing and missile ranges are mostly empty, quiet, timeless. This is how Kino first saw it.

But there are also evidences of his sojourn here, not alone in the ruins, alas, of the many beautiful missions which he established on the Rio Altar, the Rio Magdalena, the Rio San Miguel—churches whose names are like the music of their bells: Nuestra Señora de los Dolores, Santa Gertrudis de Saric, San José de Imuris, Nuestra Señora de los Remedios, San Cayetana de Tumacacori, and the Dove of the Desert—but evidences also of his industry as a farmer and stockman and trailblazer as well.

For Kino was a doer, and the history of his accomplishments staggers the inquiring mind. Let those today who live lazily in the land of mañana take heed of his extraordinary energy which permitted him not only feats of endurance on horseback that are not likely to be duplicated, but labors of building and preaching and organizing and counseling and traveling that would kill an ordinary man.

But he was no ordinary man. And so his work prevails.

Today we live here in Pimería Alta under the same bright sun and we sleep under the same blazing stars and we see the same mountains ringing our sights wherever we look. And we live in peace with the Pimas.

On March 15, 1961, the 250th anniversary of the death of Fray Eusebio Francisco Kino, a solemn pontifical Mass was held at St. Augustine's Cathedral in Tucson, Ariz. Ernest J. Burrus, S.J., of the Jesuit Historical Institute in Rome, eulogized Father Kino in the sermon. The Most Reverend Francis Joseph Green, bishop of Tucson, was celebrant of the Mass which brought together all of the clergy of the diocese, as well as some 500 invited guests.

Father Burrus described Father Kino as an Italian priest who had introduced Christianity—and cattle—into what is now Arizona. Padre Kino, 70 years old when he died, had spent two dozen years mapping the border country, converting and bettering the lot of its heathen populace. Father Burrus hailed the padre on horseback as "the builder of missions which became the nuclei of future towns and flourishing cities" covering the ground no white man had ever trod, "he was an accurate recorder bringing with him in his saddlebags, a guarantee from Spain that the Indians he was able to convert would not be enslaved. He relied on God as though he had no human means to employ—and he relied on human means as though God had abandoned him."

On March 17, 1961, during the Second Annual Arizona Historical Convention, sponsored by the Arizona Pioneers' Historical Society and the University of Arizona, Father

Burrus delivered a paper entitled: "Kino: the Historian's Historian," in the session:

"Eusebio Francisco Kino was born on August 15, 1645, in Segno, northern Italy. He entered the Jesuit Order in Bavaria, Germany, on November 20, 1665. Until early 1686 Kino [was] very much taken up with California enterprise from early 1687 until his death the night of March 15, 1711 in the Sonoran pueblo of Santa Maria Magdalena [his] activity was intense in Pimería Alta."

The paper delivered by Father Burrus discussed the various writings of Kino and historical interpretations derived therefrom. Father Burrus concludes that Kino was accurate because of "his careful and painstaking observation: [he] sifted and weighed in the light of evidence and reason." Kino, by virtue of "the considerable amount of historical information he has transmitted to us, gathered and composed from his own observation and writings of others, expressed in a medium that on the whole enables us to readily grasp his thought. And if Kino deserves this title by reason of the manuscripts still extant, how much more so, if additional ones come to light."

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT SEIZURE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA POWER CORPORATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am disturbed at the apparent indifference with which some of my colleagues seem to view the question of Government electric power. Some seem to think Government power offers no real danger to our free enterprise system—that there is room for both Government and electric company power operations in this country. Some show no alarm at the rapid increase in Government power during the last 25 years.

When I criticize Government power and warn our citizens against further expansion, I am often referred to as a reactionary trying to stop the wheels of progress. I am trying to stop progress all right, if one calls stopping our further progression down the primrose path of socialization of a basic industry stopping progress.

Mr. President, if any one thinks I am crying wolf, he should read what is going on just north of our border in Canada. In British Columbia the Government has just taken over the British Columbia Electric Co., Ltd. In one quick act, and without consulting either the company or its citizens, the Government socialized one of the largest utilities in that country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD an article from the August 21, 1961, issue of Barron's entitled "Lust for Power: A Note on the Seizure of British Columbia Electric."

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

LUST FOR POWER: A NOTE ON THE SEIZURE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA ELECTRIC

In its annual report for 1960, the British Columbia Power Corp., Ltd., a huge utility combine which supplies most of the western Canadian province with transportation, heat and light, made a modest effort to describe the sweep of its achievements. In order to harness the turbulent waters of the Bridge River, 130 miles north of Vancouver, the company built two of the largest dams in Canada, at which it installed high-pressure turbines of unprecedented size. To bring their output to market, British Columbia Power (and its principal subsidiary, British Columbia Electric) thrust two high-voltage transmission lines over some of the toughest terrain in the world. As the report quietly notes: "For some towers, anchor bolts were jackhammered 9 feet into solid rock. For others, the foundation grillwork was buried 9 feet in muskeg." Thus, the company sought to carry out its corporate credo, which runs in part: "Our aim is to serve our customers well, and at the lowest rates consistent with high standards; to conduct our business with courtesy and efficiency; to be good citizens and assist in the development of the communities we serve."

Three weeks ago British Columbia Power, after more than a century of service, reaped its reward. With a unanimity and speed of which a so-called people's republic might be proud, the lawmakers of British Columbia, at the behest of the Premier, voted to expropriate British Columbia Electric. What prompted the seizure was not discontent with the company's management of its affairs—"I just hope we can run it as well," remarked one bureaucrat with incredible candor. Instead, the move was made primarily to further the grandiose economic schemes of the provincial government, which envisions a huge hydroelectric development on the Peace River. Whether its sweet dream of peace will come true remains to be seen. What is plain is that the politicos have ridden roughshod over Canadian treaty commitments, as well as over the rights of private property. They also have committed the public purse to a speculative venture, which, far from advancing the interests of the province, well may wind up costing it dear. British Columbia is rich in natural resources. However, its statesmen evidently have not been endowed with a wealth of either sound judgment or proper regard for due process of law.

Whatever their failings may be, they surely do not lack for boldness. For years they cherished the notion of a vast hydro project on the Peace, which flows through north-central British Columbia. In this grand design, however, they were encouraged neither by the British Columbia Power Corp., which took a dim view of its economics, nor by the Dominion government which preferred joint United States-Canadian development of the Columbia. Last January, Ottawa and Washington signed a treaty pledging a mutual effort toward this end. While Vancouver presumably concurred, it secretly continued to explore its own approach. A few weeks ago its experts produced a survey purporting to show that a Peace River project, under public auspices, would be competitive with Columbia power. Vancouver acted promptly. A bill to expropriate British Columbia Electric was introduced and passed in record time. Literally overnight, a century-old private concern became an agency of the Crown.

The speed of the move was matched by its highhandedness. In a previous case of the kind, an impartial tribunal, after weighing such factors as future earning prospects and replacement costs, fixed the compensation. Here, in contrast, the price of $38 per common share (and a dollar-for-dollar exchange of senior securities for provincial obligations) was decreed, solely on the basis of paid-in capital, by the government itself, with no provision for appeal. In recent weeks British Columbia Power common, depressed by recurrent rumors of seizure, has been selling below the takeover price; hence a few speculators profited. However, the terms are patently unfair to most stockholders, some of whom may have paid as high as $53 per share, as well as to owners of British Columbia Electric preferred and convertible bonds, who have been stripped of valuable conversion privileges and dividend tax credits. In the view of the Dominion's financial community, which has denounced them as "arbitrary, unfair, and inconsistent with the Canadian tradition of equity and legal recourse," such terms smack less of expropriation than of confiscation.

Bad for investors, the sorry affair may turn out no better for British Columbia. To finance its ambitious program, Vancouver must raise a lot of money; indeed, the government already has borrowed a record-breaking $75 million from a bank, and floated $100 million of so-called parity bonds (i.e., redeemable at par on demand) at an interest cost which far exceeds the going rate. These commitments, moreover, are merely a downpayment. For the seizure of British Columbia Power, which boasts total assets of $680 million, will roughly double the outstanding provincial indebtedness, while the Peace River project, cost of which has been put at $630 million, would boost the total half as much again.

Finally, despite the huge sums at stake, there apparently is serious doubt about whether the province, vis-a-vis Peace River, will get its money's worth. Official forecasts of revenues and costs, which proved so useful politically, may or may not make sense financially (at least one member of the British Columbia Energy Board has refused to subscribe to its findings). Not a single contract has been signed for Peace River power, most of which must be sold, despite an express prohibition by Ottawa against the export of electricity, to users in the United States. Hence, whether or not the project will ever pay off, no man can predict. What can be safely said is that, without the expenditure of a penny, the venture has proved costly. As one Canadian lawmaker has observed: "This action will undoubtedly affect the confidence of investors to any natural resource industry in British Columbia and have serious consequences upon the future development of the Province."

In contrast to a bargain struck between a willing buyer and seller, both parties to the seizure of British Columbia Electric are likely to lose thereby. The transaction, however, cannot be counted a total loss. For on both sides of the border it should serve as a timely reminder of the excesses to which public power, lacking the stern discipline of the marketplace, inevitably is prone. It also suggests that in North America, as on less enlightened continents, eternal vigilance still is the price of liberty.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to insert an article by Foster Associates, Inc., Calgary, Alberta, entitled "British Columbia Electric Co., Ltd., Becomes Crown Corp."

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

BRITISH COLUMBIA ELECTRIC CO., LTD., BECOMES CROWN CORP.

INTRODUCTION

By the simple expedient of introducing on August 1, 1961, bill 5 of the special session of the British Columbia Legislative Assembly, officially known as the Power Development Act, 1961, and upon its unanimous passage 3 days later, the Provincial government converted Canada's largest, heretofore privately owned gas, electric, and transit utility from a private enterprise to a provincially owned crown corporation. Ironically, the initial reading coincided virtually to the minute with the funeral services of the company's board chairman and chief executive officer, A. E. (Dal) Grauer, who had died the previous Friday.

There appears to be no question as to the legality and finality of the acquisition of the British Columbia Electric Co., Ltd., the principal operating subsidiary of the British Co-

lumbia Power Corp., Ltd. By section 3(b) of the act, the term of office of the prior board of directors of the electric company was terminated as of 3 p.m. August 1, 1961, the effective time (coinciding with the first reading of the bill). By August 4 the new board had been designated and was meeting. Retired University of British Columbia Prof. Gordon Shrum—also chairman of the government's British Columbia Energy Board to investigate the relative costs of Peace River versus Columbia River power development—is the new chairman of the new crown corporation.

By August 4, also, the crown corporation had paid a cheque for $110,985,045 to the parent British Columbia Power Corp., Ltd., to cover acquisition of the common shares of the British Columbia Electric Co., Ltd. This was the amount established by the government in section 7 of the act and represents the paid-in value of the common shares issued as of December 31, 1961, all of which were owned by the parent holding company. No consideration was given to the $28,878,795 earned surplus shown as of that date.

Further, by August 4, the Government had announced that it would put on sale on August 9 at $100 million issue of 5 percent parity bonds of the new crown corporation—guaranteed as to principal and interest by the provincial government—to cover the payment for the British Columbia Electric common shares. This type of financing has been used successfully by several of the Government's other crown corporations and agencies, most recently a $50 million issue by the British Columbia Toll Highways and Bridges Authority. In effect these are the equivalent of government guaranteed demand notes, for they may be cashed on demand at par by the holder. It is expected that the new issue—like its predecessors—will find a ready market.

Also, the Government's goal of prompt development of Peace River power, a contributing factor in this week's actions, has already been made clear. The new corporation has announced its intention to apply immediately for a water development license.

The takeover of the privately owned British Columbia Electric Co., beset for years with recurring public ownership threats, came as no great surprise at this time. It was widely rumored that the special session called by Premier Bennett for August 1 was for this purpose. He had intimated in March that such action might become necessary if his government could not obtain a better income tax-sharing agreement with the Ottawa Federal Government. He has cited this—and thereby tried to put the onus on Ottawa—as his reason for his action. Cynics—or realists—doubt whether this was the sole or even key reason. It was not the action of acquisition as such but the method and precipitousness which had at least momentarily, stunned and shocked even some of those who were indifferent or even favorable to the eventual takeover of the British Columbia Electric Co. by the Government.

U.S. readers, in particular, may be puzzled by the speed and manner of this conversion of a large corporate organization to a crown corporation. The Canadian form of government makes possible such action without hearings or long legislative debate, as was amply demonstrated in Victoria this week. Also the opportunities for judicial review are much more limited than in the United States, and there are not the same constitutional guarantees against deprivation of property without due process of law. To forestall hostile legal action against the new crown corporation without its consent, section 19 of the new act states that, notwithstanding any rule of the law to the contrary, an action in tort may be commenced against the reorganized company only with the written consent of the Attorney General. Intended to prevent suits by shareholders of the predecessor company, the provision also prevents anyone from bringing an accident claim against the company without the Attorney General's consent.

The takeover is essentially a personal decision of Premier Bennett rather than of his sacred party. It has been generally rumored that very few party members were advised or consulted. The Premier did not even hold a party caucus before opening the special session. It has likewise been reported in the press and on television, that several of his party members had expressed privately opposition to the move. The opposition parties had long favored the action. The final vote on the issue was unanimous for adoption of the act.

The Government appears to have made an effort to treat security reasonably well. Outstanding loans, bonds, debentures, or other securities of the company will be guaranteed as to principal and interest by the new crown corporation. In turn the Government may guarantee the principal and interest of the company. This it is expected to do, as it has done in the case of the other crown corporation, the Pacific Great Eastern Railway. Inadvertently or intentionally, the holders of the preferred shares have been treated relatively poorly. They are to receive perpetual securities identical as to principal, interest, call features, etc., of the shares which they replace. However, these bonds will not enjoy the 20-percent individual income tax credit available on dividends of Canadian corporations.

Significantly also, the Government does not propose to pay any call premium on the preferred shares, although the several issues do have such provisions varying between 3–5 percent. It has been rumored that a preferred shareholders' protective committee may be organized, but it would seem that its effectiveness can be only through persuasion and not through legal redress.

There still remain many unanswered questions, much mystery and confusion about recent events, and all the factors that led to this climax. Some tentative conclusions and surmises as to the reason for the Premier's action and—more importantly—as to possible future implications, can be made. Before offering these, it is necessary to provide a background of the economic and political climate in the province and of British Columbia Electric's specific role in this environment as it developed in recent years.

BACKGROUND

1. British Columbia experienced one of the fastest rates of growth in Canada or the United States during the postwar years and until about 2 years ago. Even so it has a population of under 2 million in an area larger than California, Oregon, and Washington combined, but much of this is mountainous.

2. The industrial complex of the province is very heavily oriented toward the lumbering, paper, and pulp industries. The latter two are prospering reasonably well, and undergoing current expansion, but other industrial growth is lagging with little prospect of prompt recovery.

3. Despite its ability to grow from a 400,000-kilowatt capacity system in 1951 to a million-kilowatt capacity system in 1960, and to meet the growing power requirements of its customers, the British Columbia Electric Co. had been under recurring public ownership threats. Aside from the strong, doctrinaire-socialistic CCF Party—the official "opposition" to the incumbent Social Credit Party of Premier Bennett—the lukewarm popular support for the British Columbia Electric, even among some business leaders, is partially attributable to the preponderance of public power elsewhere in Canada and the closer historic and ethnic ties between many British Columbians and Europe, where public power is accepted as commonplace, even in essentially private-enterprise countries.

On the other hand, public ownership of gas distribution is not commonplace in Canada. The British Columbia Electric Co., in addition to serving 341,000 electric consumers, supplied gas service to 119,000 customers. The gas service, while still small relative to electric, had nevertheless experienced the greatest growth since natural gas became available in greater Vancouver late in 1956. The company also provided urban and interurban transit in metropolitan Vancouver and Victoria, the provincial capital on Vancouver Island. The latter operation has been unprofitable and consciously subsidized by the electric operations. Government indications to date are that it will continue to operate these other services.

4. The British Columbia Electric Co. operated in the southwesternmost heavily populated and industrialized part of the Province, commonly known as the Lower Mainland, and centered around Metropolitan Vancouver with about 800,000 residents; and on the southern part of Vancouver Island centered about Metropolitan Victoria with about 150,000 residents. It served therefore over half of the Province's population and well over half of its industry, but only a small part of the area.

There are several other small, localized privately owned utilities. It is likely that they too will shortly be converted to crown corporations, although no definite Government statement has yet been made. Also there are several small municipally owned electric distribution systems. Areawise, the great expanse of the Province has been supplied electricity by the Government-owned British Columbia Power Commission, although its total load and customers served have been much smaller than those of the British Columbia Electric Co. Partially because of this low customer density, its rates—even without any income tax obligations—have been generally higher than those of the British Columbia Electric Co., another fact which had been used at times by public power advocates to argue for a merger of the two organizations. It appears to be the Government's immediate policy to maintain the separate identity of the two organizations.

5. The British Columbia Electric Co., Ltd., operated the electric, gas, and transit facilities. It was thus the utility operating subsidiary and largest single subsidiary of the parent holding company, British Columbia Power Corp., Ltd. This is indicated by the fact that the parent reported total net assets at the end of 1960 of $731,400,000, compared with $727,400,000 for the British Columbia Electric Co. The parent company had made other investments, the principal ones of which were Van Tor Oils & Exploration (engaged in underground gas storage explorations), Western Copper Mills, Ltd. (a new but as yet unprofitable copper mill), and Peace River Power Development Co., Ltd.

6. The Peace River Power Development Co., Ltd., has also been expropriated as part of the act which has converted the British Columbia Electric Co. to a crown corporation. All of its property—primarily in the form of studies, plans, proposals, water rights—have been vested in the reorganized British Columbia Electric Co.

The Peace River Power Development Co., Ltd., was one of the firms organized by the Swedish financier, Axel Wenner-Gren, with the enthusiastic acclaim of Premier Bennett, to develop the potential resources of the Rocky Mountain Trench of northern British Columbia. The purpose of this particular company, with principal additional financial support from English financial and engineering groups, was to exploit the tremendous power potential by damming the Peace

River in central British Columbia, some 500 miles from Vancouver. W. C. Mainwaring, retired vice president of the British Columbia Electric Co., Ltd., became president of this group several years ago.

The prospective development of the Peace River power potential—and the delivered cost of energy from it to prospective load centers versus the cost of other potential power sources, principally that of Columbia River—became another subject of controversy and an important factor in this week's events.

The British Columbia government had claimed credit that the possibility of Peace River development softened the intractable attitude of U.S. negotiators on the Columbia River negotiations with Canada and had hastened the agreement between the two Federal Governments. Interestingly in view of Mr. Bennett's present disagreement with Ottawa, his government was represented throughout the negotiations and was ostensibly in accord with the agreement reached between the two Federal Governments.

While no precise figures have been released, it has frequently been quoted that the first stage of the Peace River development would cost between $650 million and a billion dollars. Obviously large assured markets would have to be found to interest private capital in such an undertaking. Nevertheless, the promoters and developers for a long time indicated confidence and optimism that this would constitute no serious difficulty. Cynics—or realists, as the case may be—felt that the only adequate market to absorb such a large initial capacity would be south of the border. Here the Canadian Federal Government's traditional objection to power export and the questionable economics of remote Peace River power, as long as cheaper local sources were available in the United States, become additional pawns in the power chess game.

During this period, Premier Bennett gave public indication on several occasions of the need for Peace River power development, either ahead of, or simultaneous with the Columbia River development, claiming both would be necessary to meet growing future power requirements of British Columbia and the rest of the Northwest.

7. More recently the British Columbia Electric Co. completed negotiations, initiated by Mr. Mainwaring while still vice president of British Columbia Electric, for very large, low-grade coal deposits near Lillooet, British Columbia, some 200 miles from Vancouver. It was understood that an on-site steam power-plant might produce electricity reasonably competitive with more remote hydrogenerated power.

Because of the slower pace of British Columbia's industrial growth, it now appears that the British Columbia Electric's recently completed Bridge River expansion and its new Burrard steam generating plant—with at least 600,000 kilowatts of contracted capacity—will provide it with considerable spare generating capacity for at least the next 5 to 7 years.

It was the British Columbia Electric's announced policy that it would be willing to purchase or generate power from whatever source seemed most economical at the time such additional capacity was needed.

8. Seven months ago, Premier Bennett appointed the British Columbia Energy Board with then Prof. Gordon Shrum as chairman, to study and report by August 15 on the respective costs of Peace River power and Columbia River power, as developed either as public or private undertakings. In turn, consulting firms were retained to review prior cost studies or to make their own. This report was completed recently, and its published findings were used by the government as part of its justification for acquiring the British Columbia Electric Co. Many of its basic underlying assumptions have not yet been revealed. Its conclusions—however reached—are that Peace River power and Columbia River power, developed under public ownership, are comparable in delivered price, and considerably cheaper than if developed as private undertakings. The salient comparisons are:

Optimistic growth: Columbia (public project), 4.03 mills per kilowatt-hour; Peace (private project), 6.42 mills per kilowatt-hour; Peace (public project), 4.20 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Basic growth: Columbia (public project), 4.4 mills; Peace (private project), 6.59 mills; Peace (public project), 4.37 mills.

The difference in costs is attributed largely to the lower financing costs for a public undertaking, and the saving in tax payments. The report of the energy board was tabled in the legislature a few minutes after bill No. 5, instead of ahead of it, thereby eliminating possible study and debate of the report itself.

9. The energy board report did say that the board is satisfied that the Columbia River development offers great potential benefits to Canada, but only if (a) the initial development of storage dams to cost about $450 million is subsequently supplemented by power generation facilities to cost an additional $750 million; (b) in recognition of the inadequate immediate markets for such large blocks of power as represented by these two undertakings within British Columbia, the control over the disposition of downstream benefits must be vested in the Province before ratification of the treaty. "Downstream benefits" are basically the firming of capacity and consequent greater annual generation by plants on the Columbia River in the United States, resulting from the improved river-flow made possible by the projected storage dams in Canada. The treaty proposed that these be shared in kind, basically on a 50-50 basis between the two countries, with delivery made back to Canada of its share of such generation. The British Columbia government would prefer to sell the Canadian allocation to possible U.S. customers; it is rumored that it would want such cash receipts to help pay for the development of the Peace. As recently as last week, the Federal Government refused to alter the treaty provision.

The energy board has as yet made no study of the potential surplus power market in the United States, but it refers to the possibility of sales as far distant as California through the proposed Northwest-California transmission tie.

10. Another unresolved contention between the Provincial and Ottawa governments has been the proposed financing of the Columbia development. It had been agreed that the Provincially owned British Columbia Power Commission would be responsible for the development and construction of proposed dams. Ottawa had offered a loan to cover part of the costs, but the British Columbia government was insisting on a grant for part of the cost, as the Federal Government had ostensibly made for another power project in Prime Minister Diefenbaker's home Province of Saskatchewan.

CONCLUSIONS

The full significance of the government's action has yet to be determined; the full impact can only be measured as the Government unfolds and implements its policies. There is no doubt, however, that the effects go far beyond the demise of one privately owned utility with net book assets (after deduction of $102,500,000 accumulated depreciation) of $727,400,000. There can be no doubt that Premier Bennett is gambling for tremendous stakes by any standards.

Nor can it be questioned that he has, for the moment at least, scored a simultaneous tactical victory over his Provincial political opponents and over the Federal Government. He has proved himself a keen, cold realist. A lesson for other privately owned utilities, as well as for business in general, is that he was able to act so quickly and arbitrarily, only because he knew this to be a politically popular move with the electorate.

No one knows what really prompted Premier Bennett's final decision. It is doubtful whether any single fact was determinative, but it may be surmised that some or all of the following factors contributed:

1. His tax-sharing dispute with Ottawa is a partial explanation, although it is doubtful whether this was the crucial consideration. The British Columbia Electric Co. made provisions of approximately $12 million for income taxes in 1960, but actual payments were less than $4 million, because the company was taking advantage of accelerated depreciation for income tax purposes. By the end of 1960, the parent company had an accumulated deferred credit of $44½ million for such estimated deferred income taxes. While there has been no statement from the Provincial government, it is doubtful whether the new crown corporation will ever pay these taxes.

2. By this move, the political champion of private enterprise eliminated the potentially major campaign issue of his opponents in the next election. Even his political opponents approved of the action—at least publicly—by the unanimous passage of the act.

3. There had been some recent indications that the private backers of the Peace River power development were experiencing difficulty in lining up adequate assured markets to make possible financing of the project. These would undoubtedly have to be largely in the United States, and at 6½ mills per kw.-hr. at or near the border (per British Columbia Energy Board figures), this energy was very likely unattractive to potential U.S. purchasers. The Premier may have felt that he had been committed too far in public on the Peace—or preferably the Peace and Columbia simultaneously—to be able to retract. Also, he may have felt that, considering the general doldrums of the British Columbia economy, he needed a grand-scale public works development such as the Peace represents, before the next election.

One local newspaper surmise—which may not be far off the mark—is that the British Columbia Electric management was offered the choice of developing the presently uneconomic (from a private investment standpoint) Peace River power project as the price of being permitted to remain a privately owned company. When it refused, it was doomed. If this surmise is correct or could ever be substantiated, it might become a potent deterrent for further private investments in the Province, particularly by firms whose corporate policies as profit-oriented organizations might come into conflict with the government's aims or might become political liabilities to the government in power. Already there have been newspaper rumors of the possibilities of converting pipelines within the Province to crown corporations. Such rumors might be dismissed immediately, except for the history of the last few months, which led to this week's action.

The government plans to have the Peace River development undertaken by the reorganized British Columbia Electric Co., while the separate British Columbia Power Commission will continue to have responsibility for any development of the Columbia. The Provincial government can't afford to treat present investors unreasonably, lest it jeopardize the possibilities of financing either or both of these major river developments. The permanent effects of this week's actions on investor confidence in future investments in British Columbia—public and private—remain to be seen.

There can be no doubt of the demise of the British Columbia Electric Co., Ltd., as a privately owned utility. The parent company, British Columbia Power Corp., can continue

to exist, but it may request or demand under the act that the new crown company purchase all the assets of the parent company at such a price that the total compensation, including that for the common shares of the British Columbia Electric Co., will be equivalent to $38 per common share of the parent company. This price was arrived at by the government, not by any valuation of the corporate assets, but as being the market price in March before the first intimation by the Premier that the government might acquire the company. That announcement had the effect of depressing the market price by about $4. It would appear beneficial that the power corporation exercise this option for its liquidation, rather than merely to receive cash for the electric company common shares.

This is above all a sad object lesson of what can occur when a large private enterprise becomes the unwilling or unwitting pawn of ambitious and powerful contending political groups. The demise of the largest privately owned utility in Canada and in the Pacific Northwest may provide added enthusiasm for public ownership enthusiasts. This may become particularly apparent when and if the new crown corporation starts to look for urgently needed export markets for its Peace River power potential.

Producers of natural gas and petroleum products may likewise feel the impact of greater emphasis by the crown corporation on electric load development for competitive application in order to create markets for the power surplus. This is very conjectural at the moment, for availability of Peace or Columbia power is still a few years away, and the Provincial government has up to now been anxious to develop its gas and oil resources as well. Nevertheless it is a possibility which should be watched.

Ratification of the United States-Canadian Treaty on the Columbia River may also be affected. At present Premier Bennett's bargaining position with Ottawa appears to have been strengthened, but the final outcome is not yet certain. Ottawa may or may not capitulate on some or all of its points of disagreement with Victoria. On the other hand, Premier Bennett would not appear to hold all the aces, for he will need export permits for power from the Federal Government without which the Peace River power cannot be a financial success, even if it is otherwise attractively priced. Then, too, the U.S. Government, although it has already ratified the treaty, may become tired of the deadlock between Ottawa and Victoria and pursue some alternative course which does not require any Canadian cooperation.

Finally, the Premier has taken a bold action, not only in the acquisition of the British Columbia Electric Co., but even more in his determination to proceed promptly on the Peace River development. It is at the same time a big gamble, particularly for a province with less than 2 million population and no immediate prospects for requiring the output of this undertaking. Finding adequate markets—somewhere—will be the crux of success or failure. It is doubtful whether many British Columbians understand the magnitude of the gamble in which they are now participants. If it succeeds, it may do so by affecting the requirements for natural gas and fuel oil throughout the Northwest. To that extent, future developments may have a direct effect on Canadian and west coast gas and oil producers and distributors.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it would be well worth while for my colleagues to read these two articles and note the highhanded way in which a bureaucratic government seized a privately owned and operated utility company. One may say it could not be done here, but not long ago one would have said it could not be done in Canada.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, people like myself and others of our colleagues have been under some attack because we are trying to get the Senate to express itself as to whether there ought to be substantive civil rights legislation passed at this session of the Congress.

Mr. President, the reason for that is shown by a little opening of the curtain, as it were, in the administration's policy, which we have from a press release on a speech by the Honorable Carl T. Rowan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, at the golden anniversary conclave of Omega Psi Phi fraternity, delivered in Washington, D.C., Thursday, August 15. What he says, in practical effect—and I take this pretty much as the way the administration has been acting, even if it is not an official statement of its position—is about Negroes, who he said are "so busy crying that the President should have submitted new legislation to Congress that their tears hide the really fantastic progress that is possible because of appointments and executive decrees."

Mr. President, I think those who feel as I do look on appointments and executive decrees as very important, of course. We feel that in the previous administration and in this administration great progress has been made in that regard.

But, I feel that the vertebral column of progress, the real basis upon which these very executive decrees are built, is the fact that Congress has passed legislation in this field. The legislation enacted in 1957 and in 1960 gave the administration the platform from which to move. We feel that, in view of the crisis which is now being faced in respect to the freedom riders and sit-ins—and we read in this morning's newspapers of riots in one of the cities of North Carolina in this field—again Congress must be called upon to intercede with its plea in behalf of the country, providing a basis in law, giving men both a standard to which to repair, and at the same time pledging the people, through their legislators, to support the executive department in an affirmative way. It is for that reason that I and others—and the excerpt to which I have referred I think demonstrates the point—deeply feel that we would be derelict in our duty if we did not make our contribution in terms of affirmative legislation in the civil rights situation at this session of the Congress. At least, the Senate should have an opportunity to express its views and desires upon that subject. We expect to give that opportunity to the Senate quite promptly.

BELGRADE CONFERENCE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last week a distinguished visitor to the Halls of Congress was Dr. Hans Morgenthau, former Assistant Secretary of State and now professor of political science at the University of Chicago. A group met with him for dinner, and he discussed his viewpoint with respect to one of the world crises; namely, the Berlin situation.

Yesterday's issue of the New York Times magazine carried an article by Dr. Morgenthau which I think is worthy of perusal by Senators as well as many others in this country who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but who do not have an opportunity to read the fine magazine of the New York Times. The article pertained to the Belgrade Conference.

On Friday, September 1, representatives of 24 uncommitted governments will meet at Belgrade, Yugoslavia. This is as significant a meeting as has taken place this year. We are, however, in danger of ignoring it and misunderstanding it because of the failure to appreciate the role of the neutral nations in the world today.

There is pertinent history behind the meeting at Belgrade. In 1955, at Bandung, there was a meeting of Asian nations. The response of the United States to this meeting has been stated too often to bear repetition.

In December 1958, in Accra, a meeting of representatives of African nations was held. Just as the Bandung Conference was limited to Asians, so was the Accra Conference limited to Africans. Once again there was an opportunity for the development of informal political understandings and approaches to world problems.

Now, in 1961, the neutrals meet again at Belgrade. This is not a meeting merely for Africans or for Asians. It is a meeting of most of the neutral nations and is an important event.

Over the course of the last several years Russia and the Western nations and countries polarized around them have been dealing with each other in stultified terms. Suspicion and distrust have been the keystones of conversation. For every action, the reaction has been threats of war or a deeper freeze in the cold war.

But the neutral nations are not caught in this bind. Not being able to respond in terms of war, the neutral nations are perhaps better able to come up with creative ideas for the preservation of peace. This is what the Belgrade Conference can produce. If there are a series of resolutions to come from Belgrade, let them be constructive and positive rather than complaining and negative. The neutral nations can discover that the balance of moral power which is held in their hands is a source of international leverage that they can apply against a fulcrum of distrust to move a burden of peace.

In April 1961 Premier Khrushchev told Walter Lippmann that "while there are neutral countries, there are no neutral men." But the neutral countries have the responsibilities for using their perspective in a positive manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article "Critical Look at the New Neutralism" by Dr. Hans Morgenthau and an editorial from the Washington Post of this morning appear at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, Aug. 27, 1961]

CRITICAL LOOK AT THE NEW NEUTRALISM

Time was when a permanently neutral nation was rare; Switzerland and, up to the First World War, Belgium were the prime examples. Most small nations wanted to aline themselves with one or the other of the great powers, and the great powers themselves eagerly sought such alinements. Today, on the other hand, all the great nations are meeting in conference in Geneva for the ostensible purpose of devising a neutral status for Laos. And this week a number of uncommitted nations will meet in Belgrade for the purpose of devising a common neutralist policy. One of their main concerns will be the Berlin issue, since both the United States and the Soviet Union are seeking the moral support of the neutralist nations.

Neutralism, the desire not to be alined with either side in the cold war, is a most pervasive trend in world politics. Virtually all the new nations of Africa and Asia have openly espoused it and made it their official policy. Moreover, as a popular movement, more or less articulate, the trend is strong even in the nations which belong to one or the other of the two blocs.

Nations such as England, France, West Germany, and Japan, who were masters of their own fate only yesterday, resent being wedded for better or for worse to the United Western bloc of which their former colonial committed to the alliance with the United States, large masses of their peoples wish they were not so committed.

That such tendencies are not limited to this side of the Iron Curtain was clearly revealed by the Polish revolt of 1956, which at least temporarily increased the freedom of maneuver of the Polish Government on the international scene, and by the Hungarian revolution of the same year, which produced the Nagy government's declaration of neutrality between East and West.

This worldwide trend toward neutralism has baffled the United States. On the one hand, challenged by a communism which seeks the domination of the world and is convinced that it will attain it, the United States has a vital interest in seeing as many nations as possible share its way of life and support its point of view. On the other hand, it is not lost upon the United States that many nations refuse to do either, and prefer to steer an independent course between East and West.

The United States has thus far not been able to reconcile these contradictory attitudes in a consistent foreign policy and has moved from the extreme of blanket disapproval of neutralism to the other extreme of blanket approval.

John Foster Dulles expressed the then prevailing mood when, in a speech on June 9, 1956, he defined neutrality as the pretense "that a nation can best gain safety for itself by being indifferent to the fate of others." This has increasingly become an obsolete conception and, except under very exceptional circumstances, it is an immoral and shortsighted conception.

More recently, American opinion has tended to go to the other pole of finding virtue in neutralism because it avoids at least the vice of alinement with the Soviet bloc. "We do not urge," said President Eisenhower to 15 African leaders on October 14, 1960—"indeed, we do not desire—that you should belong to one camp or the other. You cannot afford to waste your money which is needed to build the hospitals, the schools, the roads that your people need—you cannot afford to put that money into costly armaments."

The foreign policy of the United States, as it is now being fashioned by the Kennedy administration, should first of all recognize that the term "neutralism" covers four different situations which require different American responses. Neutralism may mean escapism pure and simple; it may mean political noncommitment; it may mean moral indifference. And it may mean surreptitious alinement with the Soviet bloc.

The escapist variety of neutralism is popular in the formerly great powers of Western Europe and in Japan. Large masses within these nations long for a detached position which would restore to their nations the ability to pursue an independent foreign policy and minimize their exposure to atomic destruction. This type of neutralism expresses a popular mood that is repelled by the awful risks the atomic age imposes upon nations of the second rank, and by such nations' impotence in the face of these risks.

But could those nations not escape these risks and at the same time restore their freedom of action if they were to loosen their ties with the United States? A majority of delegates to last year's conference of the British Labor Party thought so. They went on record in favor of the unilateral nuclear disarmament of Great Britain. And many outside the Labor Party share their desire to be done wtih American bases on British soil.

The second form of neutralism, political noncommitment, is the official policy of most of the new nations of Asia and Africa. As such, it is a matter of self-interest based upon three facts of the new nations' existence. First, most of these countries owe their independence to national revolutions. Second, they are unstable. Third, they need a maximum of foreign aid with a minimum of political strings.

A political commitment of the new nations to one or the other bloc would run counter to the interests derived from these facts. They feel they could not join the Western bloc of which their former colonial overlord is a member without endangering their national revolutions, and they could not join the Communist bloc without running the risk of their national revolutions being taken over by communism. In view of their weakness, most of them could not join either bloc without being reduced to satellites—that is, colonies by a different name. And by remaining uncommitted and threatening to commit themselves to the other side (or to collapse), they play upon the fears of both sides in order to gain maximum advantages.

This type of neutralism has at times tried to go beyond mere political noncommitment and create a positive political force—a neutralist "third force" pursuing a common policy. The Declaration of Bandung of April 1955, the meeting of Nasser, Nehru, and Tito of July 1956, and the recent attempt of a number of African nations to pursue a common policy in the Congo are cases in point.

Yet while some of these nations have been able to act in unison with regard to certain specific problems, all attempts to commit them to common policies on the basis of their neutralism have failed. For what unites them is but one—negative—fact: the desire not to commit themselves to either bloc. Beyond that, their foreign policies are determined by the same conflicting ambitions and interests as are those of older nations.

It is indicative of this essentially negative character of neutralism that in the General Assembly of the United Nations the neutralist nations, in spite of commanding a majority of the votes, have been unable to substitute for the policies of the two blocs a common policy of their own, but have generally split three ways: a minority voting with either bloc and the majority abstaining.

Neutralism as political noncommitment, joined to the attempt to pursue an independent foreign policy, is most typically represented by Nasser's United Arab Republic.

While leaning on the Soviet bloc without definitely committing himself to it, Nasser has been trying to establish under Egyptian leadership a three-circle empire composed of the Arab world, all Islamic nations, and the new nations of Africa. Yet, while at times the Arab League and more recently the so-called Casablanca nations—Ghana, Guinea, Mali, and Morocco—have followed Nasser's lead in their verbal declarations, Nasser has been much less successful in committing his neutralist associates to common policies under Egypt's leadership.

The third type of neutralism, moral indifference, refuses to take sides in the ideological struggle between East and West. More particularly, it refuses to pass moral judgment upon the policies of either side. It sees that struggle as a contest for power between two blocs and social systems which are both morally defective in different ways. "A plague on both your houses" is about as far as it is willing to go by way of moral commitment.

The neutralism of moral indifference has found its most eminent champion in Nehru of India. (However, it is worthy of note that Nehru's moral indifference has had a way of decreasing as the political interests of India are directly affected, as in the case of Tibet and China.) The neutralism of moral indifference is not uncommon in England and France, in Poland and Hungary.

Finally, the pseudo-neutralism marking alinement with the Soviet bloc is a byproduct of drastic changes in the world balance of power favoring that bloc. These changes are forcing the United States to retreat from certain exposed positions. The agreement to neutralize such a position of which of course Laos is the prime contemporary example, has nothing to do with genuine neutralization. It amounts to nothing more than a facade behind which Soviet influence prevails. It performs no genuine function in terms of neutralism. Its only function is to spare the sensibilities of the West in the face of a defeat.

Neutralism has been growing in recent years due to four factors which have transformed the international scene. First, many of the nations which 15 years ago had to ally themselves with the United States for the sake of survival have regained their economic strength and political stability. For them to remain within the American orbit can at least appear to be again a matter of choice rather than of necessity.

Second, in view of the emergence of the Soviet Union as a nuclear power of the first rank, alliance with the United States appears to some as no longer an asset, but a liability. While in case of a nuclear war no nation is safe from nuclear destruction, the risk is increased almost to the point of certainty for the allies of the nuclear powers. Or, to put it the other way around, there may be a slightly better chance for a nation not so allied to escape nuclear destruction.

Third, the new look of Soviet foreign policy seeks to strengthen neutralist tendencies throughout the world by proclaiming "peaceful coexistence" for all nations as an alternative to the cold war. It threatens the allies of the United States with atomic destruction and holds out the promise of disarmament, foreign trade, and foreign aid to those who keep at least a neutralist course between the two blocs.

Finally, the acceptability of this alternative is considerably enhanced by the competition between the United States and the Soviet Union for the privilege of supplying aid to the uncommitted nations. This competition offers the uncommitted nations the advantages, and exempts them from the liabilities,

of belonging to either bloc. What more can such a nation hope for than to have the best of both worlds without belonging to either?

This is obviously not a heroic attitude. But in our disparagement of neutralism we have refrained from asking: Does it make sense from the point of view of the neutralists? This is the only politically relevant question, because nations aline themselves with other nations or refuse to do so in view of their interests rather than on the basis of some abstract moral standard. And in view of their interests, the answer is bound to be yes.

A nation such as the United Arab Republic, which pursues a neutralist policy by playing the United States against the Soviet Union or vice versa, obviously is better off politically, militarily, and economically than if it were to commit itself fully to one or the other side. For thus it is able to use the support it receives from both sides rather than being used for the purposes of one side.

Similarly, a nation such as India, considering its unsolved ethnic, cultural, and economic problems, might fear for its very existence if it were to join one or the other bloc. Most of the new, weak nations of Africa, if they were to exchange their neutralist position for one of alinement, would risk being reduced to a new colonial status.

As for Japan and the nations of Western Europe, why should they not search for an escape from the liabilities of the nuclear age, since we are searching for such an escape ourselves? In truth, we are all—Americans, Englishmen, Japanese—neutralists in the escapist sense; for we all seek and hope for a way out of the awful dilemma of the nuclear age. The difference is only that we Americans, by virtue of our deeper involvement and paramount responsibility, know better than some of our friends how futile it is to try to opt out of a commitment to which there is no viable alternative.

The three genuine types of neutralism call for varied American reactions. To the escapist variety we ought to bring human sympathy and understanding. Yet we shall respond to it most effectively when we pursue policies clearly calculated to minimize, if not eliminate, the risk of atomic destruction.

To the neutralism of moral indifference, our most effective answer similarly lies in our deeds. We shall deprive this type of neutralism of its plausibility if our policies at home and abroad clearly establish a moral posture not only different from but also superior to that of the Communist world.

However, it is neutralism as political noncommitment which presents our foreign policy with its really creative opportunity. President Kennedy recognized this when, in his interview with John Fischer on December 9, 1959, he called neutralism inevitable and the great trend. He continued:

"During the immediate years ahead this is likely to be an increasing trend in Africa and probably also in Latin America. In Asia, however, there may be some movement away from a wholly uncommitted neutralism as a result of the growing awareness of the Chinese threat. The desire to be independent and free carries with it the desire not to become engaged as a satellite of the Soviet Union or too closely allied to the United States.

"We have to live with that, and if neutrality is the result of a concentration on internal problems, raising the standard of living of the people and so on, particularly in the underdeveloped countries, I would accept that. It's been part of our own history for over a hundred years. We should look with friendship upon those people who want to beat the problems that almost overwhelm them, and wish to concentrate their energies on doing that, and do not want to become associated as the tail of our kite."

However, it is not enough that we have left behind unqualified opposition to neutralism, of which the indiscriminate search for allies—the collectors' approach to alliances—was a logical consequence. Having recognized that political noncommitment is the only policy many of the new nations can afford to pursue, we must find a positive relationship to them.

A number of uncommitted nations are weak, and their weakness together with the Balkanization of vast areas of the globe, especially of Africa, has greatly increased the sources of disorder. That Balkanization runs counter to the technological requirements of the age, which call for political units larger than even the traditional nation-states of Europe.

What is required is a new order to replace the defunct order of empire. Communism offers such a "new order," adapted to the wants of neutralism, for it appears to seek only an implicit kind of alinement without formal commitment.

We have tended to counter this Communist attempt at establishing a "new order" among the uncommitted nations by offering them protection against communism. Yet while these nations need such protection, they refuse to recognize that need; for they fear that if they did they would be drawn into the cold war on the side of the West. For them the paramount issue is not communism, but colonialism. The invocation of anticommunism pure and simple, then, is self-defeating as an American policy toward the uncommitted nations.

What we need is a positive alternative to, rather than a negative polemic against, the Communist new order. It goes without saying that the new order to be promoted and supported by the United States must be unequivocally anticolonialist and meet the material aspirations and requirements of the uncommitted nations. Yet that new order must also be a political order which has room for all kinds and degrees of political noncommitment.

The uncommitted nations may well incline toward one or the other side in their moral preferences, political sympathies, economic interests, and even limited military support. The reconciliation of these different shades of neutralism with the interests of the United States, without compelling the neutralists to enter into an explicit commitment, will put the statesmanship of the Kennedy administration to its supreme test.

Even so, resentment against Western power is likely to persist among neutralist nations, and with it the tendency to play off the East against the West. To counteract this, it will avail the United States little to try to curry favor with the neutralists by trimming its policies to their preferences; neutralism feeds on this kind of weakness. Rather, we must pursue clearly defined, strongly executed, and ably presented policies to a successful conclusion, thereby demonstrating to all concerned that we know what we are about and that it does not pay to cross us. Only so will we gain the respect of the neutralists and have a chance to win their support as well.

And we might well remind the neutralist nations—at appropriate occasions, and tactfully but firmly—that their neutralism is but a function of the power of the United States.

Neutralism, like peaceful coexistence, is for the Soviet Union but a steppingstone toward communization. A nation can afford to be neutralist, not because this is what the Soviet Union wants it to be, but because the power of the Soviet Union is not sufficient to absorb it into the Soviet bloc.

Were the United States not committed to containing the Communist bloc, neutralism could not exist as a policy and would at best survive as an impotent desire and a vain hope. For neutralism in the cold war, like neutrality in a shooting war, depends upon the balance of power. It is a luxury which certain nations can afford because the power of one antagonist cancels out the power of the other.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 28, 1961]

THE NEUTRAL SUMMIT

Mr. Nehru's blooper about Berlin may have had the effect of increasing apprehensions about the 25-nation neutral summit meeting opening Friday in Belgrade. The somewhat reluctant presence of the Indian Prime Minister had been looked upon in the West as a moderating influence against any tendency toward extremism in conference resolutions—though perhaps some of the other nonalined nations attending would not welcome it in quite this fashion.

Certainly no "plague on both houses" statement from Belgrade would be very helpful in the tense test of rights and determination at Berlin. Still, the neutral nations can hardly be expected to remain unconcerned about a situation that could plunge the world into war. What one must hope, therefore, is that there will be at least some appreciation of the human values at stake.

On questions involving colonialism, the West is altogether likely to come in for criticism, with greater or lesser applicability. It would not be at all surprising to have protests about the French role in Tunisia. There is a very great difference, however, between the policy heretofore followed by, say, Portugal in the case of Angola and that followed by Britain in the case of British Guiana. Mr. Khrushchev views every Western policy as imperialist. Will the neutrals be objective enough in their own remarks to recognize the very substantial imperialism of Mr. Khrushchev in Eastern Europe?

In point of fact the colonialist line is getting a bit thin. President Nasser of the United Arab Republic, one of the sponsors of the Belgrade meeting, has implicitly recognized this in his own recent policies. Preoccupation with the sins of others is not a very constructive substitute for attention to real internal problems. To his credit, the United Arab Republic President has been showing increased concern with practical measures to help the standard of living at home.

It also is likely that the neutral summit meeting will have something to say about disarmament and about the situation of the United Nations. The realities of disarmament make it peculiarly an affair between the Soviet Union and the United States; and a mere denunciation of nuclear weapons or testing would not be much contribution to agreement. Here again, though, an expression of concern would be understandable and perhaps helpful.

With respect to the U.N., the neutrals have a case for more adequate representation on, say, the Security Council. But the Soviet troika concept for the Secretariat would be quite as dangerous for the neutrals as for the West. Indeed, the neutrals have an especial dependence upon the executive authority and initiative of the Secretary General.

Whatever may be the expectations of the State Department from the Belgrade assembly, happily there have been no advance panics and alarms here like those before the Bandung Conference of 1955. It would be difficult to find a strong common denominator among the rather disparate nations represented at Belgrade except, perhaps, the quest for status. It would be even more difficult to arrive at a definition of neutralism or nonalinement acceptable to all the participants. These factors militate against the formation of a neutral bloc as such.

In any simplistic view of world affairs, it is more gratifying to have another country stand positively with you than to remain aloof. Still, the United States fortunately

has moved away from the for-me-or-against-me formula and the "neutralism is immoral" view of Mr. Dulles toward a better understanding of the motivations of new countries and their rather specialized way of expressing their independence. The proper criterion for judgment of the results of the Belgrade Conference will be in how neutral the neutrals really are.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE 19TH AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Saturday was the anniversary of the enactment of the 19th amendment. This amendment, which extended the right of voting to women, is one of the many markers along our path of effective democracy, standing alongside the 15th amendment and the 17th amendment. The former guaranteed the right of the people to vote regardless of "race, color, or previous conditions of servitude." The latter guaranteed the right of the people to elect Senators of their choice. Each amendment in its own way was an expression of the belief that the people can govern themselves. Universal suffrage is at once the cornerstone and keystone of a genuinely human way of living.

It is entirely appropriate today, as a tribute to those who are working and sacrificing so much for true universal suffrage, that we pay our respect to the ladies who also made sacrifices for universal suffrage.

The struggle for woman suffrage in this country was long. It took seven decades. Suffragettes were at first armed only with their ingenuity, imagination, courage, and remarkable perseverance. Few elected officials were responsive to the pleas of these voteless citizens. However, those who firmly believed in self-determination befriended them, and soon women could cast their ballots in selected States and elections. In Illinois, by legislative action, they were able to vote for President and certain State officials. Despite efforts of some to overcome this advancement by challenge in the courts, Illinois women retained their precious victory.

The basis of a lasting and responsible democracy is one where the government is responsive to the needs and wishes of its people. The achievement of woman suffrage and the history of efforts to attain it stand as an encouraging example for all those who truly want to achieve a representative form of government.

THE INDOMITABLE SPIRIT OF CAPTIVE PEOPLES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let us never forget that to the captive nations of Europe we owe an invaluable debt of gratitude for their courage and indomitable spirit, which has been and shall continue to be, the rallying point for freedom behind the Iron Curtain. This passion for liberation from the tyranny of communism inspired the Hungarian revolt of 1956. This hatred of dictatorship led to the Berlin revolt of June 1953. This refusal to be chained to a life of regimentation and misery guided thousands of East Germans across the boundary in the city of Berlin to the free society of the West. And now, Mr. President, the Communists have barricaded that boundary in Berlin and shoot to kill any man who dares to defy the will of the puppet government.

But we should not think that this wall will halt the desire of the East Germans for freedom. Wherever there are people under the yoke of tyranny these people have the hope for freedom.

Mr. President, I would like to offer as an example of the spirit of a captive people a speech delivered by Hon. Joseph Kajekas, the chargé d'affaires ad interim of Lithuania, before the Second Festival of Songs of Canadian and American Lithuanians in Chicago last month. I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

It is a particularly great pleasure to be the honorary chairman of this Festival of Songs, and to address you today. The circumstances of our gathering are especially meaningful for me, because it was in this country that I spoke my first Lithuanian word, and learned my first Lithuanian song. And I know that the honor which you show me today in having invited me to address you in our mother tongue is honor which you show to our dear homeland.

At first glance, it might be hard to understand how it is that songs and a diplomat could go together on an occasion such as this. But I remind you that many are the roads that lead to Lithuania. There are the ways, for example, of politics, nationality, and culture. But today, the Lithuanian songs and dances stand in the forefront of our minds; this is especially so for me, as I recall that just several weeks ago, Lithuanian folk dances were performed in the U.S. Department of State, in the world's greatest diplomatic center.

At any rate, we certainly know that Lithuanian songs are much older than Lithuanian diplomacy. Thousands of years before Christ, we may think, our earliest ancestors found themselves at the ambered shores of the Baltic Sea, and surrounded their arrival with song. It was with a song that Lithuanians drew water from the Danube. And at the height of our national existence, Lithuanian soldiers often raised their native songs even at the very gates of the Kremlin. And these songs resounded as well on the fields of Zalgiris [Tannenberg] in 1410.

When, at the end of the 18th century Lithuania was covered with the darkness of czarist rule and a ban on all Lithuanian printing, there were only two ambassadorial tasks left for our homeland—and these were Lithuanian prayers and Lithuanian songs. Today, we are again in a position of adherence to work, prayer, and song as our leaders in hope for a brighter future for Lithuania.

The power of songs is remarkable. A song will outlive the most moving speech or sermon; it is the first thing which moves a child to wonder and to imitate. And it is in song that great love is always expressed, for words are not enough to bespeak the deepest things that fill a man's heart. Is it any wonder that Beethoven's immortal "Ninth Symphony" breaks into song in the final chorale movement, the "Hymn to Joy"?

It is in song that the history and the heart of a nation are revealed. Lithuanian songs encompass, throughout the many centuries, all the powers of God and man, all sadness and all joy, beauty and fear, nature and love. They have been admired by many writers, among them Lessing, Herder, Goethe and Schiller. Both Schumann and Chopin used them for themes in their own compositions. And when Lithuania as a nation embraced Christianity in the Middle Ages, the power of song was led to express a powerful faith, and the beautiful simplicity of a people's luminous quest for the numinous, the sacred. It is in this tradition that the aspirations of a nation developed, with respect for freedom and human dignity. And today, when one hears a Lithuanian congregation intone Strazdelis' hymn, "Fall On Your Knees," one never forgets the experience: it is impossible to forget the moment at which song becomes prayer. And when this prayer is fashioned from a whole history of trials and sufferings in the life of a nation, it is even more unforgettable. As Joyce Kilmer once said: "The very best songs that ever are sung are sung while the heart is bleeding."

The treasury of Lithuanian song is a vast one. I can recall having witnessed a group of London Lithuanians singing all night which journeying from Manchester to London. Several weeks ago, I know that a group of Lithuanian dancers sang almost without ceasing from Boston to Washington. And here, on the banks of Lake Michigan, any Lithuanian who hears again the language and song of Birute, may well know that, someday, his country will again be free.

It is because Lithuania is a land of song that we have set aside this festival in honor of our country. We have gathered here freely and of our own will. But in the present circumstances, we also gather in remembrance of the fact that it is a far different tune that the Kremlin sings.

For it was the tyrants of the Kremlin who, in July of 1940, falsified the will of the Lithuanian nation, just as they falsified her history and her aspirations. Every one of our meetings, and this significant occasion in particular, serves as an opportunity for us to make clear to the whole world that the will of the Kremlin is not the free will of the Lithuanian nation and its people. As the world hears our songs today, it may know that Lithuania cries out for justice, for the harmony of a free and independent national life to which she has a God-given right.

This month marks the passage of 21 years since the U.S. Department of State refused to recognize the illegal absorption of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. The remembrance of this act and its continued validity is an occasion of rejoicing and hope for all Lithuanians, both in the free world and under Soviet enslavement. This month is also the 39th anniversary of the recognition of the Baltic States de jure by the United States.

As a commemoration of these two anniversaries, let our songs rise as a sign of thanks to the American people and their Government. May they also rise as a token of gratitude to the Honorable Richard J. Daley, mayor of Chicago, for his sympathetic and impressive proclamation of Lithuanian Day here in Chicago. In these expressions of gratitude, all the participants in this festival join wholeheartedly.

Finally, we take note of the fact that, in 2 days, all Americans celebrate the 185th anniversary of their Declaration of Independence. This declaration acknowledged God-given, inalienable rights for all men; Abraham Lincoln pointed out that, as such, the declaration gave lasting hope not only to the people of America, but to all freedom-loving peoples for all time. In this hope, let us raise our voices in song, and proclaim throughout all lands our aspirations to liberty: until the day when we shall surely hold a festival of songs on the day of Lithuania's triumph, in the very city of Gediminas, in our beloved Lithuania.

PROGRESS IN SAMOA

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on July 26 of this year I rose in the Senate to describe for my colleagues the appalling state of affairs in American Samoa. The title in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for my remarks that day, "South Sea Slum," was unfortunately an all too accurate description of conditions on those islands. Today, in the Washington Post, there appears an editorial concerning American Samoa, which suggests that progress is now, if somewhat belatedly, being made to institute a comprehensive development program. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

SOMETHING FOR SAMOA

It finally appears as if American Samoa will cease to be a forlorn ward of the Department of the Interior. A new Governor is on the island, and the administration is working out a development program for this tiny outpost in the South Pacific. The fact that New Zealand is due to grant independence to nearby western Samoa next year has helped to wake up the administration to the backward colonial policy heretofore practiced for the 20,000 Polynesians who live on an island about the size of the District of Columbia.

Thanks to the initiative of Senator OREN E. LONG of Hawaii, Samoa has been included in the recently enacted area redevelopment bill and would also benefit from the aid-to-education measures still before Congress. Industries are being sought for the island, and hotel and recreational facilities planned to help the Samoans to help themselves.

H. Rex Lee, the new Governor, is an experienced Interior official who will have his hands full, among other things, in preparing for a South Pacific conference to be held in Samoa next year. The conference will bring together indigenous leaders from various corners of the Pacific and it will be important that U.S. territorial policy show to good advantage. About $500,000 is due to be spent on conference facilities which can subsequently be used as classrooms and other permanent structures. A new $2.3 million jet runway will also be constructed as part of the plan.

Taken together, these steps can help the Samoans prepare themselves for a meaningful choice when the ultimate status of the island is decided. However regrettable the delay, it is good that something is being done to make up for lost time.

PROVISION FOR SUPPLEMENTAL AIR CARRIERS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1969) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for a class of supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment, being in the nature of a substitute is open to amendment and, for the purpose of amendment, will be considered, under the precedents, as original text.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR HAYDEN AND THE 19TH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, earlier this month the League of Women Voters honored our wonderful colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] at a surprise party because he is the only Member of the 87th Congress who voted for passage of the amendment which gave women the right to vote.

Senator HAYDEN was a Representative from Arizona at the time. His vote helped open wide a world of new experiences for women in our country. Perhaps there have been times when Senator HAYDEN wondered if he had cast a wise vote.

I hope that we women will never disillusion him and make him sorry for that historic vote. I first heard about Senator HAYDEN when my husband became a Member of the Senate, and I remember his telling of the fact that here was a Senator who had been in Congress ever since his State had been a member of the Union.

I would ask Senator HAYDEN to be patient with us. After all, the women have only had the privilege of helping select their national officeholders for 41 years. In the life of a woman that is a short time. We hear often that phrase of "life begins at 40." Perhaps 1960 was the golden year when women joined with men to usher in the New Frontier.

I am delighted that men have helped women to become participating citizens in our Government. We have buried the idea that the wife is a legal slave. True, she cooks and washes and darns, as in olden days, but she also votes, speaks, and has a more important place as a policymaker.

Women today owe an everlasting debt to the work of dedicated persons such as Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott, Susan B. Anthony, Lucy Stone, and Julia Ward Howe.

Suffrage organizations such as the National Women's Suffrage Association and the American Woman Suffrage Association pioneered bravely and absorbed many thoughtless words and deeds. So did members of the Congresional Union, which we know now as the National Woman's Party. So did the National American Woman Suffrage Association.

Today such outstanding groups as the League of Women Voters, American Association of University Women, and the Business and Professional Women work to make this a better land.

In this age we do hear a great deal about the women's vote. How big is it? Can it swing elections? How?

I tend to agree with Columnist Sylvia Porter who wrote on October 31, 1960:

> Women are individual voters with individual views, demands, and hopes. The candidates are catering to a bloc which doesn't exist.

We celebrate the 41st anniversary of the ratifying of the suffrage amendment. I am proud to be here as the junior Senator from Oregon because men and women worked to make the 19th amendment possible.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to join in the statement of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon relative to the honors accorded to the President pro tempore of this body, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I recall the Senator from Oregon stating on that occasion that if it had not been for the activities and the foresight shown by the President pro tempore, she and her colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH] would not be Members of this body today.

We are indebted to Senator HAYDEN for his activities in those early days in behalf of votes for women, and in seeing to it that women, at long last, achieved the right of suffrage, a right which they should have had from time immemorial, along with men.

I say in all humility, but I must say in all candor and honesty, that the Senate is a far better body because of the presence, the activity, the integrity, the knowledge, and the contributions made by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and the equally distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. We are delighted that they are with us. We are grateful to Senator HAYDEN that he helped to make it possible.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I had the pleasure of attending the celebration in honor of the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], under the sponsorship of the League of Women Voters. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Oregon know, as obviously she does know, that all of us in the Chamber, on her side of the aisle and on my own, unite in saluting the distinguished American who has served so long, so faithfully, so creditably, and so well in the Senate as CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, has served.

The Senator from Oregon lists one of the great votes which the able Senator from Arizona cast as a Member of Congress long ago, a vote which brought to the women of America their right of franchise.

I certainly concur in the statement of the distinguished Senator from Montana

[Mr. MANSFIELD] that had CARL HAYDEN's side lost in those days, the postponement of the membership in this body of two distinguished Americans, Mrs. SMITH and Mrs. NEUBERGER would have been inevitable. We acknowledge his foresight and wisdom in casting that vote—indeed, his long lifetime of honorable public service. All of us in the Senate, perhaps I may say all in the Nation, are grateful for the type of U.S. Senator we know in the person of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished Senator from California.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH RUSSIA ON BERLIN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I was deeply disturbed by reading the morning newspaper articles to the effect that the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom were seeking to negotiate with the Soviet Union over Berlin, although, so the articles indicated, there was no agreement by the Government of France to participate. I was delighted to read on the news wire just a few minutes ago the following article from Washington:

WASHINGTON.—Secretary Rusk today discounted reports that the United States and Britain would act without France in seeking negotiations with the Russians over Berlin.

"I would treat those stories with great skepticism," Rusk said.

Dean Rusk made the comment as he left here for New York to discuss with U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson a number of world tension spots ranging from Berlin to Bizerte.

There have been published reports that the United States and Britain would try to launch negotiations over Berlin with Russia, despite French resistance to a proposed meeting at this time.

While in New York, Rusk also will confer with U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold.

Rusk indicated that the meeting would touch on a number of topics. "The forthcoming General Assembly (next month) will have almost all major questions before it," he said.

Mr. President, I, for one, applaud the statement by the Secretary of State.

The American people are devoted to the cause of peace with honor in the world. The Government of the United States is always amenable to honorable invitations to negotiate international problems in the cause of a just peace. But, Mr. President, your Government and mine ought not to be bullied nor threatened nor cajoled into running toward a Communist bargaining table.

I read with dismay the recent Soviet note to the United States, in which the Soviet Union heaped imprecations upon the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, and alleged, without any warrant whatsoever, that we were violating the airlanes which we are using under an agreement in which the Soviet Union itself participated and in which it concurred. It could well be that that kind of note is the basis, in the strange way that the Soviets think and reason, of their starting to interfere with or to harass our access to Berlin through the air. I do not know. But I do know there is no greater patriot, no greater friend of the West, no more implacable foe of communism than President de Gaulle. I trust full consideration will be given to the thoughts alleged to have been uttered by him when the question of negotiation first became public knowledge during the last 2 weeks.

Mr. President, the American people applaud what President Kennedy said to the world, that this country will treat any attempt to interfere with our legal rights of access to Berlin as an act of aggression. And in those sentiments the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of France concur.

We are always ready, I take it, to talk, on an honorable basis. We are always amenable to honorable requests to sit down and reason together, to try to find an honorable basis upon which peace might be established in this melancholy world. But, Mr. President, I repeat, let all understand that we cannot, we must not, and we will not be intimidated into negotiation. Courage and forthrightness, strength and honor by the Allies will best serve the cause of a just peace.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there a joint resolution at the desk?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is. Does the Senator from Montana wish to have it laid before the Senate?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, Mr. President; I so request at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 544) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1962, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the joint resolution be passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I understand that the joint resolution which our able majority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee are asking the Senate to pass, simply provides that for the next calendar month—September—the prior appropriations will continue, so that the Government may conduct its operations in the absence of our completing our work on the new appropriation bills.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from California has correctly stated the object of the joint resolution.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Arizona. I have no objection to passage of the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 544) was passed.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today, it stand in adjournment to meet at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVISION FOR SUPPLEMENTAL AIR CARRIERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1969) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for a class of supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the bill (S. 1969) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for a class of supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes, is the business now before the Senate. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to explain the bill.

If my memory serves me correctly, and the ranking Republican member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], I think will agree with me, the bill was ordered reported unanimously by the Aviation Subcommittee. I am sure the action of the Commerce Committee was unanimous.

Mr. President, this is a very complicated and difficult piece of legislation, to which the Aviation Subcommittee and the Senate Commerce Committee have devoted untold hours of hearings, consultation, and discussion in executive session. It seeks to provide a permanent place in the aviation industry for supplemental air carriers without adverse effect upon scheduled carriers. The bill before the Senate represents the best which the committee can do in the solution of this problem.

To give a brief summary of the bill, it would make it clear that a carrier may request and be authorized to perform limited services supplemental to those furnished by the regular air carriers, and

would authorize the Board to issue certificates of public convenience and necessity for supplemental service containing limitations on the type and extent of service authorized. This authority was requested by the Civil Aeronautics Board as a result of the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in United Air Lines et al. against Civil Aeronautics Board, which determined that the Board lacked authority under existing law to issue limited certificates.

The bill would—

First, grant statutory interim operating rights, in the nature of temporary "grandfather" rights, to existing holders of supplemental air carrier certificates who have performed a portion of the service authorized by their present certificates.

Second, make clear that a supplemental certificate is primarily a certificate for charter service and provide that the Board may, when the public convenience and necessity require, also authorize individually ticketed service.

Third, make clear that supplemental air carriers are not eligible for subsidy payments.

Fourth, permit the Board to issue a special operating authorization for temporary service between particular points during periods when regular service is inadequate.

Fifth, permit the Board to impose civil penalties for violations of title IV of the act relating to economic regulations.

Sixth, amend the act to provide for a statutory definition of charter service.

Seventh, make clear that a regularly certificated carrier cannot also be certificated as a supplemental carrier; and

Eighth, enable the Board to make a determination of fitness based upon considerations peculiar to the type of supplemental transportation for which authority is sought.

I refer Senators to the committee report, a copy of which is on each Senator's desk, and will not attempt to further discuss at this time the detailed provisions of the bill. I would, however, like to make this further comment.

The bill provides that carriers desiring a certificate on a supplemental carrier under the new provisions which I have discussed briefly must file a new application for a certificate. It provides for extension of the authority of presently certificated carriers until the Board has passed on the new application. Some fear has been expressed by certificated supplemental carriers that the absence of any statutory guarantee that the new application will be granted may make it difficult for them to acquire necessary financing in the interim because of the possibility that they will not be given a permanent certificate under the Board's new authority.

I wish to point out to Senators that all the supplemental air carriers, now operating on an extension of their authority given by the Congress, even before the court decision had only certificates of a limited duration. Some had 2-year certificates and some 5-year certificates.

The carriers would have been forced, even without a change in the law, to come before the Civil Aeronautics Board for a renewal or for an extension of their existing certificates. I see no way in which the carriers would be jeopardized in any right they have held, and they would be guaranteed a continuation of their authority until the Board has determined the type of certificate they shall receive.

The committee felt that it was not desirable to require the CAB to issue a new certificate to every carrier now certificated because circumstances might arise which would make this undesirable with respect to a particular carrier. For example, one certificated supplemental carrier which is otherwise eligible for a new certificate is now in bankruptcy and no one can now anticipate whether its financial problems can be solved so that the Board would be justified in granting a new certificate. Certainly, we do not wish the new certificate to be peddled around. We do not wish to have a certificate of a bankrupt company bought by another, simply because a law had been passed which would guarantee a permanent right for someone to fly as an air carrier. Other similar situations might arise.

However, the committee has worked on the assumption and with the intention that presently certificated carriers be given permanent certificates unless there are such special circumstances with reference to the particular carrier as to make it undesirable. The committee believes that this is a reasonable assumption.

The CAB has already certificated these carriers, and the proposed legislation is made necessary not by lack of action on the part of the Board, but by a court decision that the Board's action in providing for limited certificates exceeded its authority under the Federal Aviation Act.

The Board thereupon applied to Congress for the necessary authority to validate its action in certificating these carriers. The Board has been unanimous in its view that the supplemental carriers serve a public need, and has represented to the committee that the supplemental industry has had no adverse effect upon scheduled carriers. The committee therefore believes that the supplemental industry needs no protection against the Civil Aeronautics Board, and confidently expects and intends that new certificates will be issued providing all or such part of the authority requested in the application as the Board determines is in the public interest.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall be glad to yield the floor, if the Senator wishes to speak. The Senator from Kansas has been very active in trying to reach a solution to this very difficult problem, by providing for the small business element of aviation without damaging our fine regularly scheduled airlines. The effort that he and other Senators, as well as the able staff of the Aviation Subcommittee, have made is outstanding. They have worked longer on the proposed legislation before us than on any other piece of proposed aviation legislation in recent years.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to thank the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and also the staff of the entire committee.

Mr. President, I know of no other piece of proposed legislation which has received as much detailed attention this year as this particular piece of proposed legislation the Senate is considering this afternoon.

It should be said, to the credit of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] that he kept after the problem, and his staff kept up with all the various and sundry phases of the problem. Comprehensive hearings and a series of conferences were held, as a result of which many of the discordant notes which might have developed were pretty well quieted.

Mr. President, the pending bill is a comprehensive one which will establish a permanent and constructive role in aviation for the supplemental airlines. It represents a tremendous amount of effort on the part of the Aviation Subcommittee which is so ably headed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

At this time I wish to pay tribute to my colleague, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. He is not able to be present today, being necessarily detained from the Senate because of official business. The Senator from New Hampshire has contributed significantly to the bill. One of the most important features of the bill was inserted at his suggestion, and I believe it materially contributed to the unanimous backing the bill won both in the subcommittee and the full committee. The Cotton amendment requires the Civil Aeronautics Board to impose limitations on the individually ticketed operations of the supplemental air carriers to assure that their flights will not significantly divert traffic from the regular airlines which form the backbone of our air transportation system.

This protection for the regular airlines is essential in my view and in the view of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] for these are the air carriers which fly on the lean days as well as on the rush days. They serve the smaller cities as well as the big ones, and they can only provide that service if they have reasonable protection against operators who can pick and choose, operators who can fly the high profit coast-to-coast runs and ignore the cities in between. The need for reasonable and effective safeguards for the protection of the regularly scheduled airlines is further demonstrated by their present financial picture. The domestic trunk airlines of the Nation reported a net loss of over $13 million for the first 6 months of this year, according to a recent statement of the Air Transportation Association of America.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The U.S. domestic trunk airlines reported a net loss of $13,586,000 for the first 6 months of this year, the Air Transport Association of America announced today.

The loss is the greatest for any first-half period since 1947, when, with a $16,467,000 first-half loss, the trunklines had a full-year loss of $20 million. It compares with a first-6-month loss of $5,339,000 in 1960, a year in which the carriers had a full-year profit of only $1,188,000. In 1959 the trunklines had a first-half net profit of almost $30 million.

Operating revenues were $979,005,000 during the January–June period of this year, compared with operating revenues of $937,770,000 during the comparable 1960 period. Operating expenses were $975,983,000 this year, compared with $941,719,000 during the first half of 1960.

During the month of June 1961, the trunk airlines had a net profit of $6,069,000, with operating revenues of $190,051,000 and operating expenses of $173,638,000. In June of last year their net profit was $8,292,000, with operating revenues of $171,596,000 and operating expenses of $158,155,000.

Stuart G. Tipton, ATA president and spokesman for the airline industry, called this year's first-half loss "clear evidence of the severity of the depression our Nation's airlines are experiencing." He pointed out that traffic had decreased this year, down 1.9 percent below that of the first 6 months of 1960, and called for repeal of the 10 percent World War II tax on passenger travel, which he described as "one of the major obstacles to a much needed increase in traffic."

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in the light of this situation, the Cotton amendment is crucial to the bill.

Let me make one other point. This is not a bill which makes everybody happy. Neither the regular airline carriers nor the supplemental airlines are completely happy with it. I am sure that each of these groups would like a number of things changed. But I believe the bill represents an honest, fair, and forthright effort to resolve the difference on the basis of the public interest.

Again I pay special tribute to the Senator from Oklahoma, as well as to all members of the staff, who did a magnificent job in closing the gaps and presenting all the issues, giving everyone a fair opportunity to be heard and to analyze the problems, something which was invaluable to the subcommittee as well as to the full committee.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to express my appreciation for the kind words the Senator said about the junior Senator from Oklahoma.

The senior Senator from Kansas has been active for many years in working for the same solution, and has been most helpful and constructive.

Another member of the minority who has been equally helpful and tireless in his efforts to find an adequate and fair solution to the problem has been the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], a member of our subcommittee who unfortunately is unable to be present for consideration of the bill today. The Senator from New Hampshire would have taken a leading part in advocating its passage and explaining its provisions.

We owe a deep debt of gratitude to the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire for his very great contribution, and we owe a debt of gratitude to the entire staff on the minority side of the committee.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask to have it stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, line 3, after the word "that", it is proposed to insert the following: "any local service carrier or"; and on page 13, line 6, after the word "such", it is proposed to insert the following: "local service carrier or".

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, section 417 of S. 1969 would grant authority to the Civil Aeronautics Board to issue special operating authorizations to supplemental air carriers when the capacity of the certificated route carriers is insufficient to meet the requirements of the public or postal service. Certificated trunk and local service carriers would not be eligible for these special authorizations which under the terms of section 417 would be limited to 30 days and, in addition, the authorizations must contain limitations as to the frequency and types of equipment to be utilized. Such limitations would assure that the service utilized would alleviate insufficiencies that otherwise would exist without a significant diversion of traffic from certificated carriers. A written notice to the air carriers certificated to provide service between the points involved is required also, thereby giving such carriers the opportunity to protest the application in writing.

Prior to the issuance of a special operating authorization, the Board must first make findings that first, the service of a certificated route carrier is temporarily insufficient to meet the requirements of the public or the postal service; second, there is a temporary requirement for transportation between two points, one or both of which is not regularly served by any air carrier; and third, any supplemental air carrier can supply the additional service temporarily required in the public interest.

This section, 417, is undoubtedly meritorious and will give the Board authority to fill a gap which would otherwise exist without it.

An important omission from the section, however, is another very significant group of air carriers, the local service carrier, or feeder line, as they are sometimes called.

These lines also have the means and equipment to fill the gap in these peak traffic periods and should also be permitted to assist at such times.

My amendment would therefore simply insert at the appropriate places in section 417 the words "local service carrier". The effect of the amendment would be to include those carriers within the group to which the Board can issue "special operating authorizations" pursuant to its new authority.

I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will consider the amendment favorably and accept it, because it seems to me that it would fill an urgent need in the transportation system.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the distinguished Senator from Maryland conferred with me with respect to his amendment before the Senate started consideration of the bill. I wish it were possible for me to agree to accept the amendment. After such study as has been possible, in the brief period of time I have had to examine the amendment, I am very fearful that it would harm the very delicate balance that we have tried to achieve by not interfering unduly with the scheduled airlines, and still carving out an area of truly supplemental service for the supplemental carriers.

I should like to give two or three reasons. To begin with, on every piece of legislation that has been enacted to benefit the feeder lines, I have been a sponsor and floor manager of the bill. Not one single representative of a feeder carrier has appeared before the committee, written to the committee, or consulted me as chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BUTLER. It was my understanding that a representative of the feeder lines had appeared before the committee, and that the subcommittee had given the problem some real study.

Mr. MONRONEY. If such a representative appeared, his appearance escaped my attention. A representative could have been present with a statement that was printed in the record. As I recall, no objection to the bill was interposed by the local service carriers. Of course, during its long consideration by the committee, the original bill was greatly changed.

I am informed by the staff that such a representative did not appear.

It seems to me that at this late date, no representative having appeared or evidenced an interest, and with a delicately balanced bill such as the one we have before us, we would be subject to criticism if we added the feeder lines as potential competitors of the trunk lines.

I think that in the new section 417 we have made an important addition for this little business sector of aviation. When people are backed up for several days or a week waiting for space on the high-density traffic runs—for example, between New York and Miami around Christmas; or between a city, such as Chicago, where the National Republican Convention might be held, and New York; or in any case in which the regular trunk service might not be adequate—the provisions of this section would take hold. The measure has for its purpose permitting such carriers to provide a suitable supplemental service.

To fill this need, the supplemental carriers are ideally suited. By joint agreement approved by the CAB they maintain a central office located in Washington. The representatives at the office know at all times where all available aircraft of member carriers are located. Therefore, under this provision of the bill, when the high density of traffic swamps the regular trunk carrier, their association can insure that aircraft needed are ready and available.

We have carved out adequate territory, and have been instrumental in trying to expand the territory of the feeder lines. Everything humanly possible has been done by the Subcommittee on Aviation to assist them. Such legislation includes the guaranteed-loan bill, in which the Senator from Maryland participated, and other measures.

I greatly fear that accepting an amendment that has not been carefully studied, and with respect to which we have not had the reaction of the regular scheduled airlines, which have always been fearful of the feeders moving into their bailiwicks, might be disastrous.

I respectfully suggest that the Senator consider withdrawing the amendment and not let it be put to a vote at this time. The bill will be pending in the House of Representatives, which has not yet reported a bill. The subject is still open there. If the substance of the amendment of the Senator from Maryland is included in the measure by the House, if testimony is developed as to its effect, and the attitude of other segments of the aviation industry is known, the conferees will be most happy to seriously consider it.

If it is voted down in the Senate, there will be a history of rejection of the amendment. I do not feel so strongly against the Senator's amendment that I would like to prevent consideration of the amendment in conference, if after serious consideration the House of Representatives should put the amendment in the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. I join other Senators, especially those on the Committee on Commerce, who have worked with the Senator on this bill. The Senator from Oklahoma has assiduously worked at this task. It is a good bill. It is certainly not my intention to add an amendment to the bill that would hurt it.

I offer the amendment for a specific purpose. The feeder carriers are small operators in the airline business. They are small businesses. Before they could get special authorization, there would have to be a hearing before the Board, and the Board would have every opportunity to pass on their ability and their right to carry some of the traffic. Therefore, in my opinion, the addition of the local feeder lines would not add any burden or complicate the bill in any way.

The Senator has referred to the inventory of equipment. There certainly could never be any call on the so-called aircraft pool, because, before any services could be given or any authorization could be issued, there would have to be an application and a hearing before the Board.

Therefore, the fact that I propose this amendment does not seem to me to add or detract anything.

I appreciate very much the Senator's attitude. I know that he is sincere in not wanting a record vote on the amendment if it would hurt the bill. I would not like that either, because I think the amendment is worthy. I do not think it could hurt the bill. If the Senator can give me his word that this subject will be taken up and given some consideration, I am inclined to withhold the amendment at this time.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Oklahoma would be happy to consider the amendment if the House in its wisdom, based on evidence of interest in and need for such a change, should insert it in the bill.

We would be glad to consider it and discuss it in conference. However, the other Senators not having been advised of the need or having received any request with respect to it, if as a result the amendment should be voted down, it would somewhat prejudice the conferees on the part of the Senate by reason of the fact that the amendment had been defeated.

I would wish particularly to examine the effect on the subsidy to the feeder carriers, whose subsidy runs in excess of $70 million a year. The privilege of flying only two or three trips from New York to Miami, for example, may not be worth raising the many questions as to their subsidy which might be involved—for example, the problem of trying to separate depreciation and maintenance and service and overhead and pilots' salaries and all these other matters, from the standpoint of bookkeeping. I would be inclined to doubt the wisdom of such an undertaking, and as a friend of the feeder lines, I would certainly not like to expose them to responsibilities which would complicate their situation. Of course, I do not know whether it would. However, I go back to the original reason for not desiring to accommodate the Senator, and that is that we have not had any testimony before the subcommittee and no staff study to find out what might be involved.

Mr. BUTLER. It was my understanding that the presentation had been made before the subcommittee and that a study had been made and that it had been considered by the full committee. If that is not the case, I am perfectly willing to take the Senator's word for it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to ask the distinguished ranking Republican member of the subcommittee about this matter, because he was present, I believe, at most of the hearings. There might have been some mention made of it and that reference may have been buried in the record. I cannot recall it, though. The staff members I have talked to cannot recall it either. We have the printed hearings available. Perhaps the Senator could find some reference in the hearings.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I might say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that the Senator from Kansas has no definite recollection of this matter having been presented to the subcommittee or to the full committee.

Of course, the temporary peak-period service authorized in the bill, with which the Senator's amendment deals is breaking some ground in a new field. It is a new category of air service, and is a matter which must be watched carefully by the Aviation Subcommittee as it is put into effect. In that review of the special authorization we will have adequate opportunity to consider the inclusion of local service or other air carriers in the program.

I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Oklahoma that if the matter comes before the House and is presented there, with the House and the Senate being given an opportunity to see the extent to which they have gone into this matter, it would be given full and sympathetic consideration. However, to inject it here I believe would cloud this matter to the extent that it might be detrimental to the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. I would certainly not want in any way to hurt the bill, because I know the subcommittee and the full committee have worked very long and very hard on the bill. In addition to that, I would not desire in any way to injure the feeder lines. With those two considerations in mind and because of the assurances that the committee will give further consideration to my amendment at the appropriate time, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to ask the Senator a question, if he will yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have a question with regard to section 401, and I pose this question to the Senator from Oklahoma. If that section is retained, could the Civil Aeronautics Board certificate a supplemental airline to provide scheduled service between New York and Los Angeles, or between any other pair of cities?

Mr. MONRONEY. Subject to such limitations as were required to protect the scheduled certificated carriers, it could. Furthermore under section 417, if number of planes available were inadequate, it might be necessary to authorize daily service for a temporary period by supplemental carriers to supplement the regular service. The word "supplemental" means that the service would be supplemental to the service of the certificated carriers, instead of being in competition with them on the franchised routes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator for his clarifying question.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. On behalf of the committee I offer some perfecting amendments, which are at the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 17, strike "with any person who" and insert "by which any person".

On page 16, line 16, after "or (B)" insert "any operations in overseas or foreign air transportation, as a supplemental or large irregular air carrier, otherwise authorized by the Board, or (C)".

On page 17, line 13, after "shall issue" insert "a new interim certificate or".

On page 17, line 16, strike "or interim" and insert "and/or other operating".

On page 19, line 16, strike "the" and insert "any".

On page 20, lines 23 and 24, strike "extension of its" and insert "issuance of an interim certificate or other interim".

On page 21, lines 2 and 3, strike "extension of" and insert "interim certificate, interim".

On page 21, after line 8, add a new section to read as follows:

SEC. 9. (a) That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the heading "Title IV—Air Carrier Economic Regulation" is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 417. SPECIAL OPERATING AUTHORIZATIONS.—

"(a) Authority of Board to issue.

"(b) Terms of authorization.

"(c) Procedure."

(b) That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the heading "SEC. 901. Civil Penalties." is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Safety, economic and postal offenses.

"(b) Liens."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a brief explanation of the perfecting amendments printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

EXPLANATION OF PERFECTING COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS TO S. 1969

Section 1(a). The bill as reported provides that the term "charter service" "shall not include transportation services offered by an air carrier under an arrangement with any person who provides or offers to provide transportation services to individual members of the general public."

The purpose of this restrictive language is explained in the committee report as follows:

"However, it is not the intention of the committee to permit individually ticketed service to be offered to the general public under the guise of charter. The proposed statutory definition, therefore, provides that charter shall not include such individually ticketed service whether offered by an air carrier directly or by a travel agent."

It was not the committee's intention to prevent a club or organization from arranging charter through a travel agent as they are permitted to do under existing Board regulations, but the present language of the bill is susceptible to this unintended construction.

It is therefore proposed to amend the definition so as to provide "'charter service' shall not include transportation services offered by an air carrier under an arrangement by which any person provides or offers to provide transportation services to individual members of the general public."

Section 7(a)—Amendment 1: As reported by the committee, clause 2 of section 7(a) would require that in order to be qualified for interim operating authority pending Board action on its application for a certificate a carrier must show—

"(2) that between January 1, 1960, and May 25, 1961, the applicant or his predecessor in interest lawfully performed either (A) any portion of the service authorized by the certificate or interim operating authority, or (B) any operations for the Military Establishment of the United States;"

Further analysis of this provision shows that it works a hardship on one carrier, Quaker City Airways, Inc., whose operations have been performed exclusively in oversea and foreign air transportation under an earlier exemption order of the Board, rather than in interstate air transportation under the carrier's certificate. No other supplemental carrier which meets the remaining standards of this section is in this circumstance.

Because the intention of the provision is to permit carriers which have operated to continue to operate pending a Board decision on a new certificate application, it is proposed to amend this clause to permit the Board to count as qualifying operations those such as Quaker City Airways has performed. As proposed to be amended the clause would read as follows:

"(2) that between January 1, 1960, and May 25, 1961, the applicant or his predecessor in interest lawfully performed either (A) any portion of the service authorized by the certificate or interim operating authority, or (B) any operations in overseas or foreign air transportation, as a supplemental or large irregular air carrier, otherwise authorized by the Board, or (C) any operations for the Military Establishment of the United States;"

Section 7(a)—Amendment 2: If a carrier satisfies the requirements of section 7(a), the Board is directed to issue "new interim authority", and a provision of section 8(a) terminates existing certificates and other operating authority. This would mean that for a period of time certificated supplemental carriers would lose their certificates and operate on interim authority.

Because current regulations governing procurement of air transportation from civil carriers by the Department of Defense limit those eligible to certificated air carriers, it is necessary that the interim authority of presently certificated carriers be denominated a certificate to insure their continued eligibility to participate in military contracts.

It is therefore proposed to change section 7(a) to provide that the Board "shall issue new interim certificates or interim authority to such applicant." This is intended to make clear that supplemental carriers now holding certificates should be given new interim certificates while those carriers operating under other authority shall be given new interim operating authority by Board order but not by certificate. Conforming amendments are made in section 8(b).

Section 7(a)—Amendment 3: The committee intends that a supplemental carrier receive interim authority to engage in supplemental air transportation to the same extent that it is now authorized to do so, whether by certificate, interim operating authority, or exemption. The language used in the bill as reported "to the same extent authorized in the applicant's certificates or interim authority," is subject to the construction that a certificated carrier should receive new authority equivalent to that contained in its certificate (i.e., authority to engage in interstate air transportation), but should not receive interim authority equivalent to that now held by exemption or other noncertificate authority (i.e., authority to engage in oversea and foreign transportation). To avoid this unintended interpretation it is proposed to change this language to read "to the same extent authorized in the applicant's certificate and/or other operating authority."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. ENGLE obtained the floor.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], without my losing my right to the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the colloquy between the chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the eminent Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, was clarifying in the degree that clarification should be had in reference to local service carriers. I am delighted that an agreement was reached, and that the amendment of the Senator from Maryland was not pressed for determination at this time.

In the State of West Virginia we are served by three of these splendid local service carriers, Allegheny, Lake Central, and Piedmont. We value these airlines for their intrastate and interstate operations. Today is not the time, when subsidy is considered in one category and not in the other, to bring the amendment into focus or even carry it to conference with the House. This is a subject unto itself.

Mr. President, I compliment the junior Senator from Oklahoma. I feel that the very patient and most painstaking work which is done on the kind of legislation we are considering now is not fully appreciated, even in the Senate.

So I commend the knowledgeable Senator from Oklahoma and also the Senator from Kansas. Those two men, with other members on the Subcommittee on Aviation have carried forward most comprehensive consideration.

On August 1, 1961, I wrote a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I set forth that I believed "Senator MONRONEY has been most thorough and objective in handling the Aviation Subcommittee consideration of this subject and related problems." I could have said, and I now say, "Senator MONRONEY and Senator SCHOEPPEL."

Mr. President, I brought to the attention of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], certain points which should be weighed in connection with the pending legislation. I ask unanimous consent that this letter of August 1, written to

Senator MAGNUSON, and his reply, dated August 21, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AUGUST 1, 1961.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Commerce Committee,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WARREN: Though I am not a member of the Senate Commerce Committee, I do have a sincere interest in matters affecting the common carriers, including legislative developments which affect the airlines.

In this connection, I have noted with some concern the extremely poor earnings picture of the scheduled airlines, and the high degree of competition and excess capacity which exists, particularly among the trunk carriers. While much of our airline service throughout West Virginia is performed by local service carriers, we also have a number of trunkline operations in the State. The pressure on the airlines earnings picture causes me to consider the continued ability of some of the trunk carriers to serve the intermediate size cities, such as we have in West Virginia.

I realize, of course, that in air transportation, as in every other field, we must continue to move ahead, and the committee has had a problem in trying to find a place for the supplemental airlines. In meeting this problem, I am sure committee members had in mind the effect such legislation will have on the regular air carriers and in the needs of the public for supplemental air service. Two particular issues in the legislation now under consideration are pertinent, and I feel the committee will carefully weigh the consequences of these two points.

First, I consider the new definition of charter service which the committee proposes to add to the Federal Aviation Act. The committee has reversed the CAB's longstanding policy against the chartering of aircraft by travel agents and others who solicit transportation from members of the general public. While the concept of chartering aircraft for the movement of all-expense paid tours may open new opportunities in aviation, it is sufficiently complicated and fraught with diversionary dangers that some restrictive regulation should be lodged in the Board to control its development. Without this, I feel Congress could be opening a Pandora's box without any opportunity to place the lid on or even partially close it.

The second point I bring to your attention is the fact that the bill retains authority in the CAB to award supplemental air carrier certificates for individually ticketed route operations. Although the committee has added a standard of "no significant diversion" from the regular carriers, any new authority in this area stands to divert from the regular carriers. If additional service is needed, it would seem it could and should be provided under the regular certificate procedures or under the new procedure which the committee expects to establish under the new section 417.

Your committee will, I feel certain, weigh carefully the effect of these two provisions, both of which seem likely to weaken the scheduled carriers. Our esteemed colleague, Senator MONRONEY, has been most thorough and objective in handling the Aviation Subcommittee consideration of this subject and related problems.

Very truly,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
August 21, 1961.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Many thanks for your recent letter with reference to S. 1969, a bill to authorize certificates of supplemental air carriers.

As you can well imagine, the problems involved in drafting a bill acceptable to both the supplemental carriers and the regularly certificated route carriers have been substantial. I am frank to say, however, that I think the bill which the committee reported, I might mention unanimously, meets every reasonable objection. I think you will find that this same sentiment would be expressed by every member of the committee.

The original bill proposed by the Board was substantially amended in an effort to insure that the operations of the supplemental carriers would in fact remain supplemental and not result in diversion of traffic from the certificated route carriers.

I can assure you that the points which you raise were thoroughly considered by the committee and I do not believe that they posed the threat which some spokesmen within the route carrier industry alleged. If I thought this bill would jeopardize the economic stability of the certificated route carrier industry, I would not have supported it.

I certainly appreciate your kindness in making your views available to me. In this connection I am enclosing a copy of the reported bill and the committee report. If after having read the report, you or members of your staff have any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I also wish to thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his thoughtful letter of August 16, in which he acknowledged the copy of the communication I sent to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. He stated that many of the matters which I had brought to the attention of the subcommittee and the committee were discussed and evaluated in the report on S. 1969. To be sure, many of those points have been covered. Although I am not personally 100 percent satisfied with the proposed bill, I believe the purposes are well founded, and I shall support the measure.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I deeply appreciate, as I know the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] also does, the high praise which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has given us. It is praise indeed when it comes from a man who has had a practical working knowledge of the vast field of aviation for many years during the regrettable, although, I am happy to say, brief interval between his membership in the House and his membership in the Senate. His interest in aviation in the House has continued to be one of his prime interests in this body, and his worthwhile suggestions and willing cooperation have always been most valuable.

The bill does not satisfy me 100 percent. Neither does it completely satisfy the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], or the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. However, as to all such matters which deal with business rights and franchises under very delicate circumstances, there had to be a "giving" on all sides. No one got all he wanted in the bill. Still, as I view the bill, for the first time since I began my membership in this body—and that goes back 11 years—it offers hope for peace among all the branches of our great air transportation system; hope that there will be a live and let-live policy, by which there will be an opportunity for small business to serve as supplemental carriers. "Supplemental" means to give the necessary added service at the times and places, on the routes, and at the rates which will supplement our basic scheduled carrier service.

I believe that in all respects the bill will prove to be one which goes down the middle of the road, and that experience will demonstrate that neither the subcommittee nor the full committee has favored one branch as against the others. We have tried to provide for a type of service which will grow and which will be supplemental to that provided by other carriers.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the distinguished Senator from California for his courtesy in allowing me to make this comment. I am grateful also to the Senator from Oklahoma for his statement.

Mr. ENGLE. It was a pleasure for me to yield to the Senator from West Virginia; and I concur in the high compliment he has paid to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is at the desk and ask that it be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, line 8, it is proposed to insert immediately preceding the word "under", the following: "or the type of service provided therein,".

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, this is a clarifying amendment to make it plain that the certificate of a "cargo carrier" does not exclude such carriers from passenger charter service. I have discussed the amendment with the junior Senator from Oklahoma. He has agreed to accept the amendment as a clarifying amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement of the purpose of the amendment.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ENGLE

I propose an amendment to S. 1969, to provide that on page 12, line 8, immediately preceding the word "under" the following be added: "or the type of service provided therein,".

This amendment was prompted in the light of the following considerations:

Section 401e of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 provides that "any air carrier may make charter trips or perform any other special service, without regard to the points named in the certificate, under regulations prescribed by the Board." The authority of all certificated carriers to engage in charter operations is derived from this provision. However, in construing this provision, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, in 1953, ruled that it merely lifted the limitation with respect to points designated in the certificate and did not affect the type of service to be rendered. Consequently, cargo carriers would be precluded from engaging in passenger charter operations.

S. 1969 provides a statutory definition of charter. One of the primary reasons for providing a statutory definition was to discourage the Board's broad use of its exemption authority under section 416. In this connection the committee, in its report, stated on page 13:

"The committee is also strongly of the opinion that the Board's practice of routinely permitting continual large-scale charter operations by exemption is not only unwise, but illegal, because not within the 'unusual circumstances' contemplated by section 416."

I believe the committee's position in this matter is a wise and constructive one.

The cargo carriers presently carry passengers for MATS as well as passengers in transoceanic charter group by virtue of the exemption authority. Consequently in the light of the court of appeals' decision, coupled with the statutory definition of charter together with the committee's report language, there is serious question as to whether or not the cargo carriers could continue to engage in passenger charter operations. This, certainly was not the intent of the committee. In fact, it was the committee's position that the language in section 401e included all certificated air carriers and there was no intent to exclude cargo carriers. The committee, however, was not aware of the court of appeals decision, which put a different construction on this provision.

It could be argued that the cargo carriers should apply to the Board for an amendment to their certificate to permit passenger charter service. However, section 401 provides that "no term, condition, or limitation of a certificate shall restrict the right of an air carrier to add to or change schedules, equipment, accommodations, and facilities for performing the authorized transportation and service as the development of the business and the demands of the public shall require." Consequently, if passenger charter rights were given the cargo carriers in their certificates, they would be placed in the unique position of being the only class of future carriers that the Board would be without power to impose limitations as to frequency of service.

The language which I propose merely clarifies the intent of the committee to provide that the phrase "any air carrier" includes cargo carriers. It gives the Board the necessary flexibility to impose all necessary regulations as to frequency of service and otherwise in the performance of charter operations, and avoids the disadvantages inherent in giving the cargo carriers such authority in their certificates or by means of exemptions.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from California and his staff have been most cooperative in helping to draft and perfect the bill. The committee has studied the amendment. In order to make doubly certain that the all-cargo carriers affected by the charter provisions of the bill do not lose that which they have always had, namely, the right to a certain amount of passenger charter, we believe the amendment will not only be of benefit to the aviation industry but will clarify the intent of Congress.

The distinguished Senator from California, as he frequently does, has come to our rescue with a needed clarification. We are happy to accept the amendment as a part of the bill.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1969) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I observe the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may move to reconsider the vote by which the bill, S. 1969, was passed?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 1969 was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY WATERFOWL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 681, H.R. 7391.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wet lands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Nebraska withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum so that the first committee amendment may be stated?

Mr. CURTIS. I withhold my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, after the word "the", it is proposed to strike out "10-year period" and insert "5-year period".

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the role.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 216 OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 880, which amends section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests of personal property for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 880) to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests of personal property for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, which were, on page 1, line 5, strike out "(e)" and insert "(g)", and on page 1, line 6, strike out "(e)" and insert "(g)".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House. They are merely technical amendments, relettering subsections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 607(b) OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT—BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6974), which amends section 607(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and that the bill be placed on the calendar.

I make the request for the reason that there was reported from the Committee on Commerce some time ago an identical bill, S. 1185, which is order No. 176, now on the calendar. There is no need to have the House bill in committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Washington to discharge the Committee on Commerce from further consideration of H.R. 6974. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the committee is discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ACT OF 1948

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 685, which amends the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 685) to amend the Coast and Geodetic Survey Commissioned Officers Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes, which was, on page 4, lines 18 and 19, strike out ", after June 30, 1961,".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I move that the Senate disagree with the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, for the purpose of the RECORD I desire to state that this bill was introduced at the request of the Secretary of Commerce. I understand that the House amendment, which deletes the cutoff date in the bill's retirement provision, is unacceptable to the administration. In addition, I have received a letter from the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, urging that the House amendment be deleted. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
August 23, 1961.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been brought to my attention that S. 685 passed the House of Representatievs on August 21, 1961, with an amendment to section 2.

Section 2 of the bill as reported to and passed by the Senate amended section 1(r) of the Civil Service Retirement Act to constitute commissioned Survey officer service performed after June 30, 1961, as military service for all civil service retirement purposes. Such service performed before July 1, 1961, was still to be treated as civilian under the Retirement Act, as had consistently been the case in the past. The Retirement Act difference is that military service is credited without deposit, whereas civilian service is contributory and if current contributions have not been made there must be a deposit to secure full credit.

S. 685 was sent up by the administration and was introduced by you on that basis. The section 2 provision represented apparent administration adoption of a policy favoring the prospective transition of commissioned Survey officers from their hitherto civilian status to the category of military personnel. This move paralleled the legislation in the last Congress, Public Law 86-415, approved April 8, 1960, which had the general effect of placing Public Health Service commissioned officers in the category of military personnel for service performed from and after July 1, 1960—in other words, prospectively only.

Section 2 as amended in the House completely departs from the change advocated by the administration and would constitute commissioned Survey officer service as military (creditable free) for civil service retirement purposes, regardless of when in the past it may have been performed.

The House amendment not only departs from the principle sought by the administration, it proposes an action which I understand is wholly unprecedented. At no time in the 41-year existence of the civil service retirement system has there been legislation which would credit, as military, service which was considered civilian at the time it was performed.

For the reasons set forth above, it is my opinion that the Senate should not accept the House change in section 2 of S. 685.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

APPLICATION OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAW TO CERTAIN EVENTS OCCURRING ON BOARD AIRCRAFT IN AIR COMMERCE

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2268) to amend the Federal Aviation Act to provide for the application of Federal criminal law to crimes aboard aircraft.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2268) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the application of Federal criminal law to certain events occuring on board aircraft in air commerce which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1472) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"AIRCRAFT PIRACY

"(i)(1) Whoever commits or attempts to commit aircraft piracy, as herein defined, shall be punished—

"(A) by death if the verdict of the jury shall so recommend, or, in the case of a plea of guilty, or a plea of not guilty where the defendant has waived a trial by jury, if the court in its discretion shall so order; or

"(B) by imprisonment for not less than twenty years, if the death penalty is not imposed.

"(2) As used in this subsection, the term 'aircraft piracy' means any seizure or exercise of control, by force or violence or threat of force or violence and with wrongful intent, of an aircraft in flight in air commerce.

"INTERFERENCE WITH FLIGHT CREW MEMBERS OR FLIGHT ATTENDANTS

"(j) Whoever, while aboard an aircraft in flight in air commerce, assaults, intimidates, or threatens any flight crew member or flight attendant (including any steward or stewardess) of such aircraft, so as to interfere with the performance by such member or attendant of his duties or lessen the ability of such member or attendant to perform his duties, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both. Whoever in the commission of any such act uses a deadly or dangerous weapon shall be imprisoned for any term of years or for life.

"CERTAIN CRIMES ABOARD AIRCRAFT IN FLIGHT

"(k)(1) Whoever, while aboard an aircraft in flight in air commerce, commits an act which, if committed within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, as defined in section 7 of title 18, United States Code, would be in violation of section 113, 114, 661, 662, 1111, 1112, 1113, 2031, 2032, or 2111 of such title 18 shall be punished as provided therein.

"(2) Whoever, while aboard an aircraft in flight in air commerce, commits an act, which, if committed in the District of Columbia would be in violation of section 9 of the Act entitled 'An Act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia', approved July 29, 1892, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 22-1112), shall be punished as provided therein.

"CARRYING WEAPONS ABOARD AIRCRAFT

"(l) Except for law enforcement officers of any municipal or State government, or the Federal Government, who are authorized or required to carry arms, and except for such other persons as may be so authorized under regulations issued by the Administrator, whoever, while aboard an aircraft being operated by an air carrier in air transportation, has on or about his person a concealed deadly or dangerous weapon, or whoever attempts to board such an aircraft while having on or about his person a concealed deadly or dangerous weapon, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"FALSE INFORMATION

"(m)(1) Whoever imparts or conveys or causes to be imparted or conveyed false information, knowing the information to be false, concerning an attempt or alleged attempt being made or to be made, to do any act which would be a crime prohibited by subsection (i), (j), (k), or (l) of this section, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(2) Whoever willfully and maliciously, or with reckless disregard for the safety of human life, imparts or conveys or causes to be imparted or conveyed false information, knowing the information to be false, concerning an attempt or alleged attempt being made or to be made, to do any act which would be a crime prohibited by subsection (i), (j), (k), or (l) of this section, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"INVESTIGATION BY FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

"(n) Violations of subsections (i) through (m), inclusive, of this section shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 903 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1473 (a)) is amended to read as follows:

"VENUE

"SEC. 903. (a) The trial of any offense under this Act shall be in the district in which such offense is committed; or, if the offense is committed out of the jurisdiction of any

particular State or district, the trial shall be in the district where the offender, or any one of two or more joint offenders, is arrested or is first brought. If such offender or offenders are not so arrested or brought into any district, an indictment or information may be filed in the district of the last known residence of the offender or of any one of two or more joint offenders, or if no such residence is known the indictment or information may be filed in the District of Columbia. Whenever the offense is begun in one jurisdiction and completed in another, or committed in more than one jurisdiction, it may be dealt with, inquired of, tried, determined, and punished in any jurisdiction in which such offense was begun, continued, or completed, in the same manner as if the offense had been actually and wholly committed therein."

SEC. 3. Paragraph (4) of section 101 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1301 (4)) is amended by striking out "operation or navigation or aircraft within" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "operation or navigation of aircraft within".

SEC 4. Title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"AUTHORITY TO REFUSE TRANSPORTATION

"SEC. 1111. Subject to reasonable rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrator, any air carrier is authorized to refuse transportation to a passenger or to refuse to transport property when, in the opinion of the air carrier, such transportation would or might be inimical to safety of flight."

SEC. 5. (a) That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the heading "Sec. 902. Criminal penalties." is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(i) Aircraft piracy.

"(j) Interference with flight crew members or flight attendants.

"(k) Certain crimes abroad aircraft in flight.

"(l) Carrying weapons aboard aircraft.

"(m) False information.

"(n) Investigations by Federal Bureau of Investigation."

(b) That portion of such table of contents which appears under the heading "TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS" is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 1111. Authority to refuse transportation."

Mr. CURTIS. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question or two for the RECORD?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. This is the so-called hijacking bill which the Senate debated for a period of 2 days, some time ago. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. This is the House-passed version of the bill which the Senate had previously passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. CURTIS. Are there major differences?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would like to explain the differences when I make my statement. Following my statement I shall move that the Senate accept the amendment of the House.

Madam President, this is the bill which was passed by the Senate on August 10, 1961, and which was passed by the House with amendments on August 23, 1961.

I have discussed the House amendments with the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the chairman of the committee [Mr. MAGNUSON], and it is our considered opinion that the Senate should concur in the House amendments without a conference or further amendment.

The substance and effect of the bill as passed by the Senate and as amended by the House are practically identical. We believe, however, that the bill has been substantially improved technically by the House amendments. The House amendment adds a new subsection to the Federal Aviation Act defining and specifying the punishment for aircraft piracy, rather than making the maritime statute applicable, as did the Senate bill. The House amendment also adds a needed provision with reference to the venue for trial of these offenses. Both of these changes, in our opinion, represent an improvement in the bill as passed by the Senate.

There is one problem with reference to the section prohibiting the carrying of concealed weapons aboard aircraft in that the Senate bill exempted law enforcement officers of any municipal, county, or State government from this prohibition, whereas the House bill uses the term "any municipal or State government", as did the bill as reported by the Senate committee, and makes no specific reference to county law enforcement officers. However, it is the view of the House committee, and was the view of the Senate committee, that county law enforcement officers are clearly included within the phrase "municipal or State government", so that no specific amendment to the House bill in this regard is necessary.

Madam President, it is important that the effective date of this statute not be unnecessarily postponed.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, the congressional intent is to include county law enforcement officers. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. We wish to make it clear that in the acceptance of the House amendment we intend that county officers be included. The separate reference to municipal officers is necessary, because they operate under municipal ordinances; but county officers enforce State law, and therefore are an arm of the State, whether they be employed by the county, or a parish, if the State happens to be Louisiana, or other divisions of State government.

Mr. CURTIS. The deletion of the words do not exclude county officers, but the contrary is true. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. County officers are not excluded from the exception. The only reason we are taking this matter up and urging that the House version be adopted, so we will not have to go to conference, is that we do not know when another airplane hijacking may occur. I think this is the best means for us to proceed, in order to take advantage of the work done by the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] in having the bill ready so we were able to move with great rapidity.

I do not find anything substantially wrong with the version of the bill before the Senate, although it changes the provision to a minor degree, and makes the maximum punishment of imprisonment for 20 years for interfering with flight crews apply to cabin attendants. The Senate bill did not so apply.

In order not to delay passage of this vital bill, which is one of the ways we intend to discourage the commission of this heinous crime, which could cause the loss of as many as 100 lives, I think we should take the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. I agree with the statement made by the Senator from Oklahoma. I believe we were right in the first instance in not applying to stewardesses the provision which applied to flight crew members who were actually employed in duties directly involving the safety of the aircraft. But the crime having to do with interference with stewardesses may be prosecuted, either under section 1 or the other section. We assume that, if it was a minor crime, like that of a drunk quarreling with a stewardess over whether or not he could keep his bottle, he would not be charged under the major punishment portion of the bill, but under the minor provision, which would not carry the heavy penalty.

In other respects, it seems the House has not significantly changed the bill. We put the word "county" in to be sure that county law enforcement officers required to carry arms were included under the law; but I think we should make it plain, as a part of the legislative history, that county officers acting as State officers in that respect are intended to be included, although not specifically mentioned.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree, and I am sure the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who exerted great effort to expedite the bill and have it ready almost immediately, would also agree. It perhaps would help in making the legislative history if he would state that county officers, in enforcing State law, are covered under the language of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the distinguished ranking Republican member of the committee.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made with reference to the proposal. Senators probably know, as they should know, that the bill originally started with the proposal of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. Our Aviation Subcommittee and full committee acted on the bill expeditiously, and certainly with the promptness and dispatch which should have governed our actions.

I regret that the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the Sen-

ator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is not present today. He is unavoidably detained on official business in New Hampshire.

We think the proposal is an excellent one, and it is a mark of wisdom and judgment to take the House version. We are heartily in favor of it. I commend the Senator for calling it up.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator very much for his valuable participation as well as that of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the members of the committee on the minority side. They always cooperate for the greater safety of aviation.

Madam President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the action by which the Senate concurred in the House amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY WATER FOWL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wet lands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, for some years the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior has been engaged in a program for the acquisition of the so-called wet lands in the United States for the purpose of preserving and conserving those lands for use by wild birds and particularly waterfowl. The program was initiated some years ago and agreed upon, so far as the nature of the lands and the places in the various States are concerned. Those places include most of the States of the Union. There was agreement between the Fish and Wildlife Service and the States involved, whether with the Governor of the State or the regulatory agency, such as the State game commission in my State.

We learned that the annual appropriations, from the beginning, were insufficient for a seemingly modest program. About 4 years ago we checked with the Department of the Interior on the program and learned that if the program continued at the same slow rate it would be sometime after the year 2000 when we would acquire the minimum acreage of wet lands needed. We also learned that the duck stamps, which are purchased by many Members of the Senate, including the Senator from Washington, cost $2. The bill in this regard was originally reported by my committee on the basis that the money would be used for the acquisition of wet lands; in other words, the hunters, the Audubon Society people, the conservationists, and the wildlife people who bought stamps would pay for the acquisition of wet lands.

After we reviewed the program some 4 years ago we learned it would be something like a fantastic figure of 69 years before the minimum amount of wet lands would be acquired. Of course, in the meantime the value of lands has gone up, though not as much in the case of these particular lands as is true with regard to other lands.

We also learned that a great portion of the duck stamp money was being spent for administration.

We passed a law, with the support of all the people interested in the problem and the administration and the States involved, to increase the price of the duck stamp from $2 to $3, and also provided that all the money collected would be used directly for the acquisition of wet lands and that, when the lands were administered, the Department of the Interior should come to the Congress for a direct appropriation for the administration of the lands.

I think last year was the first year the $3 charge for the duck stamp was in effect.

The $3 charge for the duck stamp will bring in between $4½ and $6 million, to be put into the fund.

We learned further, in reviewing the program, that the acquisition of wet lands was not proceeding as fast as deemed desirable, even with the $3 charge for the duck stamp.

This year there will be a great shortage of ducks, I am told by the experts on wildfowl and waterfowl, because of the drought situation.

Many of us belong to an organization called Ducks Unlimited, for which we pay $2 or $3 a year.

The Senator from South Dakota has just handed me a duck stamp. It may not be good for this year, but perhaps it will be good for next year.

We have been trying to conserve the great natural resources for the waterfowl. We have had excellent cooperation with the Canadian Government as to the breeding grounds north of the United States. Only recently we have had better cooperation with the countries of Latin and South America, where some of the ducks go. The enforcement there has been a very difficult problem. The Mexican Government has been very considerate in regard to the problem. We never did get a treaty signed with Cuba, where the ducks are slaughtered in the winter season. I do not expect we will get a treaty now.

The program was proceeding slowly, but fairly well. The $3 duck stamp will bring in between $4½ and $6 million.

A shortage of ducks and waterfowl has a direct effect on the amount of proceeds from the sale of stamps. If duck hunting is not very good, the duck hunters do not buy many stamps. We hope to increase the sale of duck stamps by doing the job of acquiring and preserving the wet lands. That is the reason for the bill being before the Senate.

The bill is a House-passed bill. The House passed it on July 10, 1961. There was little or no opposition to the objectives of the bill.

The House passed a bill to authorize appropriations of $150 million over the next 10 years—that is, $15 million a year—and provided that at least 75 percent of the proceeds from the sale of duck stamps would be returned to the Treasury, until the amount was repaid. The House-passed bill also provided that, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, at the end of 5 years, if the program was working out well, the price for the duck stamp could be raised from $3 to $4, and at the end of 10 years it could be raised to $5.

The Senate committee decided we could meet that problem about the duck stamps when we got to it, and we allowed the $3 charge for the duck stamps to remain, but we recommended authorizing appropriations of only $50 million for the next 5 years; that is, $10 million a year. This, would add to the moneys obtained from the sale of duck stamps, would bring in $50 million for the purchase of wet lands to speed up the program.

We changed the provision with regard to 75 percent of the proceeds by making it mandatory that 90 percent of the proceeds of all duck stamp sales would be returned to the Treasury.

In effect, this is a program of borrowing a little from the Treasury.

We added an amendment to the bill—we do this, anyway, but thought we would make it more safe—to provide that no lands should be purchased under the plan unless the Federal Government and the State involved had a complete agreement, either with the Governor or the State agency, such as the State game commission in my State. It is provided that they must be in complete agreement as to the nature of the lands and the acreage involved.

I should like to point out certain significant figures. The Senate committee held hearings for two sessions. The House committee held quite lengthy hearings. Originally, when the program was started, 127 million acres of wet lands were available in the United States. Now only 22½ million such acres are available which are of any significant value. We have cut the number in half, and said that 12½ million acres would be a safe minimum to acquire. The Federal Government would hold only 4½ million of those acres, and the remainder would be held by the States. In some cases there might be a coordinated program. Since July 1, 1960, all proceeds of the sale of duck stamps have been going for the acquisition of land and the enforcement of regulations, and that is the way we want the program to continue.

Most of the wildlife groups, such as the Audubon Club, Ducks Unlimited, and others which are interested in State game commissions, were in favor of an acceleration of the program by the proposed method. If we were to operate the program as we should and acquire the small minimum acreage suggested, we might increase the waterfowl population of the North American Hemisphere to the extent that the amount of money received from the sale of the $3 duck stamps might increase beyond the

amount now received, which is between $4½ million and $5 million. If that were the case, and if an increase of 15, 20, or 25 percent took place, then, of course, the amount would come in every year, and would go back to the Treasury to repay the amount expended. There would be no cost except to those who purchase the stamps.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. First, I believe that a measure of the kind before the Senate is eminently justified. A unique plan has been devised whereby money could be made available at an earlier date than it would be if an accumulation of the fund were left to the proceeds of duck stamps.

There are two reasons for urgency. One is that some of the lands that should be acquired are going out of the market, so to speak. The second reason is that the price of the lands to be acquired is rising. For those reasons an acceleration of the program is greatly to be desired.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman one question. It has reference to the proviso that is proposed to be added at the end of the bill.

The committee amendment reads:

Provided further, That no land shall be acquired with moneys from the bird migratory conservation fund unless the acquisition thereof has been approved by the appropriate State or State agency.

In presenting the bill the Senator from Washington referred to the Governor. Does the chairman consider the proviso to refer to approval by the Governor, or approval by the appropriate State, or does he have in mind an act of the State legislature?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe it is intended that the Governor or the appropriate State agency would give approval. In some States game commissions are established by State law. The members of the commission are appointed by the Governor and they have the control, responsibility, and authority on questions dealing with game laws.

In some cases there is a State game commissioner, who is merely a member of the executive branch of the State government. We wanted to provide for both types of State organization.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What I seek to do is to bring out the question of whether the language used would do exactly what the chairman has suggested. Would it not be better to have the proposed legislation read "has been approved by the Governor of the State or the appropriate State agency?"

The bill states "by the appropriate State."

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe that was an error. Does the Senator have the Senate bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have a copy of the pending bill, H.R. 7391.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, the Senator from South Dakota would suggest that, on page 2, line 20, the language read:

Provided further, that no land shall be acquired with moneys from the migratory bird conservation fund unless the acquisition thereof has been approved by the Governor of the State or the appropriate State agency.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is what I am suggesting. I am a little uncertain as to what is meant by the language "appropriate State or State agency."

Mr. MAGNUSON. I see what the Senator means. I think his suggestion would clarify the language. I am glad to accept the amendment.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered as new text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments agreed to are as follows:

On page 1, line 7, after the word "the", to strike out "ten-year period" and insert "five-year period"; in line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000"; on page 2, line 9, after the word "year", to strike out "1972" and insert "1967"; in line 11, after the word "comprising", to strike out "75 per centum" and insert "90 per centum"; in line 15, after the word "aforesaid", to strike out "ten-year period" and insert "five-year period", and in line 17, after the word "fiscal", to strike out "year." and insert "year: *Provided further*, That no land shall be acquired with moneys from the migratory bird conservation fund unless the acquisition thereof has been approved by the appropriate State or State agency.".

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I offer my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 20, it is proposed to strike out the word "appropriate" and insert the words "Governor of the", and on the same line, following the word "or ", insert the word "appropriate".

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, the language would then read, "been approved by the Governor of the State or appropriate State agency."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, the Senator from Washington has referred to cooperation with Canada with respect to the area where ducks are produced. It is true that there is a drought in a portion of the great prairie country. It extends into Canada and the great natural breeding grounds there. For that reason steps in this direction are most important so that we can bring about the necessary conservation at the earliest possible date in order to conserve the natural breeding grounds of the migratory waterfowl.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I cannot conceive of any acreage of wetlands that it is intended to purchase in the next 3 or 4 years that has not already had the joint approval of all the States and everyone else involved.

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. As a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, I have observed such procedure to be the practice in the 4 years in which I have been a member thereof. In spite of the absence of the type of amendment contained in the committee amendment, that always is the practice of the Commission. Normally at meetings of the Commission at which land is acquired, and approval of such acquisition is had, there are present representatives of the official appropriate agency of the State in which the land is located. There has already been processed before that time the area of agreement between the Federal agencies and the State agencies which makes the approval possible. So on that score I reassure the Senator from South Dakota, as well as the Senator from Washington, that the practice is already invoked.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The matter was explained to some Members of the Senate, and some witnesses testified to it also, but it was felt that it might represent a little safeguard in case we were to run into it in one place or another.

Incidentally, I wish to return to the Senator from South Dakota his license. I would say to him that he will soon have to get a new one, because this is a 1960 license. It is a small game license, and the fee is $2. Then there is a duck stamp here, $3; also a wild turkey license in South Dakota, $2. He will have to get a new one. [Laughter.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I note that the duck stamp is good until the 30th of June, 1961.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, but the Senator will have to get a new stamp.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will get a new one as soon as a new duck season comes around again.

Mr. MAGNUSON. A great deal of work and planning has been done to encourage the sale of more of these duck stamps. It is very significant to note that a great number of people who buy the duck stamp do not hunt ducks. They want to preserve wildlife and wet lands. The purchase of these stamps is encouraged by many organizations, notably the Wildlife Federation, Field and Stream Magazine, by hunting and bird magazines, and many other organizations.

Mr. HRUSKA. Some of those who purchase the stamps do not use them at all. For example, Members of Congress whose sport used to be to go duck and geese shooting now just hope to go duck and geese shooting

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. The Senator is looking at one of those Members of Congress right now.

Madam President, this is a good bill. It is a good program. I believe that in a year or two it will be a self-revolving fund. Perhaps 5 years from now we may need authority to raise the price to $4. If so, I think we can do that, and find some justification for it. However,

I believe we should go the way we are going.

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. As the Senator from Nebraska understands, the jurisdiction and the processes of the Migratory Waterfowl Conservation Commission would not be in any way changed or altered by the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. The purpose of all this is really to enact a finance bill to raise the wherewithal to do something that the Senator and his associates have recommended.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is not a finance bill, inasmuch as it is an authorization bill subject to the regular appropriation process.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. What that amounts to is that it is subject to appropriations each year, and it amounts to a prespending arrangement for the revenues derived from the sale of the duck stamps.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct; this coming year it will be, but I believe the revenues will catch up.

Mr. HRUSKA. The revenues which the sale of the duck stamp will produce can be spent in each of the next 5 years, in addition to the appropriated funds under the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; but later we are taking 90 percent of the proceeds of the duck stamp sales and putting them back into the Treasury.

Mr. HRUSKA. But not until 1967.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. It does not start until 1967.

Mr. HRUSKA. So until that time the Conservation Commission will be entitled to spend not only the proceeds from the sale of the stamp but also any moneys appropriated pursuant to the authority contained in the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Whatever Congress would regularly appropriate.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is for the purpose of accelerating the acquisition process of the wet lands, which are fast disappearing.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Knowing the Appropriations Committee as I do, I would think that there would not be a great deal more over and above the proceeds from the sale of the duck stamp that would be appropriated in the next 5 years.

Mr. HRUSKA. The proceeds from the sale of the duck stamp need not be appropriated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I said over and above that.

Mr. HRUSKA. Over and above that?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Then what is the purpose of the bill? Starting with the fact that the duck stamp now produces about $5 million in revenue, how much will be available in fiscal year 1963 with this bill ripening into law?

Mr. MAGNUSON. If we authorize the Senate version of it, $10 million a year plus proceeds from the sale of duck stamps. The Department of the Interior would have authorization to come before the Appropriations Committee, in order to keep the program going, and ask for an extra $10 million for that particular year.

Mr. HRUSKA. So that it would fill it out to the $10 million.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. That was the understanding.

Mr. HRUSKA. The statement of the Senator from Washington was that $55 million would be available if this law became effective.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Fifty million dollars for 5 years. That is $10 million a year.

Mr. HRUSKA. Ten million dollars a year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is by way of authorization?

Mr. MAGNUSON. By way of authorization, yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

VISIT TO UNITED STATES BY EXCHANGE BROADCASTERS

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I call attention to the present visit in the United States of 21 radio and television broadcasters representing stations in Africa, Europe, the Far East, the Near East, south Asia, and South America. These visitors, all of whom hold important positions in the radio and television industries of their own countries, have come to America for the eighth consecutive year to study the advanced techniques of American radio and television broadcasting.

Under State Department sponsorship, the program is administered by the Television and Radio Center of Syracuse University, where the broadcasters will attend a special 4-week seminar. They will also spend considerable time in New York City to observe the operations of the major networks.

The last few weeks of their program will give each visitor an opportunity actually to observe and work in two different radio or television stations.

Madam President, the United States, and in particular New York State, has been in the vanguard of radio and television broadcasting since the origin of broadcasting. This exchange program can be of tremendous benefit to these visitors in showing them the operational techniques of American broadcasting. They will also have ample opportunity to see our economic, social, and political systems at work throughout the country, to observe the advantages of a free and responsible broadcasting industry, and to achieve a better understanding of American life.

I extend to these broadcasters a hearty welcome to the United States, and particularly to New York State, where they will be spending much of their time. I hope the trip will be beneficial and enjoyable for all.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to include after my remarks a copy of the Department of State press release describing the program in more detail and listing the names, nationalities, and positions of these exchange visitors.

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

RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTERS FROM 18 COUNTRIES TO OBSERVE U.S. BROADCASTING INDUSTRY UNDER STATE DEPARTMENT PROGRAM

A group of 21 radio and television broadcasters representing stations in Africa, Europe, the Far East, the Near East, South Asia, and South America, will arrive in Washington today to participate in a special exchange program sponsored by the Department of State. The 4-month program is designed to better acquaint the participants with the American people and the operations of the American radio and television industry.

The visitors, all of whom hold program or administrative positions with radio and television organizations in their own countries, will have the opportunity to exchange ideas with American radio and television experts and to view American broadcasting in action in many different communities throughout the Nation.

This is the eighth consecutive year that the State Department has sponsored such a program. It will be administered by the Television and Radio Center of Syracuse University. Dr. Eugene S. Foster and Mr. Richard M. Cobb of the university are now in Washington to meet with the group and assist the Department of State in launching the program. The group will spend 2 weeks in Washington for orientation at the Washington International Center. While here the broadcasters also will visit various Government agencies, and observe the operations of the Voice of America.

The group will then go to Syracuse University for a special 4-week seminar which will include comparison of American broadcasting practices with broadcasting in other parts of the world, and prepare the visitors for their assignments to American broadcasting stations later in the program.

Early in October the broadcasters will visit Boston for a week and will then spend 2 weeks in New York City, where they will observe the operations of the major networks. They will then attend the annual conference of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters in Washington.

From late October through early December each visitor will be placed in two different radio or television stations for periods of 3 weeks each. The visitors will observe the day-to-day broadcasting operations as well as the relationships of the stations to the communities they serve.

The broadcasters will assemble in Washington for a week of discussion on their experience before returning home on December 21.

The visiting broadcasters are:

AFRICA

Republic of Congo: Felix Lambert Tathy, press attaché, Congolese Ministry of Information, Brazzaville.

Nigeria (2): Emanuel Belo Fadaka, service manager, NBC, Lagos. Christian O. Scott-Emuakpor, program assistant, Nigerian Broadcasting Corp., Lagos.

Republic of Somali: Mohammed Hasci, management of Somali Radio, Mogadiscio and Hargeisa.

EUROPE

Greece: Dimitrios Constantinidis, director, drama department, Greek National Broadcasting Institute, Athens.

Italy: Adolfo Pitti, staff member, RAI-TV program, Rome.

Norway: Steinar Bjarne Brauteset, program editor, Norwegian Broadcasting System, Oslo.

Poland: Ignacy Waniewicz, chief editor, scientific and educational programs, Polish TV, Warsaw.

Sweden: Ivar Gustav Ivre, assistant director, Swedish TV, culture and lecturers department, Stockholm.

FAR EAST

Malaya: Abdul Aziz bin Abu Hassan, broadcast assistant, department of broadcasting, Penang.

Philippines: Renerio Corcino Tan, assistant station manager and production manager, DYRL, Bacolod.

Singapore (2): Ismail bin Hassan, senior Malay program producer, Radio Sarawak. Claude Doral, acting head of program section, broadcasting division, Radio Singapore.

NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA

India: Nand Lal Chowla, station director, All-Indian Radio, New Delhi.

Pakistan: Sajjad Haider, regional director, Radio Pakistan, Hyderabad (Sind).

SOUTH AMERICA

Argentina: Eduardo Jorge Celasco, producing and directing programs, channel 13, Buenos Aires.

Brazil (2): Ronald Sanson Stresser, owner and general manager, Radio Colombo do Pasona Ltda., Rio de Janeiro. Jose Gerardo Barbosa Lima, program director, Ceara Radio Club, Rio de Janeiro.

Ecuador: Hugo Delgado Cepeda, announcer, Guayaquil television station, Guayaquil.

El Salvador: Victor Cincinato Barriere, general manager, Television Salvadorena, SA, San Salvador.

Mexico: Luis A. Rivas Aguilar, manager, XEFC, Mexico City.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HON. HARRY F. BYRD AT BERRYVILLE, VA.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Madam President, on Saturday, August 26, 1961, I made a speech at Berryville, Va. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

After 50 years of public service in Virginia—and I am profoundly grateful for the honor of having been allowed to serve—I shall attempt today, as best I can, to define Virginia conservatism.

Before attempting this definition, I want first to pinpoint the differences between the views of a leading liberal of today and what I regard as my constitutional duty as a Member of the U.S. Senate, representing Virginia.

Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, is recognized as such a liberal. Last November he said I should be purged as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee if I would not support the proposals of the socialistic platform written by Chester Bowles and adopted by the National Democratic Convention last summer.

He made no charges against me. He did not allege that I had abused the position of committee chairman. He professed personal friendship. But he announced he would attempt to defeat my continuation as chairman if I would not blindly support a political party platform.

In reply I stated publicly that I was unalterably opposed to nearly everything in the platform; that I intended to fight everything inimical to the best interest of this country, in or out of the platform; and then I challenged him to take his fight to the Senate floor.

I said, as a Member of the Senate, my first allegiance was to the people of Virginia, and I recognized no outside control over my vote. The Virginia delegation to the convention opposed the platform, and the Honorable Lewis McMurran, a member of the Virginia House of Delegates, denounced it from the convention floor.

In my letter to Senator CLARK, dated December 2, 1960, I said in part:

"My allegiance is to Virginia, where the people have elected me six times to the U.S. Senate. I have what is to me the supreme honor of having served in the Senate longer than any other Virginian in history. I recognize no control over my votes in the Senate from any outside influence including the national Democratic convention and a caucus of my Democratic colleagues in the Senate.

"In my votes in the Senate I will follow the basic principle of our representative democracy, that a public official owes his allegiance primarily to those who elected him. I will submit to no coercion such as you propose, in performing my duties as a Senator from Virginia.

"Am I to be purged as chairman of the Finance Committee because I refused to support measures which I believe to be dangerous to the Republic I pledged myself to serve faithfully and to the best of my ability?"

Thus, there was presented a clear issue between present-day liberalism and conservatism. It was fundamental. Senator CLARK took his fight to the floor. He got one vote—his own. The Senate of the United States upheld the fundamental concept that a U.S. Senator owes his first allegiance to the people of his State, except in extreme national emergency.

I think fundamentals are at the base of Virginia's conservatism, whatever the definition may be. Generation after generation, we have consistently followed the principles established by those immortal Virginians who laid out the province of our constitutional and representative democracy.

Virginians of today still believe in the Jeffersonian doctrine that the least governed people are the best governed. We oppose the vast and increasing concentration of power in the Federal Government at Washington, and we are alarmed by it.

We firmly adhere to the fundamental principles that this Nation is a confederation of States, and the Federal Government is confined to the powers given it by the original Constitution and amendments legally adopted by not less than three-fourths of the States.

In simple language, Virginia wants to preserve the fundamental principles under which, in the brief span of 160 years, with only 6 percent of the world's population, we became the most powerful Nation in history.

We had already known the tyranny of a remote monarch when George Washington led us in the Revolution; and more than once we have known the oppression of unrestrained central government at home.

We have recently witnessed the unconstitutional usurpation of power by the Warren Court. Its integration decision at the same time struck down previous Supreme Court decisions on the subject, and struck at the heart of the rights of States.

Virginia was the cradle of the Republic. We devised the first representative government in the New World at Jamestown. Our forefathers led the fight for liberty; they conceived the principles on which the Nation was founded; and they put them into effect.

We felt the iron hand of military rule in the terrible Reconstruction days. In the War Between the States we suffered devastation seldom equalled in all history. We endured the tortures of rising from its ashes. We asked for no outside aid; and we received nothing but the suppression of carpetbag rule.

We have experienced the cruel hazards of public debt and the long and costly burden of paying it off. We contracted a $35 million debt 126 years ago, in 1835, for public works. That was a lot of money in those days. At that time we could not foresee that war was coming, or that West Virginia would secede.

But war did come; and West Virginia did secede, and for 40 years she refused to pay her share of that debt. The interest quadrupled the principal. To the great credit of Virginia let it be said that, despite war devastation and loss of territory, she paid off and funded every dollar of that debt and the interest.

Virginia has never issued a State bond since we learned that lesson, and today we are one of three States in the Union free of State indebtedness.

The word "conservation" has great and constructive meaning however it is used; the variations of it are especially meaningful in analyzing the Virginia attitude. The word comes from "conserve" which, according to Webster, means "to keep in a safe and sound state."

This is a high and worthy purpose, whether applied to natural resources or political principles and institutions. The political definition of a "conservative"—again according to Webster—is one who "favors conservation of existing institutions and forms of government."

Conservatism, as we understand it in Virginia, means to accept responsibility for preserving and protecting our basic principles and institutions while exercising the privilege of using and developing them.

What are these basic principles? There are others, but foremost I list States rights, and the independence of the three separate but coordinate branches of government. This combination provides the check and the balance to insure against concentration of power which, by experience, we have learned to fear.

These, and others, are the principles on which we achieved our liberty and our freedom for the pursuit of happiness. They are the base of our greatness.

Virginia is known as conservative because we adhere to the fundamentals of our form of government and we will fight to protect them. In this I think we can take great pride.

No nation ever had higher purposes; a better system of government has never been devised. It is not a pure democracy; but it is a brilliant and practical approach to it. The contributions of great Virginians to its formation are unparalleled.

In Virginia we know the blessings of our form of government, and experience has taught us its dangers. We know the need for checks and balances. We know that, under the Bill of Rights, powers not specified as Federal are retained by the States and the people.

We do not forget that Jefferson warned us against usurpation of power by the Federal Supreme Court; and we recognize this usurpation in Warren Court decisions which have been chipping away at the fundamentals of our representative democracy.

Andrew Jackson, a great liberal of his day, took pride in paying off the Federal debt, and he had the Jefferson warning in mind when the Federal Supreme Court of his time rendered its decision in the Cherokee case. He said, "Now that Marshall has made his decision, let him enforce it."

Virginia resisted the Warren Court integration decision in defense of the principles on which it believes this Nation was founded. We shall always defend these principles to the extent of our strength, and regardless of how ruthlessly we are crushed.

Washington warned us against "change by usurpation," because "it is the customary weapon by which free nations are destroyed." If we have a deeply rooted mistrust of unrestrained rule by central government, there are reasons for it.

Along with the fundamentals I have mentioned, there are more. They may be summarized as self-reliance, thrift, and the opportunity for every American to start at the bottom and go to the top—if he has the energy and capacity to do so.

We believe in these fundamentals as we believe in the system of free enterprise and free competition. This is the system that makes possible the independence, liberty, and freedoms we enjoy. How else could we achieve material prosperity and cultural accomplishment? Virginia's conservatism takes these beliefs seriously, and we fight to preserve them.

There are still more reasons why Virginia is called conservative. Another is best personified by Jefferson, himself. No American has been more constructively liberal than Jefferson. He stands second to none in his eagerness for sound progress in furthering the general welfare of people and the Nation.

His liberalism is our conservatism of today. The people of Virginia learned from Jefferson. They stand with him now because his was a sound liberalism developed from the conservative base of strong Federal, State, and local governments in their respective areas, sound financing, informed electorate, etc.

These are not deterrents to progress. They are the basis for it. They contemplate growth in the Nation's size, resources, and population. They provide the freedom necessary for varied approach to worthy objectives.

The distorted connotations of the words "conservative" and "conservatism" promoted by the self-styled liberals of today are in sharp contrast to those of Webster which I have cited. As usual, Webster is right.

Virginians are not reactionaries. We do not turn back the hands of the clock. We do not necessarily defend the status quo. But neither do we assume that change is necessarily progress. We want progress, but we want sound progress.

Basically, we wish to solve our problems within the framework of fundamental principles. We have proved to ourselves that this can be done. We know their violation leads to a chain of troubles.

We reject the prevalent idea that progress is measured by the size of public debt and expenditures. Virginia is free of State debt for all intents and purposes. But the Federal Government goes deeper and deeper into debt, and we are assessed for its principal and interest.

The number of people in Virginia is about average for the 50 States. Therefore, on a per capita basis, our share of the $300 billion Federal debt is about $6 billion. This is more than $1,500 for each man, woman and child in the State. Interest on the Federal debt runs to more than $9 billion a year. This averages $45 a year in interest for every man, woman, and child in Virginia.

In Virginia we believe sound progress is built on fiscal conservatism, and we have the record to prove it. Since the end of World War II, Virginia's progress has exceeded the national average in population—both urban and rural; and in personal income—both total and per capita.

This is the case also with respect to manufacturing plants, their employment, and their payrolls. It is true also with respect to the capacity to generate electric power, and the power generated.

Since World War II, Virginia has exceeded the national average with respect to increase in the number of retail establishments and their sales; life insurance purchased; bank assets and deposits; number of telephones; automobile registrations, etc.

Thirty-five States have more land area than Virginia, but only 19 States have more surfaced highway mileage, and only 8 States exceed Virginia's 4-lane highway mileage. Ninety-six percent of Virginia's 54,000 miles of roads is surfaced.

Virginia is the only State to construct and maintain a statewide highway system without bonded indebtedness, financed on a pay-as-you-go basis from gasoline and automobile taxation.

People from the world over are attracted to Virginia. Automobile tourists in the State number 35 to 40 million a year. The motor tourist business alone in the State amounts to some $775 million annually, and Virginia ranks near the top among the States which people like to visit.

Virginia ranks 14th among the 50 States in population; it ranks 15th in personal income; it ranks 16th in total expenditure for purposes of education; and it ranks 17th in capital outlays for education.

Not only has Virginia exceeded the national average in population increase since World War II; its population increase in the past 10 years exceeds that of all but two Southern States—Florida and Texas. The increase in Virginia was 19.5 percent as compared with 12.2 percent in North Carolina.

Commerce Department figures show the increase in Virginia's personal income between 1950 and 1960 exceeded the rise in every Southern State except Florida. During the decade Virginia's personal income rose 82.7 percent as compared with an increase of 74.9 percent in North Carolina.

In State and local taxes, per $1,000 of personal income, Virginia takes less from its citizens than any other Southern State, and in the whole Nation only three States take less—Missouri, Delaware, and Alaska.

State and local taxes, per $1,000 of personal income, in Virginia average $69.69, as compared with the high of $122.84 in South Dakota, and $81.55 in our neighboring State of North Carolina.

These are some of the facts which may be cited to document the record of sound progress in Virginia during recent years. There are many more. The story they tell is another part of the answer to the question, "Why is Virginia conservative?"

Virginia's policy should always be one of sound progress. This is our nature. We look forward to programs of even more solid achievement in education, health, highways, industry, agriculture, and, in fact, in all areas of State responsibility; and I think we have every reason to expect them.

The reasons for Virginia's conservatism may be summarized in four parts: Deep background in the development of the American system; great ordeals under oppression of centralized power; unwavering adherence to principles; and belief in sound progress.

Our attitude generally has never been expressed better than Thomas Jefferson put it in an 1816 letter to Samuel Kerchival. He said: "A departure from principle in one instance becomes a precedent for a second; the second for a third; and so on until the bulk of society is reduced to misery without sensibilities, except for sin and suffering. The forehorse of this frightful situation is public debt. Taxation follows that, and in its train there is wretchedness and oppression."

In contrast with conservatism and no debt in Virginia, let us in conclusion examine the attitude and the situation in the Federal Government.

For more than 15 years the United States has been acting as the policeman for the free world, the banker for the free world, and the Santa Claus of the free world.

The Federal debt is increasing every day. The Federal deficit in the past year was $4 billion. The Federal deficit in the present fiscal year may reach $10 billion.

We continue to spend and spend, and tax and tax, and borrow and borrow, without regard for the consequences. Our dollar in the past 20 years has lost more than half of its purchasing power.

We have balanced the Federal budget only 6 times in 30 years. It is possible that the Federal budget may not be balanced for many years to come. On the basis of present proposals and current trends, the Federal Government may be spending more than $100 billion a year within 3 to 5 years.

Recent Congresses appear to have totally disregarded the fact that the most sacred duty of the legislature is to act as trustees for the soundness of the Nation's future.

Congress today, and for the past 30 years, has looked only to the present, not to the future. It has allowed Federal debt to be piled on top of Federal debt, to be paid off by generations to come.

I have the positive conviction that no Member of Congress today will live to see the Federal Government pay off any part of the debt now being created every day. It will be passed on to our children and grandchildren. This is as wrong as it is unnecessary.

Every day new programs are presented to Congress for nonmilitary expenditures. It is proposed that we spend $40 billion to go to the moon. If we go to the moon at all, we should go on a pay-as-you-go basis.

We were asked to spend $20 billion in Latin America, and give a blank check to the President for the purpose of making foreign loans in so-called less developed areas.

I offered an amendment in the Senate to provide for these expenditures, if at all, only to the extent of annual appropriations by Congress. When Congress, most closely representing the people of this country, loses the power over the purse to the executive branch, we shall have lost one of the vital instruments of check and balance in our system of government.

In all of this we are playing into the hands of Khrushchev. The Russian dictator is doing all in his power to destroy us from within. Our form of government and our free enterprise system are high on his list of prime targets.

This is the time for all of us to ask ourselves these searching questions:

How long can we continue to spend, tax, and borrow at the present rate?

Are we on a permanent deficit basis?

When will the breaking point come?

Profligate spending has gone hand in hand with concentration of power in the Federal Government. Can democracy survive if we impair our solvency?

Can we continue to move into a socialistic welfare state and preserve the freedoms that have made us great?

Should we not take warning from the fact that the purchasing power of the American dollar has declined sharply and is still going down?

We must reduce all nondefense expenditures which may be desirable, but not necessary.

It is imperative that we keep up our military strength, but this is not possible without fiscal preparedness as well.

In Virginia we understand that first things come first. The Virginia I know so well and love so much is not living in the past. We are vitally aware of the requirements of the present.

The trials Virginia has suffered, and her long experience, serve her well in reckoning with existing conditions and preparing for the future. Her progress is dependable, based on the principles she knows to be sound.

For all of these reasons, and probably more, Virginia's conservatism is a symbol throughout the Nation, and basically it follows the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson and George Washington.

CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY WATERFOWL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, first, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for having had considered in the Committee on Commerce, of which he is the chairman, the bill H.R. 7391 and also for his presentation of the bill before the Senate.

Madam President, I am a member of the Waterfowl Conservation Commission, on which serve not only two Members of the Senate, but also two Members of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Speaking from the experience I have had as a member of the Commission, I share the firm finding of the committee and its conclusions that there is a need for the accelerated spending of additional moneys from the public Treasury for the acquisition of the wetlands for waterfowl, for their increase and, in fact, in some cases, their preservation. It is only through that method that there will be precluded the possibility of those lands being used in the meantime for other purposes or reclaimed, as it were, and made unavailable for these uses in the years which lie ahead. Once they are gone, they will never again be available for these purposes.

There is one feature of the bill for which I am particularly pleased; namely, that it is an authorization bill rather than a bill which would permit the drawing on the Treasury for the next 5 years of $50 million without further reference to Congress and its regular appropriations processes.

The bill is an authorization bill. It authorizes the expenditure of $50 million over a period of the next 5 years. As I understand, any amount which is appropriated by the Committees on Appropriations in the succeeding 5 fiscal years will be available for expenditure through the regular processes of the Migratory Waterfowl Conservation Commission, in addition to the funds which will be produced by the sale of duck stamps, to which reference has been made. I presume it will be up to the Department of the Interior and other interested agencies to appear before the Committees on Appropriations each year and present their justification for such amount over and above the amount required as the proceeds from the sale of duck stamps, but not to exceed $10 million a year, and certainly not more than $50 million in the 5 years, for the purposes which are outlined in the bill and also in the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of 1934, as amended.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Am I not correct in understanding that the bill provides for a backdoor spending method of raising these funds?

Mr. HRUSKA. I had not so understood. It is an authorization bill. It authorizes annual appropriations to be made in the regular course of business.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that explanation.

Mr. HRUSKA. I refer to section 2, beginning at the bottom of page 1, which reads:

> SEC. 2. Funds appropriated each fiscal year pursuant to this Act shall be accounted for, added to, and used for purposes of the migratory bird conservation fund established pursuant to section 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, as amended.

There is also a statement in the first section of the bill, following the enactment clause, which reads:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the five-year period beginning with fiscal year 1962 not to exceed $50 million.

Does that answer the question of the Senator from New York?

Mr. KEATING. I am not certain that it does. Section 3 provides:

> Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be treated as an advance, without interest, to the migratory bird conservation fund.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. The language continues:

> Such appropriated funds, beginning with fiscal year 1967, shall be repaid to the Treasury out of the migratory bird conservation fund.

I do not know whether the bird conservation fund has anything to do with the Byrd amendment, but that language sounds to me very much like backdoor spending.

Mr. HRUSKA. Section 3 relates to the repayment to the Treasury from the migratory bird conservation fund. To that extent it is a "bird" amendment—spelled with a small "b" and with an "i" instead of a "y."

This language has nothing to do with circumventing the regular appropriation process, which is so dear to the hearts of the advocates of the Byrd amendments.

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to have that explanation from the Senator from Nebraska. I am certain it will serve its purpose in making the legislative intent clear.

Mr. HRUSKA. I am certain that the legislative history will be well established.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXCHANGE OF LANDS AT BOARDMAN, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend Public Law 86-500 of the 86th Congress.

Companion bills are being introduced today in the House of Representatives by members of Oregon's congressional delegation.

This measure is designed to clarify certain points raised by the Navy in connection with an exchange of lands involving a naval installation at Boardman, Oreg., authorized by the basic statute.

This matter is one which has been discussed with the Navy, the Governor of Oregon, and with Representative AL ULLMAN, of the Second Congressional District of Oregon, in whose district the lands are situated. It is my hope that the Armed Services Committee will give early and favorable consideration to this amendatory legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter dated August 25, 1961, to Senator RUSSELL, signed by the Governor of Oregon, be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

AUGUST 25, 1961.

Re Boardman exchange legislation.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: During last year's session of Congress, your committee approved an amendment to the military construction authorization bill, which authorized the State of Oregon to acquire the Boardman Bombing Range, Morrow County, Oreg. This authorization contemplated an exchange of State-owned lands for the Boardman site with the State to provide the Navy with a complete substitute bombing range facility. Your action in this matter was sincerely appreciated by the people of the State of Oregon. Subsequently considerable progress has been made in carrying out the exchange plan.

In pursuing the plan as originally contemplated, a serious problem has developed. The site originally selected by the Navy was found to be limited in its usefulness as a training facility. As an alternative, the Navy has submitted a proposal which is acceptable to the State of Oregon and to its prospective lessee. This proposal calls for the Navy to retain a portion of the existing bombing range and to transfer a portion of the range to the State of Oregon in exchange for lands the State will transfer to the Navy. This arrangement will actually expand the Navy's present training potential at Boardman.

The language in the existing act, section 207, Public Law 86-500, is considered by the Navy as too restrictive to permit accomplishment of its alternate or modified proposal. Amendatory language has been prepared by the Navy, which provides the Secretary of the Navy with greater flexibility in carrying out the exchange. It retains the protective features incorporated in the original act. A copy of this amendatory language is attached and is satisfactory to the State of Oregon. The approval of the amendatory language at this time is a matter of great urgency, and it is our hope it can be passed during the current session. The Navy, the State of

Oregon, and its prospective lessee are most anxious to consummate the transaction.

With your favorable consideration at this time, the transfer which you have previously approved will be greatly facilitated. This transfer will aid our national defense effort, expand our space program, and advance the economic development of the State of Oregon.

May I again express my appreciation to you for further considering this matter.

Sincerely,

MARK O. HATFIELD,
Governor.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, let me state to the Senate that Public Law 86–500 provided for a land exchange in Oregon, involving the so-called Boardman site, which is owned by the Navy, and the so-called Wagontire site, which is owned by the State of Oregon. At that time it was felt that the exchange would involve the Boardman site and the Wagontire site, and Public Law 86–500 was drafted in order to bring about that exchange. Thereafter it developed that the Wagontire tract would not be serviceable to the Navy in carrying out the Navy program. So it is necesary to evolve another land exchange. The Navy takes the position that, in order to cover the new arrangement, it will be necessary to have Public Law 86–500 amended.

I wish to assure the Senate that there is nothing substantial in these amendments, and no change in the original public policy is involved. Yet we are faced with a time limit. All of us recognize that it will be difficult to get the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee to take the necessary committee action on this measure before adjournment, unless there is clearance by both the Senate leadership and the House leadership. Since time is of the essence—because the Boeing Co. is anxious to begin its operations on the site; but until the land exchange can be legally completed, the Boeing Co. will not proceed to invest its funds in developing these operations on land over which it does not have legal control—we urge very, very prompt action.

All we can say publicly at this time about the matter—as the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, my distinguished colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER], who joins me in submitting this measure this afternoon, well knows—is that the exchange is of importance to the security of the country.

It would be most unfortunate if action on the exchange were delayed simply because of the necessity to add some minor amendments to the existing law, in order to put the Navy in a position in which there will be no question of its legal authorization to complete the exchange. It would be extremely unfortunate if we had to wait until January to accomplish this objective.

Therefore, Madam President, in introducing the bill today, all I can say is that the members of the Senate Armed Services Committee will be visited by the two Senators from Oregon personally, undoubtedly, in the next few days, with a plea for quick clearance on this matter, so we can get the measure to the floor of the Senate by the end of this week, I hope.

Let me say to the majority leader that I am referring to an amendment which my colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and I are introducing this afternoon to Public Law 86–500, the land exchange law passed at the last session. Our amendment provides for an exchange of land in Oregon, so that the Boeing Aircraft Co. can proceed with a testing program which is of importance to the security of the country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator from Oregon state the calendar number of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. It does not yet have a calendar number; I introduced the bill only a moment ago, on behalf of myself and my colleague. I am explaining why time is so important in connection with the bill. It involves only a technical matter. At the last session the Senate passed Public Law 86–500, which at that time involved an exchange of land between the Navy and the State of Oregon, involving the Boardman site, owned by the Navy, and the so-called Wagontire site, owned by the State of Oregon. After the Navy sought to carry out the arrangement, it found that the Wagontire site would not meet its needs. So the Navy has worked out another arrangement with the State of Oregon; and the new arrangement calls for only minor amendments to the existing law, so there can be an exchange of Navy land and Oregon State land. The Boardman site is to be divided, and some State land is to be added to it. But the Navy legal staff says it will be necessary to add some minor amendments to Public Law 86–500.

However, the difficulty is that the Senate Armed Services Committee is not holding frequent meetings; neither is the House Armed Services Committee.

So the two Oregon Senators will do their very best to get the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee to take their word for this matter, so to speak, because we have worked out this matter with the Navy, and we are proposing only what the Navy wants—namely, to have the law amended so that the State of Oregon and the Navy and the Boeing Aircraft Co. can make the necessary arrangements, in order to permit the Boeing Co. to make the necessary installations for the vitally important testing arrangements.

Since time is of the essence, I want the majority leader to know that I shall urge on the Senate Armed Services Committee—just as our colleagues of the Oregon delegation in the House of Representatives will urge on the House Armed Services Committee—that immediate clearance be given. But, lacking that, I am prepared to offer this measure as an amendment to any measure which comes before the Senate. However, I hope that course will not be necessary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say that I shall be prepared to discuss the matter with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and we shall do our best.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the majority leader. There is no dispute about this matter. I know that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will, as always, give us complete cooperation, but time is running against him, too.

Because this is only a technical matter, and because the Navy and Boeing Co. need to have these amendments made almost immediately, in order to patch up Public Law 86–500 so as to give the Navy the necessary technical legal authorization, I sincerely hope we can succeed in having this matter handled almost pro forma by the Senate Armed Services Committee, by having it take the word of the two Senators from Oregon as their bond, because we are not requesting anything that is not completely in line with existing law. However, the legal technicalities require that the Navy request that these minor amendments be made to the existing law.

Today, I have introduced the amendments, in the form of a bill, on behalf of my colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and myself, and I have had printed in the RECORD a letter from the Governor of Oregon to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I shall supply all the necessary supporting data.

My plea is that very, very prompt action be taken, so that these amendments can be enacted into law before the adjournment comes.

The major reason for these amendments is that the Boeing Co. believes this action must be taken before it proceeds with its testing arrangements, which I assure my colleagues are most important in connection with certain testing operations which the Boeing Co. is doing for the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2476) to amend section 207 of the Military Construction Act of 1960 in order to clarify the authority granted under such section to the Secretary of the Navy to exchange certain lands owned by the United States for lands owned by the State of Oregon, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not familiar with the details of this matter and whether or not the Defense Department has made a report on it, but I can assure the Senator I will have the staff of the committee examine into it and see if it is possible to take the matter up at our next meeting.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator the Defense Department wants such amendments. That is where we got them.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, turning to another matter, I wish to place in the RECORD and make brief comment on an editorial from the St.

Louis Post-Dispatch of August 23, entitled "Liberty, Not Tax Aid."

This editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, in eloquent and condensed form, presents my whole case on the school issue as between public and private school legislation. I respectfully recommend to the advocates of aid to private schools—and I yield to none of them in my determination to seek to get legislation to aid private schools within the framework of the Constitution and subject to the restrictions of the first amendment of the Constitution—this St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial. They are going to have to face up to a bombardment of such editorials and public comments, in my judgment, if the advocates of aid to private schools persist in taking the position that they will use their power in this country to prevent the passage of public school legislation unless we capitulate to the private school forces in this country and either pass private school aid legislation first or concurrently with public school aid legislation.

If the advocates of private school Federal aid want that fight, then we had better get it behind us. But it is not in the interest of the private schools and it is not in the interest of American schoolchildren to get involved in that kind of controversy. It is unnecessary, and it is particularly unnecessary when among us here in the Senate are men who have been fighting for the legitimate interests of private school education in this country.

I said the other night, when I answered Cardinal Spellman, that I was well aware of the fact it is not politic to take that stand. But that is no new position for me to be in. I need only satisfy myself that I am right, and when I am right, there is no force in this country—even the powerful private school advocates—that will deter me in my course of action.

As I said to the educational director of the archdiocese of my State, who wrote me a letter in protest of the position I had taken on this issue, in which he stated he would like to take me before groups of Catholic parents in Oregon so I could see the temper of those parents, I would welcome that opportunity. But I respectfully suggest that he familiarize himself with the temper of the Congress, because here is where I have to do my legislative work. I have not changed my position in the slightest in support of the Clark-Morse bill for aid to private schools; and I ask the Catholic leaders of the country, "What is wrong with that bill? Why do you not start giving us support for that bill, rather than take the position that we have to follow your legislative procedure or be confronted with your political opposition?"

We will take that, too, if that is the way it has to be; and, in this free society let a free people decide the result. But, as I said to the director of education for the Catholic archdiocese in my State, I want him to understand it makes not one whit of difference to me what political opposition I get in my State from his group or any other group; it will not change the stand of the Senator from Oregon on the merits of any issue. In the face of that kind of opposition, the Senator from Oregon will continue, so long as he is in the Senate, to press for a constitutional bill that provides aid to private schools within the framework and limits of the first amendment.

But again I say it is my hope that the advocates of private school legislation will cooperate with those of us who have the responsibility of seeking to take through the Senate of the United States sound and fair legislation both for public and private schools.

Madam President, I think the St. Louis Post-Dispatch put this case in an unanswerable and clear statement when it said in its editorial:

LIBERTY, NOT TAX AID

Cardinal Spellman no doubt reflects the views of many persons of his faith when he argues that it is anti-Catholic discrimination to deny public tax support for parochial schools. But the argument will not stand up. What he is saying, in effect, is that schools which teach a particular religion have the same right to tax support as schools which teach no religion. They do not.

The sponsors of public aid for parochial schools have tried to convince the country that all they are asking for is educational freedom, the civil rights of parents to determine what kind of education their children shall have, the right of parochial school pupils to equality.

Able proponents of this viewpoint have presented the issue as one of doing justice to minorities. The United States is a pluralistic society, they say, and the followers of all religious faiths are entitled to full religious liberty. They argue that if public school aid is withheld from parochial schools, then the Government will be penalizing those families which as a matter of conscience insist on a religion-oriented education for their children; and the penalty will impair that family's religious liberty.

With all due respect to the many Roman Catholics who sincerely hold such views, we believe this line of reasoning overlooks several elements of the problem.

The followers of every religious faith (and the followers of none) do indeed have a right to full religious liberty. But this does not mean they have a right to obtain financial support for indoctrination in their particular faith from the followers of other faiths, and the followers of none. It would be just as logical to say that unless the Government builds all the churches, religious liberty is being impaired.

The basic characteristic of the public school is that it is open to all children and does not impose upon any the tenets of a particular religious faith. The public school is founded on the principle that its business is nonreligious education, and that religious training can properly be provided somewhere else.

Many families, no less devout than others, accept this functional division by sending their children to public school and relying upon home or church for religious training. Others who feel this arrangement to be inadequate are at liberty to insist upon combining religious training with general education in one school. But they cannot fairly demand the right to do so at public expense.

The reason is that it is fundamentally wrong to tax one family to pay for the propagation of another family's faith. This is the underlying and profoundly wise principle upon which the constitutional doctrine of church-state separation rests. American society is indeed a pluralistic one, but to remain so it must insist that public schools remain public, which means that they shall not meddle in religious training; and that taxes derived from all the people shall be reserved to schools that serve all the people.

The Roman Catholic hierarchy's opposition to Federal aid for education unless it includes aid for parochial schools has already, we think, sharpened religious divisions. They would be sharpened still more, and would affect our political life in an unhealthy way, if tax funds became the object of a political scramble among the various creeds. The best, the socially most cohesive, and the constitutional way to deal with this matter is to tax nobody for the support of any particular creed, and to tax everybody for the support of nonreligious public schools.

Madam President, this outlines pretty clearly the point of view—and it is a widespread point of view in this country—of those who do not agree with the Catholic leaders that the legislative procedure must take up concurrently public school and private school aid legislation or even, more preferably, take it up in the same bill.

I say from the Senate Chamber again today, in my judgment, the clear duty owed by the elected representatives in the Congress is to take to the people of this country a public school aid bill and then also, in a separate bill, to take to them a private school loan bill. The loan bill should provide for an interest rate to cover the cost of the use of the money; in other words, the taxpayers should give to the private school people no concealed subsidy.

Madam President, we have proposed legislation before the Senate to accomplish that purpose. I say now, most respectfully, I think all we need for the ultimate passage of the legislation either before we adjourn this fall or early in the next session is the understanding cooperation of the advocates of the private school legislation, not the kind of attack and opposition and criticism some of us have been getting because we have simply taken the position, "We do not care from where the opposition comes; we are interested only in the merits of the issue."

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I repeat that I shall continue to stand for Federal aid to public schools in a separate bill and Federal aid to private schools in a separate bill, within the limitations of the Constitution of the United States. If the spokesman for private schools are really interested in loans for their own schools and not just in blocking improvements in the public school system, I invite them to join with me in trying to obtain enactment of both these bills. In any case, I shall not be deterred from my legislative course of action by their opposition any more than I am deterred from seeking loans for private schools by Protestant objections, which certainly are far more potent in my State of Oregon.

No Catholic child in America, in either public or private school, will profit from the obstruction of the public school bill. Second-rate public schools will mean a second-rate America, and what Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish child is going to be better off then?

CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY WATERFOWL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7391) to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wet lands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, this is certainly not a difficult bill, in the sense that it is short in text and states very plainly what it proposes to undertake. As a part of my remarks I think I ought to read the text of the bill into the RECORD.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl and to offset or prevent the serious loss of important wetlands and other waterfowl habitat essential to the preservation of such waterfowl, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the five-year period beginning with fiscal year 1962, not to exceed $50,000,000.

When the bill passed the House of Representatives on July 10, 1961, the text was substantially the same, except that it provided a 10-year program and encompassed not to exceed $150 million.

I gather, according to those who have a way of calculating interest on items of this kind for a long repayment period, that the charge under the House bill would probably aggregate $120 million before the program was consummated, and under the Senate bill the interest would probably aggregate some $13 million, to be reimbursed over a period of 11 years.

Madam President, there are a number of reasons why I feel that some legislative history ought to be made and why I ought to interpose an objection to the bill.

First, it uses the old technique of earmarking funds, if that is what is sought to be done, to ultimately take the money out of the duck stamp fund, even though the bill itself makes no affirmative provision on that score.

I understand the Bureau of the Budget had an objection on the ground that there was no hint of an increase in the duck stamp price to $4, and then subsequently to $5, depending upon how long it would take to defray the amount involved.

This is a technique we are slipping into gradually: of finding an easy source of revenue somewhere and then earmarking it, diverting it for specific purposes, always, of course, at the expense of the general funds flowing into the Treasury of the United States.

This is to be regarded as an advance, and it is to be noninterest bearing. It would appear to me to have a little of the flavor of back-door spending, about which we have heard so much recently.

I understand this is at variance with the program of the President of the United States. If the President has asked for this, I have not seen it in print. The President rather emphasized the fact that something ought to be done about wet lands in the Midwest and Northwest sections, on the grounds that those where important, but I do not believe the President indicated we ought to set up a fund, which could easily be increased over a period of years, under which the program would simply move all over the United States of America where there are migratory waterfowl. After a little while, States and groups and individuals would come to the Congress to ask to be included in the program, to ask to build up the funds, with increasing demands year after year, until the program became one of those amazing commitments in the fiscal structure. Then we would wonder how it got there.

This is another excess over the President's program. It is interesting with what impunity the Congress undertakes to go beyond the confines of the good fiscal policy laid out by the President.

With that blithe spirit, when the housing bill was before the Senate, we approved, if we total up all the housing provisions, $1.4 billion above the President's program. We approved the military procurement program. No one quarreled about the President's request with respect to defense and the survival of the country. But a spirit of benevolence and generosity pervades Congress. We thought we would do the President one better, so we gave him $596 million more than he requested.

When the space program was finally approved we were openhanded. Evidently there is money lying around loose everywhere. In effect we said to the President, "We will do better by you. Instead of giving you what you asked, we will give you $227 million more."

A Youth Conservation Corps is proposed. I do not know who is asking for it, but if my figures are correct, and such a Corps is established and extends over a period of time, the ultimate commitment will amount to $1,400 million.

Recently the distinguished Senator from Washington, the chairman of the committee, presented an interesting bill to pursue the science of oceanography. I know that the deep sea divers want the measure. I know that the people who like to walk around on the bottom of the ocean want it. I know it is fun to look through a test tube at marine organisims that are brought out of the briny deep. Perhaps in due course such studies will have some value. I feel that if the program were continued year after year in a modest fashion, we could consummate some of the objectives in that field. But when the Senate finished consideration of that bill—and I raised my voice against it—we had committed the Treasury, so to speak, for $603 million.

A GI bill will be coming along from the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

What will be the ultimate commitment under that bill? There will be a fine built-in sum of $2 billion. When the measure is enacted, we shall have to pay the bill at some time, because it will create a built-in commitment in the Federal structure.

It seems to me that Members of the House and the Senate ought to take time off and read the statement prepared by the former Budget Director, Maurice H. Stans. Incidentally, he was one of the ablest men who ever graced that office. In his statement he called to account all the built-in commitments made and what they add up to. They run into the hundreds of millions, including officers' retirement, GI benefits, subsidies for the maritime program, and that sort of thing.

The cost will have to be paid by those who come after. I have often said, capriciously and sarcastically, "What fun it would be if my great-great-grandchildren could only be around to see what fun their great-great-granddaddy might be having in spending what they will be required to pay back." That is what it amounts to.

I have tried to resist a great many bills, and I resist the one now before the Senate. I would like to make provision for ducks and give the sportsmen of the country a chance.

Nothing brightens a day so much as to see a mallard with its wings outstretched, a body containing a perfect aeronautical structure, sailing out and moving down. We see him get the little feathers at the edge of his wings properly placed. He brings his feet up and makes a landing that would put any airplane and any pilot to shame. Nature has provided this ability for the mallard. The gray goose from Canada will do the same thing.

I am not a real outdoorsman, but I love nature. I love best to watch birds. No one can say that I have no interest in them. Only yesterday, when I should have been at a desk thinking up points on the steel issue for discussion sometime later this week, I sat for nearly an hour, on the bank of the stream where I live and watched a white heron. What a beautiful sight to see that long-legged fowl finally pull in his neck, extend his feet behind him, streamlining first his legs and then his feet. It was a sight to behold that revitalizes one's faith in the Almighty. Waterfowl have an amazing natural structure that we call life, and all the beauties that are in it. So no one can say that I have no interest in wildlife.

But I never get away from the fact that from day to day we are living with a structure of government that must be made to function properly.

It must be kept within fiscal bounds in the hope that not only our own generation but the taxpayers who come after—the children, the grandchildren, the great-grandchildren—will not regard what we did in this time and generation with a baleful and cynical eye and say, "What a tragic and dismal inheritance we got from our great grandpappies back in the decade of development—the 1960's."

So I want to keep the program in proper form.

We have done better than the budget request in the so-called oceanography program, the GI bill, and also the Health, Education, and Welfare program. We included $156 million more than the budget requested.

It is an amazing sequence. The agency says, "We need so much." Instead of giving the agency what it requests, we say, "We will give you more."

Representatives of the agency say, "We cannot find the talent to use the funds you propose to give us."

We say, "We will try to find the talent for you."

If we go out and raid the communities of the land for research personnel and doctors, and bring them down to the great citadel of Washington for the purpose of spending the appropriated money, then, of course, we shall hurt the professions back home.

In the Defense appropriation fund we added $750 million to the amount requested.

How openhanded can this body be? How careless can we be? How can we ignore the fiscal problems that are presently before us and ignore also the warnings of the President and the requests of the President from time to time?

I heard a portion of the steel discussion the other day. The danger of inflation was mentioned. The possibility that a price increase in the steel industry would rock the boat and fan the fevers of inflation all over again was discussed. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] talked about the deficit in the previous fiscal year, which ended on June 30, and the deficit that we could foresee in the next fiscal year. It is wonderful. Perhaps we shall have a $6 billion, a $7 billion, or $8 billion deficit in the following fiscal year. Yet the Director of the Budget will blithely talk about a balanced budget. I would like to see it balanced as we go. I would like to see the money rather than speculate as to whether or not there will be sources that can be tapped in order to make up the deficit and keep us in a state of balance.

We have a structural unemployment problem. "Structural unemployment" is a great disarming and euphemistic term. A newspaperman asked me about it the other day. I said, "Oh, that is merely a term which means 'built-in unemployment,' and if it were so called instead of 'structural unemployment,' I think everyone could understand what was meant."

However, I like euphemistic terms. I am reminded of the lady who was having her family tree examined. Unfortunately they found one brother who had occupied the electric chair in Sing Sing. The genealogist who was doing the work did not particularly want to state that fact.

He hunted for something which would get around that fact and still tell the truth. At long last, at that part in the genealogical treatise he wrote: "There was one brother who occupied the chair of applied electricity in a large public institution." [Laughter.] That is a wonderful way to say it. I like the euphemism about structural unemployment. It is here. It is built in. Everyone wants to do something about it. It will command a little more attention than the acquisition of wet lands at a time like this, when we are dealing with money that we do not have.

Madam President, there is not a line in the whole legislative lexicon that intrigues me so much as the first line in every appropriation bill which comes to the floor of the Senate. Everyone knows what it is. It says: "There is appropriated out of funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated." There are no funds in the Treasury when we are in a deficit position. The necessity for this has not been shown. Who knows what the commitments on the Federal budget will be? In proportion as the fiscal affairs of the country are lightly dealt with, the impact will not be only on the duck hunters, but it will also be on every man, woman and child in the country if the inflationary fevers beset us again. It is because of that larger interest that I resist the bill.

That is all I need to say about it. I hope it will not prevail. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, I remind the Senator from Illinois that a few years ago a group of sportsmen and conservationists who were just as much interested in ducks as he is, and who wanted to have a place for ducks to land, when they spread their pin feathers and bend their feet forward, instead of having to land on concrete pavements or dry farms, so they would have wet lands on which to nest and fly from and grow up on, came to Congress, the Senator from Illinois will remember, and said, "Put a tax on us. Sell a duck stamp that every duck hunter in America must buy. Make it a dollar. We will use the money to buy the wet lands necessary, so we can preserve the ducks and the waterfowl population of America."

They asked for the tax. Congress acquiesced. We put that tax on them and we made the amount of the tax $1. We required every duck hunter to buy a duck stamp for $1. We said that the money would be used to purchase wet lands. Then they returned to Congress and they said that they wanted us to make it a $2 tax, because we were not acquiring the wet lands fast enough. Congress again acquiesced with the desires of the people who wanted this tax imposed on them.

In the last administration, in order to balance the budget, someone down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue got the bright idea that we did not need to use the money for the purchase of wet lands; that it would be a good idea to take the money and use it for the administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Accordingly, we have been using the money for that purpose, instead of using it to buy wet lands. So since the last administration we have been using it to pay salaries and expenses.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can agree pretty well with what the distinguished Senator says. I defy him to find a line in the bill which will have any impact on the conservation programs of the Department of Agriculture under which they dry up lands. Now we will acquire wet lands. Is it not about time, before we come in with a bill like this, for some of these agencies to get their ducks in a row and reconcile these programs before we get to this kind of proposal?

Mr. METCALF. I welcome the support of the Senator from Illinois for a bill which I have introduced.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why does not the Senator get his provision written into the bill which we are considering today before we come to a vote on it?

Mr. METCALF. I want to get one thing done at a time. The only thing we want done now is the job that we promised these people we would do when we established the duck stamp fund, and when we said we would use that money for the purchase of wet lands. The Senator from Illinois has been talking about how much interest would accrue on this interest-free money. How much interest would accrue on all the money that was diverted for administrative expenses in the last administration? How much interest would accrue on the money that was used illegally?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not the slightest idea.

Mr. METCALF. How much is it going to cost us to acquire the lands today that could have been acquired about 2 or 3 or 5 years ago out of this fund that was diverted? It seems to me a matter of common equity to do this for the duck hunters, which is the thing that they asked us to do and that we promised to do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wonder if the Senator would support a motion to recommit the bill to committee, and then to have the agricultural conservation specialists come to Congress and help us write into it all the necessary provisions, so that at long last we will have a bill in which we are not going in opposite direction, buying wet lands on the one hand, and the Department of Agriculture doing its level, vehement best to dry up lands.

Mr. METCALF. I would not support such a motion, because the Senator from Illinois will recall that such a provision was added to the bill previously, and in conference somehow or other it was dropped out of the bill. These are not soil conservation lands. These are all sorts of lands that are on the market and open for purchase.

The senior Senator from Nebraska and I were on the commission in charge of passing upon such land as will be purchased. He knows as well as I do that many of these lands have never been used in soil conservation. Sometimes we are acquiring hunting lodges

and hunting rights which are going to be used for other purposes, and some of them will be drained and used for airports or something like that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am going to ask the distinguished Senator, when the public works bill comes to the floor, to look at all the projects and note how many drainage and levee districts are going to get money out of the Federal Government to build levees higher, to make levees wider, to keep out river water so it will make it possible to produce rice and corn and just about everything else. For years I have fussed against it, when they first trotted out what was called the Jadwin plan, to move the water away, to get it into the river course, and to get it to the Gulf of Mexico.

We got into it, and we have been into it ever since that time. What does that amount to? With money taken from the Federal Treasury, the river bottoms are being taken away, bottoms which the Almighty meant for the waterfowl. If that is not at cross-purposes with what is provided in the bill, then I have never seen it.

Mr. METCALF. It may be at cross-purposes, but if we are to keep faith with those who have come to us and said, "Tax us so that we can acquire, out of the money we have contributed to the Federal Government, some wet lands in order to breed and perpetuate the waterfowl of America," we will have to pass such a bill as this. Those funds have been diverted for several years. They have been used for purposes other than those which were provided in the bill.

Yes, some soil conservation districts are being drained. Levees are being built. But let us buy some land for waterfowl breeding purposes. Let the Federal Government purchase such land and let it be administered under the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Instead, the money which has been contributed by duck hunters through the purchase of stamps has been used for other purposes, including administrative expenses.

In order to keep faith with the duck hunters, it is time for the Federal Government to buy land, while such land is still available, and to advance the money from the Treasury, so that the 12½ million acres of wet land can be acquired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let the Members of the Senate decide whether to spend $50 million to buy wet lands while the Army Engineers are building levees to take away the wet lands, and the Department of Agriculture introduces a soil conservation program to drain those lands so as to get the water more quickly into the water courses. That does not make a logical, sensible pattern.

Before this kind of bill, which authorizes the expenditure of $50 million, is passed by the Senate, we ought to come back and make certain that all these provisions are harmonized. Then the chances are that the minority leader would give his vote for the bill.

Mr. METCALF. It is necessary to have both kinds of projects. It is necessary to drain lands. It is necessary to drain them for soil conservation purposes. It is necessary to have levees to protect agricultural lands along the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. At the same time, it is necessary to save some wet lands for breeding grounds for waterfowl.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Actually, as the Senator from Montana knows, even though he does not come from a State which has the flood control problems of States like Louisiana—for the most part, his State is a high, arid State, while Louisiana is one of the low, coastal plain States—we have the problem in the spring of getting the floodwater off the land, and in the summertime and fall the problem of finding water to put on the crops. There is nothing new about that situation in Louisiana. We know what it means to have floods and droughts in the same year. Floods usually come at one time, and droughts at another time. At one stage of the proceeding, the problem is to keep the floodwaters from destroying homes or washing them away and destroying crops. Later in the year the problem is to get enough water on the land before a drought strikes. So we have two problems, not only in one section of the State, but in many parts. In one part of the year we have too much water; in another part of the year we do not have enough. The way to handle the situation is to solve both problems.

The results of the latest studies which have been made show, to my knowledge, that all the money which has been spent on flood control in the whole Mississippi River Valley, the entire investment, would not equal the cost of 1 year's damage from the type of flood we had in 1927.

Mr. METCALF. The Senator from Louisiana is correct. He has also stated another fact. In my part of the country, where the nesting grounds of the northern birds are located, it is necessary to have some swampy wet lands. They are not a part of flood control projects at all. In the early spring, when the snow melts in the mountains, it is necessary to conserve the water, so that floods would not occur in the lower reaches of the great rivers, and as far down as Louisiana. It is not agricultural land that is to be acquired in this program. The land which will be acquired is the land which is not useful for agricultural purposes or any other purposes except as nesting and breeding grounds for the propagation of waterfowl.

It is necessary to have flood control projects. We must develop all of them that we can. Water must be impounded for irrigation purposes and to enable navigation all the way down the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. Facilities must be provided to prevent floods in Louisiana. That is why the water in the upper reaches must be impounded in the spring. But all that has nothing to do with the problem which confronts us concerning the kind of land which is sought to be acquired by the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a portion of the committee report on page 2, beginning with the title "Wet Lands," and a letter from the Department of the Interior addressed to the chairman of the House committee on May 10, on the bill, which ends with the statement:

> We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that if this proposed legislation is revised in accordance with the enclosed draft, enactment thereof would be in accord with the program of the President.

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

WET LANDS

The Nation, to be successful in its objective of preserving sufficient habitat to sustain our migratory waterfowl must step up its wetlands acquisition program. With only present duck stamp revenues available, we cannot hope to achieve our goal of acquiring the additional lands in less than 40 years.

We need to have not less than 12½ million acres of wet lands under public control in the 48 contiguous States. These lands must be properly distributed throughout nesting, migration, and wintering areas used by ducks and geese. At this time a total of 5½ million acres is already in public ownership, 3½ million acres under control of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and 2 million acres controlled by the States. The four flyway councils have determined which areas should be given priority attention and which new projects should be acquired and whether with State or Federal funds. Under this agreement, subject to annual revision, it is planned that of the 7 million acres to be acquired, the Federal Government will acquire 4½ million acres and the States the remaining 2½ million acres.

The Fish and Wildlife Service advised your committee that of the 127 million acres of wet lands once available, over 80 percent have been either destroyed completely or their wildlife value seriously reduced by man's activities. Each year since 1949 over 1 million nonfarm dwelling units have been built in suburban areas. Many real estate developments involve the filling in of coastal marshes and estuaries. New industries are located on reclaimed land along our rivers. Marshes and swamps are being annihilated in the construction of highways and airports. Millions of acres of wet lands have been drained to provide additional agricultural land. In the northern prairie States about one-half of the important waterfowl production habitat has been destroyed through drainage.

Of those 127 million acres of wet lands in the United States, now less than 23 million acres are of significant value for migratory waterfowl.

Your committee held public hearings on H.R. 7391 and a companion Senate measure (S. 2175) introduced by Senator HUMPHREY. The legislation was vigorously supported by all witnesses; no one appeared in opposition.

This bill, according to its proponents would provide funds for wetlands purchases while that land is still available and enable the acquisition to be made during a period when the cost is estimated to be less than in later years.

The preservation of these wet lands will provide a substantial contribution to the national water conservation program. They will also preserve and create a much needed recreational potential, need for which will continue as our population increases. Then,

too, these wet lands are essential to many forms of wildlife and will provide habitat for many birds and animals.

Your committee is of the opinion that a large share of this appropriation will be used to purchase lands in areas where recreational opportunities are becoming more and more important to our citizens.

COSTS

The bill would authorize an appropriation of $50 million over a 5-year period. This sum, with the anticipated revenue of $25 million from the sale of duck stamps over the same period, would make available $75 million. After 5 years the bill would provide that 90 percent of the duck stamp funds would be returned to the Treasury until the $50 million loan is repaid and the lands would then be held for migratory waterfowl refuges debt free.

The bill would provide that funds appropriated pursuant to this act shall be treated as an advance, without interest to the migratory game fund. Your committee is of the opinion that the public benefits from this program justify placing the interest burden on the public. The entire cost of the program is to be paid by the duck hunters from their $3 duck stamp, but all of the lands purchased with this money would be owned by the United States.

THE AMENDMENTS

On line 7, page 1, strike "ten-year period" and insert "five-year period".

On line 8, page 1, strike "$150,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000".

On page 2, line 8, strike "1972" and insert "1967".

On page 2, line 10, strike "75 per centum" and insert "90 per centum".

On page 2, lines 13 and 14, strike "ten-year period" and insert "five-year period".

On page 2, at the end of line 15, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided further,* That no land shall be acquired with moneys from the migratory bird conservation fund unless the acquisition thereof has been approved by the appropriate State or State agency."

AGENCY REPORTS

Reports from the Department of the Interior and the Treasury Department on similar legislation, submitted to the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, follow:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1961.

Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BONNER: Your committee has requested a report on H.R. 4603, a bill to provide for the acceleration of the land acquisition program for the migratory bird refuges and waterfowl production areas, and for other purposes. This report is applicable also to the identical bills, H.R. 4624 and H.R. 6133.

We urge that this proposed legislation be revised and enacted in accordance with the attached redraft thereof. Such draft incorporates certain changes that are self-explanatory and which we feel are desirable in carrying out the object of this proposal.

This proposal will authorize a significant and highly desirable program of land acquisition for the benefit of the Nation's migratory waterfowl. We believe that it will provide a practicable means of stepping up such land acquisition activities, with the ultimate costs thereof being financed with duck stamp revenues. This is generally consistent with the policy already established by the Congress for the use of such revenues.

Such a program is desirable, we believe, due to the fact that various factors—our rapidly increasing human population, continuing urban and industrial expansion, as well as various agricultural and other land drainage programs and activities—are having a very adverse effect upon our migratory waterfowl, i.e., principally ducks and geese. Marshes and swamps have been ditched, dredged, drained, burned, filled, paved, and polluted to meet the demands of modern civilization for more agricultural lands, more industrial sites, more urban housing developments, more roads, and more airports, etc.

It is significant to note that there were originally in the 48 contiguous States some 127 million acres of wet lands; however, by 1955 this total acreage was reduced to approximately 74 million acres. Of this amount only 22.5 million are now of significant value for migratory waterfowl use. Each year this acreage shrinks considerably. Time is running out in the race to preserve our migratory waterfowl. These factors are reducing the natural habitat available to our migratory waterfowl and are creating an urgent need for well-considered countermeasures. The only solution, we believe, is an expansion in the Federal land acquisition program for the benefit of our migratory waterfowl resource. Unless appropriate action is taken soon, very serious losses to this resource will result.

Although considerable areas of wet lands and other suitable waterfowl habitat are still available in certain places, opportunities for acquisition thereof are disappearing rapidly. Pressures for other use and development of these areas are increasing. Land costs have continued to rise. In carrying forward our refuge acquisition program, we are handicapped frequently by a lack of sufficient funds with which to acquire, when they become available, many of the excellent properties that are needed for these purposes.

Notwithstanding the foregoing considerations, it should be noted that an important step has been made toward accomplishment of the goal that we are convinced is desirable in providing adequately for our migratory waterfowl population. The Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act, as amended by the act of August 1, 1958 (72 Stat. 486; 16 U.S.C. 718d), requires that beginning on July 1, 1960, all net revenues from duck stamp sales be used for the purchase or lease of lands for these purposes. We expect future revenues from this source to range from $5 to $6 million each year; however, because of the adverse factors previously indicated, we must emphasize that these duck stamp revenues will be grossly inadequate. They will permit only very gradual acquisition of the needed properties. Consequently, an accelerated land acquisition program is urgently needed in order that we may obtain, while they are still available, those important wet lands and other wildlife habitat areas that are essential for our migratory waterfowl.

This proposed legislation would authorize the appropriation of not to exceed $20 million a year over a 10-year period; however, it should be noted that under the terms of this bill, these funds would be paid back out of duck stamp revenues, beginning in 1972. Our proposed revision would eliminate the annual limitation which we believe is unnecessary. Appropriations made during the 10-year period, when merged with the duck stamp revenues may be expected to provide a total of some $200 million during the 10-year period. In order to carry out this program in the manner and scale that we believe it should be carried out, we estimated that $10 million could be obligated for land acquisition in fiscal year 1962; $12 million in 1963; $19 million in 1964; $23 million in 1965; $25 million in 1966–67; $23 million in 1968, and $21 million in 1969–71. We anticipate that such expenditures would be sufficient to acquire title or lease approximately 3,960,000 acres of waterfowl lands. We would expect to acquire title to approximately 2,810,000 acres and to lease or acquire easements to approximately 1,150,000 acres. This amount of acquisition and control of land for waterfowl conservation purposes would comprise 88 percent of the total of 4.5 million acres that we consider to be a desirable ultimate goal for such acquisition by the Federal Government. At the end of the 10-year period we would expect to continue land acquisition with 25 percent of the duck stamp revenues, as indicated under the terms of our suggested revision, until the remaining acreage is obtained. The remaining portion of the duck stamp revenues, 75 percent under the terms of our redraft, would be used for repayment of the funds advanced for land acquisition.

The need for Federal and State cooperation and progressive action in perpetuating the Nation's waterfowl resources has become generally recognized. Public ownership or control of 12.5 million acres of key wet lands in the 48 contiguous States is highly desirable. It is essential that these lands be properly distributed throughout the nesting, migration, and wintering areas used by ducks and geese. This Department now manages some 3.5 million acres for this purpose and the States manage some 2 million acres of suitable waterfowl land. Under the Federal-State program that we envision, the Federal Government would acquire the additional lands to which we have referred previously in the amount of 4.5 million acres, and the States would acquire the remaining additional 2.5 million acres, thereby bringing the total acreage under public management of waterfowl resource conservation up to 12.5 million acres.

So far as Federal expenditures are concerned, the income from the $3 duck stamp, which is earmarked for this land acquisition program, will repay the cost of the Federal portion of such program, as indicated by the terms of this proposed legislation. In this connection, you will note that our suggested revision contains a provision that will permit an increase in the cost of the duck stamp to $4 after the first $50 million has been advanced, unless the Secretary of the Interior, on the basis of pertinent factors, determines that such an increase is unwarranted and contrary to the public interest. A similar $1 increase in the price of the duck stamp would be made after the advancement of the second $50 million unless the Secretary finds that such an increase is not in the public interest.

We anticipate full cooperation by the States in carrying forward this program. We believe this proposal is in the public interest because it will permit Federal acquisition of these important waterfowl lands while they are still available and at less cost than would be the case if such acquisition is carried out over a long period of time.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that if this proposed legislation is revised in accordance with the enclosed draft, enactment thereof would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK P. BRIGGS,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I recognize the fact that a considerable argument could be made in favor of the bill. That is true of many bills. However I also think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] made an excellent argument from the standpoint that we should wait until we have the money. We should postpone some of these projects until the Federal budget is balanced.

The Senator from Montana points out that this program was started years ago by charging duck hunters a dollar apiece

for stamps, the money to be used for the acquisition of wet lands. The fee for the stamp was subsequently raised to $2 and later to $3. As he stated, since that time some of the money received has been diverted to pay administrative costs. The bill, however, does not correct that situation.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I do not have the report before me, but the report shows that in July 1960, amendments to the act provided that none of the money could be diverted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is in the report. I am speaking of the bill.

Madam President, even though this program may be meritorious if our fiscal policies are to be kept on a sound basis it will be necessary at some point to curtail some of these spending proposals until such time as there is enough money. With that in mind, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "fiscal year 1962" and insert in lieu thereof "the first fiscal year following the close of a fiscal year with a balanced budget."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, the amendment would enable Congress to put its stamp of approval on the program, but the financing of the program would begin when money was available to pay for it. After all, Congress should do either one of two things: either the program should be postponed until such time as the money is actually available to pay for it, or the bill should be accompanied with a provision for an additional tax increase which would pay for the cost of the program. The bill as it is presently written does not do either of those things. Let those who like these spending programs vote also for the necessary taxes at the same time.

I wonder if the chairman of the committee would not be willing to recommit the bill, as the Senator from Illinois suggested, or to postpone its effective date until such time as the budget is balanced and we have sufficient money available to pay for it.

Let it not be said that the duck hunters shot a hole in our Federal budget.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I could not accept the amendment because this is a House-passed bill. It was reported unanimously by the House committee and unanimously by the members of the Senate committee who considered it. We are not dealing with the taxpayers' money as such; we are dealing with the money which the duck stamp buyers put into the Treasury under a pledge which was made at the time the first act was passed.

I was the author of the $2 duck stamp bill several years ago. At that time the duck hunters were told that the revenue derived from the sale of duck stamps would be used to acquire wet lands.

We have learned that for the past 9 years about 50 percent of that revenue was going into the Treasury and was not being used for the acquisition of wet lands.

Two or three years ago, I introduced a bill which provided that all the money acquired from the sale of duck stamps, with the exception of a minor amount to defray the cost of printing the stamps, should be spent directly for the acquisition of wet lands. In the meantime, the program bogged down.

Now all that the people who are interested in the program are asking is that the money which they paid to the Government through the purchase of the $3 duck stamps be used for the acquisition of wet lands. At least 90 percent of it should be used for such purchase; the rest is to be used for the enforcement of some minor regulations. Ninety or ninety-five percent of the equity paid in should be used. In the meantime, in order to get the program underway, the Treasury is being asked for a certain amount as an advance.

In any case it must be approved every year by the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee; they must even approve the amount to be put into the trust fund. So this amendment is entirely different.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have no objection whatever to having the full $3 collected by the sale of these stamps used for the acquisition of wet lands but that is not what this bill provides. I have just as much interest in the program as does the Senator from Washington or anyone else.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure of that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have never missed a year buying duck stamps. I enjoy duck hunting as much as anyone else does, although I may say that if the other duck hunters have no better luck than I do, there will always be many ducks in the air.

I would agree to a further increase in the cost of the stamp if that is necessary, but it must be used in a proper manner. However, this measure does not provide for that. This is just a flat $50 million appropriation at a time when we already have an unbalanced budget.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The point is that once the program of acquiring 2½ million acres is finished, every dime received by means of the sale of duck stamps can be used to repay any amount that is owed, or anything else, or for the enforcement of regulations to improve the lands. Once the lands are acquired, the program will be through.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Washington has been here longer than most of us have, and he knows very well that there is no such thing as getting through with a program once a Government agency gets it started. Government agencies have more lives than the proverbial cat.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suggest that if something is not done, we shall soon be through with the ducks, the geese, and the other waterfowl.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I think we should either recommit the bill or else postpone its effective date until the Government has the necessary funds.

In this case, the bill does not provide for additional revenue, and the Senator from Washington does not suggest any other means of obtaining the necessary funds than to borrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I think the Senate did pretty well with the bill. The House version of the bill, which was passed unanimously by the House, called for a program which involved three times the modest amount the Senate voted for. Furthermore, some of the land is rising in value every year. Whatever the Government pays for these wet lands is a good investment, and is good for the country in many respects.

No additional appropriations will be necessary. The committee must merely reappropriate the money which goes into the Treasury as a result of the sale of the duck stamps.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, it is true that the House unanimously passed the bill. But that was long before the Berlin crises had developed. It was before the President said that all of us have to sacrifice on our pet projects. It was before the increased arms program was put into effect; when the House acted the Secretary of the Treasury was making representations that we would have a balanced budget and perhaps would soon be able to reduce taxes.

However, today we are confronted with an unbalanced budget, as a certainty; and the only question is how much the budget will be unbalanced.

Therefore, present circumstances are far different from those which existed at the time when the House acted on this bill.

I repeat that if we do not stop spending on some of these programs, where will this end?

Does anyone think we can provide all the funds that are requested for all such programs and all the necessary funds for the military programs, and at the same time keep taxes where they are now? I am sure the Senator from Washington will not advocate higher taxes. But if we keep on spending and do not have higher taxes there will be inflation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, the Senator from Delaware refers to this measure as if it were my personal bill. But I merely represent the committee. The committee, after due deliberation, decided that the program is in the interest of the welfare of the country.

I am sure the President did not suggest at any time that we close up shop and not do some of the things which should be done to strengthen the country. We could appropriate an infinite amount of money for the building of airplanes and the construction of tanks, and we could draft an innumerable number of men, and could do everything which one might want for the defense of the country—and of course the Senator from Delaware and I support the necessary defense measures—but all that will not be worth very much unless some of the things needed to keep America strong are also done. Certainly the defense program does not require Congress to close shop on all the other necessary programs. The President never suggested that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Did the President suggest this program?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course I have heard the President speak about the crises and about how we have to tighten our belts. But that is like ringing a dinner bell, for those who are not in favor of many of the necessary programs. It happens many times.

The letter was sent to the committee, and the Assistant Secretary of the Interior testified. I now read from the letter again:

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that if this proposed legislation is revised in accordance with the enclosed draft, enactment thereof would be in accord with the program of the President.

The enclosed draft called for some technical amendments.

There was no contrary testimony before the Senate committee, and we held hearings and invited all interested persons to attend.

The funds involved are not tax funds. In a sense the funds belong to those who purchased the duck stamps and are interested in the development of the program, which calls for the purchase of these lands.

I, too, buy duck stamps. I do not know whether the hunting in my State is as good as is the hunting on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. But I shall try the hunting there, too, someday.

All who have studied this matter—including the Migratory Bird Commission, of which the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Nebraska are members—have agreed that this should be done; and that is why the bill is now before the Senate.

Of course, we could act to stop many bills. I think there are many things we do not need to proceed with; I agree with the Senator from Delaware about that. But I think this is a good bill; and, in my opinion, if we do not start this job now, we shall be very sorry in the future.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, the Senator from Washington has read from a letter in which it was stated that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget had no objection to the bill. Is the Senator from Washington aware of the fact that the letter is dated May 10, 1961, long before the recent Berlin crisis?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I said the letter was sent to the House committee, and I said that in testimony received no later than last week he repeated the statement he had made in the letter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But the letter from which the Senator quoted is dated May 10, 1961.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course it is. That letter was sent to the House committee. Then he testified before our committee not more than 2 weeks ago, and said that he took the same stand.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not question the Senator's statement, but I have not seen any other letter. I do not doubt that he has stated the matter correctly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have said that after he sent that letter, he appeared—not more than 2 weeks ago—before our committee and reiterated the stand he took in the letter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If there is a subsequent letter, where is it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been read a third time. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may place in the RECORD at this point the testimony of the Department of the Interior before the Senate Committee on Commerce, as presented by Assistant Secretary of Commerce, July 31, 1961.

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

STATEMENT OF FRANK P. BRIGGS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have a very, very short statement, because I realize how busy all of you are over here.

I am here this morning to support the views of our Department. I take it that you have the Department's report.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. We will put that in the record in full.

Mr. BRIGGS. President Kennedy, in his natural resources message to the Congress early this year urged an immediate acceleration of the wetlands acquisition program.

Secretary of the Interior Udall has stressed the critical need to bring 4 or 5 million additional acres of wet lands into our national wildlife refuge system before these lands are lost by drainage or filling—or priced beyond the reach of the public purse.

In the past year, many leading conservation agencies have campaigned vigorously for a crash program to save the Nation's waterfowl habitat and we are most gratified to have their support in this field. May I add that several of them are here to add their endorsement to this bill.

It is obvious that the annual revenue our Department receives from duck-stamp sales—about $5 million—is not enough to get duck habitat restored in the short time we have to restore it.

As Secretary Udall has said: "What we save now (today) may be all we'll save. In this case, time is our enemy."

Our goal is the acquisition by the Federal Government of an additional 4½ million acres for refuge and waterfowl production purposes.

We hope to get control of about 4 million of these acres within the next 10 years. This should put us over the hump.

We estimate that this will cost $200 million and require an advance of $150 million to be merged with the $50 million expected to be available from duck-stamp revenues in the next 10 years. This proposed advance will be repaid to the Treasury from duck-stamp revenue accruing after fiscal year 1971.

We urge your favorable consideration of this proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 8, as follows:

[No. 168]

YEAS—65

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morse
Allott	Hickey	Morton
Bartlett	Hill	Moss
Beall	Holland	Mundt
Bible	Hruska	Neuberger
Boggs	Jackson	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Proxmire
Capehart	Jordan	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Keating	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Russell
Church	Long, Mo.	Scott
Clark	Long, Hawaii	Smathers
Cooper	Long, La.	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Magnuson	Stennis
Dworshak	Mansfield	Symington
Ellender	McCarthy	Talmadge
Engle	McClellan	Thurmond
Ervin	McGee	Wiley
Fong	McNamara	Yarborough
Fulbright	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Miller	Young, Ohio
Hayden	Monroney	

NAYS—8

Bennett	Goldwater	Tower
Dirksen	Prouty	Williams, Del.
Douglas	Saltonstall	

NOT VOTING—27

Anderson	Chavez	Kefauver
Bridges	Cotton	Kerr
Burdick	Dodd	Lausche
Bush	Eastland	Muskie
Butler	Gore	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Hart	Schoeppel
Cannon	Hartke	Smith, Mass.
Carlson	Humphrey	Sparkman
Carroll	Javits	Williams, N.J.

So the bill (H.R. 7391) was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1908) to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 6453. An act for the relief of Earl Cupton; and

H.R. 5179. An act for the relief of the U.S. Display Corp.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 1022. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments; and

H.R. 6244. An act for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services erroneously in receipt of family separation allowances.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 3596. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to Purvis C. Vickers, Robert I. Vickers, and Joseph M. Vickers, a copartnership doing business as Vickers Bros.;

H.R. 6765. An act to authorize acceptance of an amendment to the articles of agreement of the International Finance Corporation permitting investment in capital stock;

H.R. 8599. An act to amend various sections of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 438. Joint resolution to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 so as to authorize and direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a study and investigation of the adequacy, for the protection of investors, of the rules of national securities exchanges and national securities associations; and

H.J. Res. 544. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1962, and for other purposes.

THE PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN SHORELINE AREAS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 624, S. 543.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 543) to promote the preservation, for the public use and benefit, of certain portions of the shoreline areas of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 3, line 1, after the word "Minnesota," to strike out "Debidue Island, South Carolina; Kiawah Island, South Carolina;"; in line 3, after the word "Virginia", to strike out "and" and insert "Great Salt Lake, Utah; Lake Tahoe, Nevada-California;"; in line 4, after the words "North Carolina", to insert a semicolon and "and the shores of Hawaii"; on page 5, line 3, after the word "adopted", to insert "under appropriate laws and regulations"; in line 6, after the word "to", insert "administer, operate, and"; in line 13, after the word "section", to strike out "if such conversion, use, or disposal is continued for more than one year within the twenty-five year period immediately following the acquisition of such property by such State,"; in line 17, after the word "therefor", to insert "from such", and in line 22, after the word "of," to strike out $10,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of promoting the preservation, development, and accessibility to all American people of present and future generations of such quantity and quality of coastal and inland shoreline areas as will be necessary for individual enjoyment and assuring the cultural, recreational, physical, and scientific benefits that shoreline resources provide, and promoting the retention for the public of adequate and representative portions of the shoreline areas which remain relatively unspoiled along the Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf coasts and along the Great Lakes and inland river systems, and which possess particularly valuable recreational opportunities for the public, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are authorized to take certain action in the public interest toward the establishment of national shoreline recreational areas, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to render assistance to the States in the establishment of State-administered shoreline recreational areas, in accordance with the following provisions of this Act.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN AREAS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to make a study and investigation to determine what further action should be taken to save and preserve, in the interest of, and for the benefit of, the public, the following-described shoreline areas of the United States: Cumberland Island, Georgia; Huron Mountains, Michigan; Channel Islands, California; Pictured Rocks and Grand Sable Dunes, Michigan; Sleeping Bear Dunes, Michigan; Fire Island, New York; Cape Flattery, Washington; Leadbetter Point, Washington; Mosquito Lagoon, Florida; Pigeon Point, Minnesota; Popham-Saint John, Maine; Parramoure Island, Virginia; Great Salt Lake, Utah; Lake Tahoe, Nevada-California; Smith Island, North Carolina; and the shores of Hawaii. As part of such investigation and study, the Secretary shall obtain the advice, with respect to each such areas, of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, and the Governor of the State in which such area is located, and shall hold public hearings with respect to each such area to explain the proposal and provide opportunity for public expression of views relating thereto.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall submit to Congress, within two years after funds are made available to conduct such study and investigation, a report of the findings of such study and investigation, together with his recommendations, including recommendations for such legislation as may be needed. Such report shall contain, but shall not be limited to, specific findings with respect to—

(1) what action the United States should take in order to save and preserve, for the public use and benefit, each such area;

(2) the estimated total cost to the United States of acquiring and developing such areas;

(3) the estimated total amount of land, including submerged land, in such areas, which may be procured by donations or purchased with donated funds;

(4) the suitability of each such area for the establishment of a recreational area; and

(5) the scenic, scientific, historic, and recreation value of each such area.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $400,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

ASSISTANCE IN ESTABLISHMENT OF STATE AREAS

SEC. 3. (a) In order to assist the States in the acquisition and preservation of suitable relatively unspoiled shoreline areas along the Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf coasts, and along the Great Lakes and inland river systems, in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, and the Act of June 23, 1936 (49 Stat. 1894; 16 U.S.C. secs. 17-k—17-n), relating to the park, parkway, and recreational area programs of the United States, the Secretary may pay, at such time as he may deem advisable in carrying out such purposes, to any State an amount equal to one-half of the purchase price of any land or water area, or interest therein, to be acquired by such State in accordance with this section. Pursuant to such regulations as the Secretary may deem advisable and in the public interest, any such payment shall be made only with respect to a State project area with respect to which such State (1) has authorized and financed a suitable land acquisition program, (2) has adopted under appropriate laws and regulations plans for

land use and development that are acceptable to the Secretary for the purposes of this Act, (3) agrees to continue to administer, operate, and use as a public recreational area. In addition, any such payment shall be made subject to the understanding and agreement by such State that the conversion, use, or disposal, for purposes contrary to the purposes of this Act, as determined by the Secretary, of any property acquired by such State with funds supplied in part by the United States pursuant to this section, shall result in a right of the United States to compensation therefor from such State in the amount of one-half of the fair market value of such property, as determined at the time of such conversion, use, or disposal.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated, for the purpose of making payments authorized under the provisions of this section, not in excess of $25,000,000.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL FOREST AREAS

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to make a study and investigation of areas within the national forest system bordering upon oceans, lakes, or rivers, which are appropriate to preserve and develop in such system as shoreline recreational areas, for the benefit of the public, for their recreational, cultural, physical, and scientific values.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress, within two years after funds are made available to conduct such study and investigation, a report of the findings of such study and investigation, together with his recommendations, including recommendations for such legislation as may be needed. Such report shall contain, but shall not be limited to, specific findings with respect to—

(1) appropriate areas, including description, acreage, adjacent water areas, cultural, recreational, scientific, and other values, and accessibility to the public; and

(2) cost of the establishment, development and administration as shoreline recreational areas, including estimated cost of acquiring any private inholdings or rights, or adjacent private lands essential to a contiguous, administrable area.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $400,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, we are all aware of the attempt to hijack the Continental Airlines jetliner at El Paso on August 3. We are all the more aware of it because of the action taken jointly by the House and Senate today in agreeing to the so-called hijack bill and sending it to the White House.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that under date of August 4, 1961, President Robert Six of the Continental Airlines, who is largely responsible for the act of courage shown by the plane crew and the prompt way in which the situation was handled, was sent a telegram by the President of the United States. I believe that previously the Vice President had also congratulated President Six of the Continental Airlines. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the telegram sent by President John F. Kennedy to Robert Six, president, Continental Airlines, expressing the appreciation of the Federal Government, and an article published in the Denver Post, issue of Wednesday, August 9, entitled "J.F.K. Thanks Six for Role in Capture."

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

AUGUST 4, 1961.

Mr. ROBERT SIX,
President, Continental Airlines,
Denver, Colo.:

I want to express the appreciation of the Federal Government for your cooperation and skill in helping to cope with the hijacking of the jet plane, August 3. The courage of the plane's crew and your own prompt arrival to assist in meeting the situation contributed greatly to the successful conclusion of a potentially dangerous situation.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

[From the Denver Post, Aug. 9, 1961]

J.F.K. THANKS SIX FOR ROLE IN CAPTURE

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy thanked Robert Six of Denver, president of Continental Airlines, Wednesday, for his "cooperation and skill" in coping with the attempted hijacking August 3 of a Continental jetliner at El Paso, Tex.

In a brief letter to Six, Kennedy said: "The courage of the plane crew and your own prompt arrival to assist in meeting the situation contributed greatly to the successful conclusion of a potentially dangerous situation."

The two hijackers, a father and son from Coolidge, Ariz., were captured on the plane as it sat on the runway at El Paso.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I commend the majority leader for bringing this subject to the attention of the Senate. I think a very unusual set of circumstances was involved when an airline, which had been running through all of its lifetime in a civilian area and not in a war area, was suddenly confronted with a situation such as the crew of Continental were confronted with when the hijacker jumped the pilot. I have previously made some remarks in the Chamber on this subject. But it seems to me that the celerity with which Mr. Six and his associates came through from a management standpoint, keeping in constant contact with the White House all the time they were on their way from Denver to where the plane landed, and also what the crew did on that occasion, merit the highest praise that we in Congress can give them. Since, of course, Continental Airlines' main office is in Colorado, I am particularly proud of the performance of the personnel.

(At this point Mr. METCALF took the chair as Presiding Officer).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am well aware of the great interest shown by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] in this particular matter because, as he has pointed out, the headquarters of Continental is at Denver. It is a Colorado concern. It has a distinguished record, and I know that both he and his colleague [Mr. CARROLL] are very thankful for the prompt action shown by President Robert Six and the courageous action taken by the crew at the time of the attempted skyjacking. I commend him for the interest he has consistently shown on this question.

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

Mr. BIBLE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it has been my privilege to know Robert Six, the president of Continental Airlines, for more than a quarter of a century. I pay tribute to him, as other Senators have done today, but more importantly, I point out the fact that the scheduled airlines of the United States are on standby for defense purposes for this country. Its fleet of excellent aircraft, fine pilots, and well-trained personnel in all departments is certainly a bulwark to our Nation.

THE PLIGHT OF THE LEAD AND ZINC MINER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last Thursday the chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] made a thoughtful and sobering presentation of the plight of the domestic lead and zinc miners.

As the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] pointed out, these miners have seen, in recent years, a steady dwindling of their income and their market due to a great increase in imports of these products and a failure on the part of the Federal Government to take note of the real need for action.

As I presented in testimony to the committee considering the Lead and Zinc Act of 1961, the time has come for the Federal Government to take action that will bring long-range improvement in this very important industry. We cannot afford a piecemeal approach, nor one that will only lead to a continuation of the decline in the share of the lead and zinc market going to our domestic producers.

The recent action of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in ordering S. 1747 to be reported is an encouraging sign, for action at the national level is needed.

It is my hope that the Senate will soon have an opportunity to take favorable action on this measure and that this will be the beginning of a recognition that the Federal Government has a responsibility with regard to the lead and zinc problem.

I congratulate the able Senator from New Mexico for his excellent presentation of this problem and for his leadership in alleviating the plight of the miners who have contributed so much to our security and prosperity in past years, and who must play a vital role in the economy of our Nation.

A WORD FOR FRANCE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, all of us have heard or read the cynical yarn that Americans are soft and more concerned with their comforts than with the stark realities of this Communist-threatened world.

In World War I the Kaiser and his advisers said that of us; Hitler's Nazis and Japan's fire-eaters said it and began testing the thresholds of our tolerance long before we entered World War II,

by abusing our hospitalities, our citizens, and our national dignity, until our entrance into these two wars became inevitable.

The Soviet Union, it appears, has learned nothing from history, neither do its masters in the Kremlin, know the courage of the American people.

As an example of our courageous devotion to freedom, I call attention to an American citizen and the company he has founded, Mr. A. N. Spanel and the International Latex Corp. They have carried on a worldwide campaign on behalf of free-world unity for over 20 years. In these years Mr. Spanel and his company have pleaded for an aggregate free-world strength born of genuine unity. This effort became an almost endless flow of editorial advertisements presented as a public service, in paid newspaper space. Additionally, they have, in this manner, undoubtedly done more than any person or company in American history to enhance Franco-American relations by informing the free world and the American people in particular of the importance of France to it and to the United States.

I heartily endorse this effort to strengthen and perpetuate the historic ties which since our War of Independence and during our Nation's earliest struggles have linked us with France.

Apart from these ties, it is well for us to remember that almost uniquely among the major nations on the continent of Europe, France has carried the torch of civilization and freedom in modern times. Alone among the continental powers it has never succumbed to the totalitarianisms of the right or left. It has never yielded to either fascism or communism.

The most recent of these articles appeared in the Paris edition of the New York Times, August 21, 1961, entitled "On Yielding to Pressure." It is as informative as it is provocative and merits the widest possible readership.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Spanel's article be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

ON YIELDING TO PRESSURE

(By A. N. Spanel)

The issue posed by the dispute over Bizerte is difficult and dangerous. That it has arisen in this time of nerve-racking tension and menace in Berlin is especially unfortunate. Indeed, the timing of the violence unleashed by President Habib Bourguiba in Bizerte, precisely when the Communist challenge to the West in central Europe was reaching a climax, may not have been accidental.

Nations under major threat in one place, he may have calculated, might be more amenable to yielding under lesser pressures in another place. It is a tactic all too familiar in the annals of political extortion.

But whether the eruption of the Bizerte crisis while the Berlin crisis was underway had been planned or was an unhappy coincidence, it is a misfortune that tests American commonsense. The hour is far too grave for the counsels of panic, or for grandstand plays reckless of larger consequences.

The great free-world powers, of course, must use their good offices to promote an equitable and peaceful solution of the problem in Tunisia. But the attainment of that objective would be seriously hampered, perhaps precluded, if the American Government again allows itself to be intimidated by dogmatic, know-nothing "anticolonial" slogans.

Too often in the past Washington has sided too easily with the small country against the great power, regardless of the facts and the justice of the situation, regardless of the heavy price in free-world disunity.

The temptation nowadays is to aline with the emerging nations, to bid for their applause, in defiance of larger and more pressing interests. Like Pavlov's experimental dogs, we are being conditioned to react to the ringing of Afro-Asian and Red bloc bells. It is high time that we broke the spell of that conditioning.

Both prudence and past experience demand that we do not lose sight of the facts in the Franco-Tunisian affair. The record must be kept straight. And the central fact in that record is that Mr. Bourguiba—by his ultimatum and by initiating the violence—deliberately provoked the hostilities. The noise of artificially staged anti-French demonstrations in Tunisia should not be allowed to drown out that reality.

It was alarming, therefore, to read the Washington dispatch by Lloyd Garrison in the New York Times of August 19. If his forecast of U.S. conduct in the U.N. General Assembly on Bizerte is correct, then America is about to perpetrate another policy blunder, with the Communists reaping another easy victory.

"Earlier this week," Mr. Garrison reports, "it was presumed that the United States would abstain on any resolution considered even mildly offensive to France, as it did when the Security Council voted on the issue last month."

But now, he says on the authority of "a highly qualified State Department official," that presumption has been canceled out. The American position on Bizerte has "not been decided," he attests: "The United States has not ruled out the possibility of voting a mild African-Asian bloc resolution backing Tunisia."

This advance notice of possible American submission to Afro-Asian pressures is particularly shocking in the context of events in Berlin, which make maximum unity of the major NATO nations imperative.

Can we afford to affront and outrage France, a steadfast ally in the central European situation? What are we trying to repeat—another Suez?

In 1953 Washington pressure virtually forced the British to leave the Suez area which in the end served to turn over Suez to anti-Western politicos in Egypt. Then it nudged Britain into withdrawing its garrison from the canal. Finally, in late 1956, the United States intervened in concert with Russia against France, Britain, and Israel, thereby giving Nasser a standing and stature that put the free world at a cruel disadvantage in meeting Soviet intrusions in the Middle East.

Have we learned nothing from that disastrous chapter of recent history? Are we hellbent for destruction of another key Western position, this time in the vital Mediterranean, to appease Afro-Asians many of whom are openly manipulated by our common enemy?

What, after all, is our country's priority interest—to please the newly arrived "neutral" nations heavily subsidized by the United States and her allies, or to stand shoulder to shoulder with our principal allies for all that is right, and to weld an effective coalition of the great democracies against the crowding Communist threat?

These are crucial questions that must be asked insistently by the American people in the days of test in the U.N. Assembly. We dare not delude ourselves once more that we can continue to play the ambivalent role of mobilizing NATO strength and at the same time cutting it down in U.N. votes.

THE PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN SHORELINE AREAS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 543) to promote the preservation, for the public use and benefit, of certain portions of the shoreline areas of the United States.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the pending proposed legislation is designed to promote the preservation for the public use and benefit of certain portions of the shorelines of the United States. The bill was reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by almost a unanimous vote, and the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], before he left last weekend to undergo surgery, asked me to present the bill to the Senate. I have just been advised that he has undergone surgery and he has withstood the operation very successfully. I am sure he will be back in his seat within the very near future.

The bill, known as the shorelines bill, is one on which the committee has spent considerable time and devoted a great deal of attention in attempting to work out many different viewpoints in this particular field. I think we are all aware that the country is in a population explosion, which is going on at an unprecedented rate. For example, the chairman of the committee made us very well aware that there is an even greater explosion in the demand for recreational facilities and for the opportunity to get out of doors.

Since World War II, park and forest visitors, the number of hunters and fishers—and particularly the number of people who seek recreation on a beach of one sort or another—has mounted far faster than population itself. At least three multipliers are at work: population growth, increasing individual incomes which make it possible for more people to afford outdoor recreational activity, and increased leisure time—longer vacations—which afford greater opportunity to get out of doors.

The growth in numbers of visitors at all types of outdoor recreation facilities since World War II has been phenomenal—and the greatest of all has been at beaches, reservoirs, and facilities which offer water sports. You will find in the report on this bill a table showing the average annual percentage increase in use of various types of facilities. Attendance at national parks has been going up 8 percent a year. It has gone up 10 percent at national forests and State parks, and 12 percent at our wildlife refuges and ranges. Topping them all, however, is a 28 percent annual average increase in use of Corps of Engineers reservoirs.

A recent Gallup study indicated that about twice as many residents of the Delaware River Basin want to go to the beaches as go to the mountains for a weekend outdoors.

There has been a tremendous growth in outboard motors in use in the Nation—from 2.8 million in 1950 to more than 6 million in 1960.

This increase in use of water-based recreational facilities has been reflected in increased demand at all levels of government for more public beaches.

In 1935, the Park Service suggested the acquisition of 12 national seashore recreation areas with 600,000 acres and more than 400 miles of ocean and gulf shore on the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico. It would then have cost less than $15 million total. One of the areas was partly acquired—Cape Hatteras. We are looking at another now, Padre Island. The estimated cost of acquiring about two-thirds of the island is now 12 times the estimated cost of the whole island back in 1935. A bill to acquire Padre Island is pending before the Interior Committee, and we hope to consider it tomorrow in a markup session. The other 10 areas proposed in 1935 are gone. They have become real estate developments and industrial sites and it is unthinkable to take them over now. One area, available to the Government at $26 an acre in 1935, is now being sold in lots valued at $65 per front foot.

Many examples can be given of the increase in costs. The bill is intended to move the Nation along in an orderly, economical way toward the establishment of both Federal and State shoreline recreation areas which will meet the growing demand, and will develop some of these shoreline facilities in inland States.

The bill does three things:

First, it directs the National Park Service to make detailed studies of 12 areas which might be considered for national shoreline recreational facilities. Most of these areas were spotted in the Park Service's reconnaissance survey of our shorelines. They are in the group which the Park Service considered most outstanding and worthy of Federal consideration.

In processing the Cape Cod bill, which we recently enacted, and the Point Reyes bill, which is now on the calendar and will be brought up by motion momentarily, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has found that much detailed information is needed than the generalized study which the Park Service was able to do on its reconnaissance study with private funds.

The first major objective of S. 543 is to have the Park Service make the necessary detailed studies of the 12 areas enumerated in the bill. Of the 16 areas originally in the bill, 2 have been removed by direction of the committee. I believe an amendment will be offered to take out two areas in the State of Michigan, which are now being made the subject of individual park bills. Shortly I will yield to the senior Senator from Michigan for the purpose of considering the first amendment along that line.

The amount of money estimated which will be necessary to make these detailed studies is approximately $400,000.

The second major objective of the bill is to stimulate the various States to cooperate in meeting the public's demand for shoreline recreation facilities. Appropriation from time to time of a grand total of $25 million of matching funds is authorized, to assist the States in acquiring State shoreline areas. The proposal of such a matching fund program has itself done a great deal of good in activating the States to meet their share of responsibility in this field. The chairman has corresponded with the Governors of the States. A great majority of them have looked over the problem as it affects their State and responded enthusiastically to the State aid provision in the bill. Their letters will be found in the printed hearings.

Without question, this $25 million of matching funds will get us not just twice its total in State recreational facilities, but several times its total by stimulating the States to move ahead on their own. The sum is a very modest one compared to the job to be done. If it were equally divided among the States—and that is not required to be done—it would amount to $500,000 for each of the 50 States. This is not a tremendous amount in view of costs, which are running up to $3 million per mile of waterfront in more densely populated areas where the demand and the need for shoreline recreation facilities is the greatest.

The third objective of this bill is to have the National Forest Service take a look at lands the Federal Government already owns—the 186 million acres in the national forests in 44 States—and see if we cannot establish some water-based recreation areas without paying millions of dollars acquisition costs.

The Forest Service has 54 miles of shoreline on the Great Lakes, 42 miles on the Oregon and California coasts and about 11,000 miles of ocean front in Alaska. The national forests contain 1,000 reservoirs and over 12,000 lakes of more than 10 acres in size, totaling 2.7 million acres. They have 81,000 miles of rivers and streams.

The national forests now include some well-known water-based recreation areas such as Pend Oreille, Palisades, Flaming Gorge, Chelan, and Shasta in the West; Ouachita, Cumberland, Fontana, and Watauga in the Southeast, and the great Boundary Waters canoe area in Minnesota. It has fine recreation areas on Lake Tahoe, which lies across the California-Nevada border. It is my hope that they will survey their holdings in that area for possible expansion of the facilities already there and that the Park Service will look into the possibility of some development on the eastern Nevada shore, where it may be possible to acquire some lake frontage very reasonably.

The bill before us authorizes the appropriation of $400,000 for these Forest Service studies—an authorization that can save us tens of millions of dollars by assuring optimum use of lands we already own—to meet the demand for shoreline recreation facilities.

The appropriations authorized in the bill are $400,000 for Park Service studies, $400,000 for the Forest Service survey, and $25 million to be appropriated over a period of years for aid to the States.

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

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, after many years of careful consideration by both Houses of the Congress, the wilderness bill is now before the Senate for action.

The members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs are to be congratulated for their careful study and review of this very important measure and for the thoroughness with which they considered the views of all those who are concerned with the plan under which the wilderness system is to be established. It is my belief that the Interior Committee has reported a good bill, and I would urge favorable consideration of S. 174 by the Senate.

On July 29 an outstanding newspaper in my State editorially supported the bill as reported to the Senate. This paper, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, has been a leader in efforts to preserve and develop the natural resources of both the State of Missouri and our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial, entitled "Out of the Wilderness?" in the July 29, 1961, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

OUT OF THE WILDERNESS?

For 5 years the so-called wilderness bill has been pending in Congress. At last, by a solid 11–4 vote, it has been recommended for passage by the Senate Interior Committee, Chairman CLINTON ANDERSON's enthusiasm and the support of western Senators giving it a good chance on the floor. And the 2,400 pages of Senate testimony in its favor ought to impress the House.

Under this measure, portions of national parks, national forests, and wildlife reserves would be set aside in perpetuity so that future generations might have at least a glimpse here and there of their land in its virginal state. No new agency would be set up, and Congress could review the provisions, from time to time, in the light of experience.

Perhaps few of us have a taste for the rugged pleasure of wild beauty. Nevertheless the logic of preserving at least a small portion of our natural scenery must be persuasive to all except those devotees of the bulldozer who would exploit anything. It is a minor mystery why this bill was not passed long ago. Let us hope that it will be listed among the accomplishments of this Congress.

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

Mr. BIBLE. I am happy to yield to the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator if the pending bill follows up on more reservations similar to the Cape Cod reservation which the committee reported earlier and which has been enacted into law. It involves the same principle, does it not?

Mr. BIBLE. It is the same principle. I would say to the Senator from Massachusetts, the coauthor of the Cape Cod National Seashore bill, that it follows exactly the same pattern. At one time the Cape Cod bill was before us for study. The studies went forward, as the Sena-

tor knows, and as a result of the studies and the fine work that went into the proposals that came before the committee, we were able to move the Cape Cod bill forward. The pending bill follows the same principle.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The question will then arise as to the peak or top priority areas which should be the next priority areas to be considered, because they might be lost if we did not acquire them now.

Mr. BIBLE. That is true. Without doubt the costs will increase. What these studies will show, I do not know. However, we cannot move forward intelligently without the detailed studies that the bill envisions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And the studies are to be made within 2 years, or so, so that we can get some action.

Mr. BIBLE. The report must be made within 2 years from the enactment of the bill. The Department of Agriculture, which is in charge of the National Forest lands, will be required to report back in a period of 2 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I congratulate the Senator and his committee. I know the feeling in my State in the Cape Cod area, what it means to many people. As one Member of the Senate and as one who knows the advantages of such action as is contemplated, I hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Massachusetts and I hope the bill will be enacted. If we had not had studies made on the Cape Cod area we would never have been able to work out a bill generally as satisfactory as this one.

So the very purpose of this action is to move in the direction suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am pleased that the committee has reported the shoreline bill. It is much needed. I hope the work will be speedily conducted. I congratulate the Senator from Nevada upon his work.

However, may I inquire as to the status of projects which are not included under section 2. Do I understand correctly that if they are not included, they are put at the bottom of the totem pole, so to speak?

Mr. BIBLE. No, no; far from it. I hiked over the Indiana Dunes with the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I know of his interest in the Indiana Dunes. This is a matter of special legislation which is now pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It so happens that it is before the subcommittee of which I am the chairman. I have said to the Senator from Illinois, as I have said to many of his constituents, and to many of the residents of Indiana who have written me about the Indiana Dunes, that I plan to hold full dress hearings on the Indiana Dunes in either January or February.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the decision is favorable, the Indiana Dunes could move up toward the top of the list, instead of being put in the basement?

Mr. BIBLE. I do not think the Indiana Dunes are in the basement. I would rank the bills which we are looking at at the present time as something in this order:

First, the Cape Cod bill, which has become a law. Next, the bill which is now on the calendar as the Point Reyes bill, which has been studied in detail. There are some details concerning the Indiana Dunes which need to be studied.

The third bill which is coming along in the national seashore group relates to Padre Island, Tex.

Then, I should say, quite possibly, if the hearings vindicate the proposal and justify moving it, the Indiana Dunes bill would probably be the fourth in line.

I should say that the Oregon Dunes bill would be the fifth in this particular chain of national seashore proposals.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I am happy to yield.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I wish it were possible for the people of the United States to see the expression on the face of the Senator from Massachusetts, because he has his bill safely behind him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When the Senator from Masaschusetts looks at the lady Senator from Oregon, what can he do but smile?

I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada a question. He said he trudged along the Indiana Dunes. But did he run as fast as the picture of the Senator from Illinois which was published in the press seemed to indicate he covered the span?

Mr. BIBLE. The distinguished Senator from Illinois easily outdistanced the Senator from Nevada. I now yield again to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand the studies were being made without prejudice to the other projects. If, in the opinion of the administration and Congress, it is desirable to push the Oregon Dunes, Point Reyes, Padre Island, and the Indiana Dunes, they will not be held back because of the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. No. To the contrary, the Indiana Dunes project has moved along a little further than have the proposals for some of the other areas which are designated in the bill—some 16 in all. As a matter of fact, by way of illustration, the bill provides for a study of two fine areas in the great State of Michigan. The studies have been made by independent people. The project has moved foward even faster than we thought it would. We have made it the subject of a special bill introduced by the two Senators from Michigan. Because of that work, the Senator from Michigan will offer an amendment to remove two projects from the bill and move forward with it independently. The committee would certainly do the same thing with respect to the Indiana Dunes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his graciousness and cooperation, and I express the hope that this beneficence will continue to increase.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Michigan, because I have alluded to the problem of Michigan several times.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment will not be in order until the committee amendments have been adopted.

Mr. McNAMARA. I withhold my amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, so as to accommodate the Senator from Michigan, I move that the committee amendments be adopted en bloc.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the committee amendment on page 5, line 22, involves an increase from $10 million to $25 million.

Mr. BIBLE. That is the amendment relating to the payments authorized to be appropriated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator's request means that if the amendments are adopted en bloc it will be impossible to cut that amount back.

Mr. BIBLE. That would not be my intention. I would ask that the bill as amended be subject to further amendment. I have no disposition to try to preclude the Senator from Wisconsin from offering amendments at any time, if he wished to do so.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin has no such intention, but he would like to ask some questions about which he feels certain the Senator from Nevada might be able to satisfy him.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I do not suggest, by asking that the committee amendments be adopted en bloc, that any Senator be precluded from offering an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada may request that the bill as amended be treated as original text for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. That would be my second request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan to enable him to offer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, lines 21 and 22, it is proposed to strike out "Pictured Rocks and Grand Sable Dunes, Michigan; Sleeping Bear Dunes, Michigan;".

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Michigan and I agree in principle with S. 543, a bill to promote the preservation, for the public use and benefit, of certain portions of the shoreline areas of the United States.

We agree also with the need to study and investigate certain areas to determine what future action should be taken to save and preserve certain well-known and outstanding shoreline areas of the Atlantic, Pacific, gulf, and the Great Lakes.

However, of the several areas listed in section 2 for study and investigation, both the Pictured Rocks-Grand Sable Dunes and Sleeping Bear Dunes in

Michigan have already been investigated thoroughly by the Department of the Interior.

In 1959, the National Park Service with donated funds initiated detailed studies of both the Pictured Rocks and Sleeping Bear Dunes areas. These studies that recommended both areas for addition to the national park system have been completed and the final reports are now being processed for publication. The three reports on the Sleeping Bear area have already gone to the printer and distribution is scheduled for the middle of September. These three reports will include:

First. A summary report including a proposed plan for public use development.

Second. A comprehensive treatise of the natural history and other values of the area.

Third. A report on economic feasibility of establishing the area as a unit of the national park system.

The latter report was prepared by the Institute of Community Development and Service of the Michigan State University.

The final report on the Pictured Rocks area—which encompasses the Grand Sable Dunes—is receiving final edit prior to submission to a printer. Distribution of this comprehensive report is expected later this fall and will include chapters on natural history, proposed development of public benefit, and economic feasibility.

At our request, the National Park Service furnished advance information on the findings and recommendations of the detailed studies of both the Pictured Rocks and Sleeping Bear areas. Based on this information, we introduced on June 27 bills to establish national recreation areas at both locations. We hope, with the cooperation of the Interior Committee chairman and the chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, to move forward without delay to public hearings and consideration of the varying points of view on these two proposals.

Therefore, because both areas have already been studied thoroughly, have been determined to be of national significance, and legislation reflecting the current judgment of the Department of the Interior as to these areas is before the Senate, I propose that section 2 of S. 543 be amended to exclude both the Pictured Rocks-Grand Sable Dues and the Sleeping Bear areas, both in Michigan, as areas for investigation.

Mr. President, I ask the chairman if he will accept the amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I have discussed the proposal with the distinguished Senator from Michigan. The amendment he offers is acceptable to the committee. Enough studies have been made by outside groups, and we have moved area studies forward in such manner, that we now have information to go forward with the necessary hearings. This we will do either this fall or early next year with respect to independent bills to create national seashore areas in those two parts of Michigan. They will be considered independently, because it has now been determined that there is no need for further study. I am happy, for that reason, to accept the Senator's amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada for his cooperation. I assure him we will pursue the project in any manner he deems advisable to reach the ultimate objectives of his committee.

Mr. BIBLE. We hope to take a look at the Michigan area later this fall or early next year. It has great problems, just as all the seashore areas have problems. They include the problems of people who have lived in the areas for many years.

This point was raised in connection with the seashore bills. The dairy people have some vital interests which need protection and will be protected, and there are similar problems. But as a result of the hearings, I believe it will be possible to move the bills forward in a satisfactory way.

In any event, the necessary studies have been made, and there is no need to have them covered by this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, a number of Senators have asked that I yield to them. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Iowa, a distinguished member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I now yield to him.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. President, section 3 of the bill provides the Secretary with authority to pay up to one-half of the purchasing price of any land or water area to be acquired by a State in accordance with this section. I call attention to the fact that the areas to be acquired may include inland river systems. I wish to point out that during the consideration of the bill both the distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and I made quite a point of the fact that in the surveys to be conducted under the bill and also in the acquisitions, attention should be given to our inland water systems and shoreline areas within the interior of the United States, as well as to those around the Great Lakes and on the seacoasts.

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the report by the committee, beginning on page 5, with the heading "Inland River Shores," and continuing to near the bottom of page 6, be printed at this point in the RECORD, so as to make clear that the future planning with respect to shoreline acquisition and development will include inland river shores.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 649) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INLAND RIVER SHORES

During the committee's consideration of S. 543 amendments were proposed to include studies of the Mississippi River and its major tributaries, the upper Missouri River between Fort Peck Dam and Fort Benton, Mont., the Columbia, and other rivers.

The committee believes that a survey of shoreline recreational opportunities on major rivers and other inland lakes should be undertaken. The rising demand for such recreational facilities will ultimately require that it be done and, as in the case of seashores, the increasing speed of development of desirable sites by commercial interests will greatly increase values and Government cost of acquisition as time elapses. S. 543 includes the preservation and development of shoreline areas on inland river systems as one of the objectives of the Congress. The amendment to include studies of specified stretches of inland rivers was set aside only upon the understanding that the National Park Service will be requested to undertake a broad reconnaissance study of major inland river and lake areas, in the pattern of the seashore studies previously conducted, to identify specific areas of present or potential benefit to the general public warranting legislation authorizing more intensive studies of the desirability of Federal acquisition of a reasonable number of specific inland river sites. The committee's action in setting aside the proposed river amendments was in no way a disapproval of the proposal. On the contrary, it was done to permit a more comprehensive approach to the problem. It is not sufficient to establish recreation areas on shores at the perimeter of the 48 contiguous States. There is equivalent need for similar facilities in the inland States.

The 16 seashore areas which the National Park Service is directed to study by S. 543 do not include any of the 5 areas which Congress is currently considering for acquisition. Additional studies are not required in these five instances. The list does include areas on the Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, the Pacific, and Great Lakes shores which were found to be outstanding and worthy of consideration for national acquisition in the 1955–59 reconnaissance studies.

Since the introduction of S. 543 the National Park Service has done more extensive study of two of the named areas in Michigan (Pictured Rocks and Sleeping Bear Dunes) and appropriations for a study of the shores of Hawaii have been proposed and are under consideration. The areas were retained in S. 543 to assure completion of the studies and reports. Because of its knowledge of the status of these reports, the committee added Great Salt Lake in Utah and Lake Tahoe in Nevada-California without increasing the $400,000 authorization of funds for the National Park Service to finance the total project. It is believed the work of studying the additional areas can be funded from the total because of the work completed on the two areas designed in the original bill.

Mr. BIBLE. I think the report makes abundantly clear that nothing in the bill would in any way run counter to the expressions by the Senator from Iowa or the expressions by the distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Montana. This measure merely calls for a more comprehensive approach.

Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. BIBLE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I think two or three things should be taken into consideration in connection with this measure.

Like the Senator from Nevada, I am from an inland State which has no seashore. Nevertheless, I have supported the bill. But I join other Senators in believing that in dealing with this matter, we should provide for orderly procedure and development. This year we have committed ourselves to the expenditure of quite a few million dollars for the Cape Cod Seashore. The Point

Reyes Seashore bill is now on the calendar. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is now acting on the Padre Island bill, and I am informed it will complete its action in the next day or two.

So, all in all, I believe that in the next few years, in connection with these three areas alone, by means of the authorizations contained in the bills, we shall have committed ourselves to the expenditure of probably close to $75 million to $100 million. I support this development; I believe it is a wise investment in the future of the country. On the other hand, we cannot help but be somewhat concerned about the amount of funds required for this work, which we believe desirable.

In particular, in connection with this bill, I believe that part of the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, as set forth in the report, should be read into the RECORD, because it is very significant. It reads as follows:

> At this time, there is no way to appraise the extent of land devoted to commercial timber production or other resource uses that might be affected by shoreline areas to be studied by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. In connection with the studies that will be directed by the bill, it is believed that the concerned Departments should, in making their recommendations to the Congress, evaluate the impact of these recommendations on other land resources. The future needs of the Nation for the products and services provided by forest lands is expected to be so great that Congress should have the benefit of such evaluation in considering the recommendations to be submitted to it by the executive departments.

So I believe this will lead us down a more orderly path toward the development of our seashores, which will be necessary if we are to make proper provision for the recreational facilities of our population. I only hope that the last sentence of the Secretary's letter will be well remembered when we come to consider the wilderness bill. The future needs of the Nation in connection with the products of our forest lands are expected to be so great that Congress should have the benefit of the evaluation which is to be provided; and I hope that will be carefully considered when we take up the wilderness bill, which interlocks with the seashore area development bills.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from Colorado. He has been a most helpful member of our committee, and has taken a very definite interest in this important area of conservation, and has made very definite contributions.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, as a cosponsor and an enthusiastic supporter of the bill to set aside national shorelines, and having followed the efforts of the Senator from Nevada in the subcommittee, of which he is chairman, I wish highly to commend him for his most effective handling of the bill. When the history of this Congress is written, I believe one of the things longest remembered about it will be its achievement of establishing these shoreline areas. This is resource development in the finest sense. It will make life richer and better for all the American people.

I hope the same efficiency which has characterized the handling of the bill by the senior Senator from Nevada will continue. Cape Cod National Seashore is established. Last week the Interior Committee reported favorably on Point Reyes in California. Padre Island, Tex., will, I am confident, be reported shortly.

As for the Indiana Dunes, to which I was happily introduced by my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I hope we get speedy action. I went there a little more than a year ago with the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS]—and was deeply impressed by its beauty and deeply depressed by the rapidity with which it was being destroyed by the plague of pollution and other forces of annihilation. I wish to say that time is awasting and that every week that passes until we act, we are in danger of losing still more of this priceless heritage situated in an area which, perhaps beyond any other in the Nation, because of its nearness to the second greatest population concentration in the United States, needs to be preserved in the interest of this rapidly increasing citizenry. Much of this area has already been destroyed. When Senator MOSS and I were there a year ago last spring, we traveled through a smog which would make the Los Angeles smog seem pale and harmless by comparison. Our eyes and nostrils were assailed by acrid fumes from steel mills. We saw the foul pollution of the once beautiful Indiana shore of Lake Michigan. We were deeply distressed to think that there was not unanimous support for a move to put an end to that, pollution and destruction, and to preserve the priceless and unique heritage that the Nation had in the Indiana Dunes. Their preservation—at least what is left of them—is called for imperatively; and I hope we shall move as rapidly as possible to save what little is left of Indiana's shoreline.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President——

Mr. BIBLE. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have several questions concerning the sharp increase in appropriations in this bill from $10 million up to $25 million. I note that the bill was introduced on January 23, and that the bill as originally introduced appears to have provided for the authorization of an appropriation of $10 million. In the bill on page 5, in line 20, we find an indication that that was the authorization originally contemplated.

In the committee report I notice there are letters which were received from the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Commerce. In each case, as I review the committee report, it seems that the letters were written on the basis of the original bill. As a matter of fact, the letter from the Department of Agriculture refers to the $10 million authorization.

I have several questions to ask in regard to this matter:

First, was the Bureau of the Budget and were the other Departments apprised of the increase to $25 million, and did they approve of that much of an increase?

Mr. BIBLE. I would say that the increase was made only after rather exhaustive hearings, as reflected in the written report on the hearings which is before the Senate. They indicated that $10 million would be most inadequate in order to do the job of matching the funds provided by the States. For example—and I happened to conduct the hearings—the head of the Park and Recreation Board—I believe that is his official title—of the State of California appeared before the committee and made a rather strong presentation to the effect that $10 million would be inadequate.

He pointed out, for example, that in the State of California the $10 million provided in the bill, on a matching basis, would buy only 4 miles of coastline. We found this to be pretty sound based upon the costs we have developed in our other national seashore bills to date. For example, the Cape Cod bill has a total price acquisition cost of $16 million. The Point Reyes bill, which is another seashore bill, on the opposite side of the continent, on the Pacific Ocean just north of San Francisco, has a price tag of $14 million for the acquisition of the seashore park areas there.

It was apparent to the committee that the $10 million figure was not a realistic one; that if we were to make available an amount which would do any good, the figure should be higher. This amount would allow something in the neighborhood of $500,000 per State if it were parceled out to the 50 States. It was for this reason that the committee went to the higher figure.

There is no magic in the figure. Perhaps it should be $30, $40, or $50 million. In any event, it would depend on the final action of the Appropriations Committee. It was not checked back with the Budget Bureau as to whether it would agree with that figure. The figure was arrived at by the committee. The Bureau of the Budget made one suggestion about reversion, which we incorporated. We did not solicit their additional view as to whether $25 million was a correct figure, or whether it should be $10 million or some other figure.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator has already answered my second, unasked question. I see that there is a great deal of justification, as he pointed out in the hearings, for increasing this amount from $10 to $25 million.

I am somewhat discouraged with the notion that $25 million will buy such a small proportion of California coastline, as the Senator from Nevada so well pointed out. The cost of the Cape Cod project was $16 million. It seems we may be getting into another multibillion-dollar program before we are through with this kind of legislation.

At any rate, I am frankly shocked and disappointed that the Bureau of the Budget was not solicited for its opinion on the increased authorization, which is 150 percent higher than the figure on which it passed favorably. Without such an opinion this Senator would regard the approval of the Budget Bureau and the departments as meaningless.

When was this decision made by the committee? When the bill was marked up?

Mr. BIBLE. When the bill was marked up, which was on the 26th day of July. This decision was made in that area of time—the latter part of July.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Wisconsin stands to gain very greatly by this kind of legislation. We have a long and beautiful shoreline. The Governor of Wisconsin is interested in it and has expressed his enthusiastic support for the measure. He has expressed his support of this kind of State-Federal partnership approach as realistic.

There is great merit in the bill, but I have reservations. I question the cost of the measure, particularly the potential cost involved. I dread the prospect of a multibillion-dollar future involvment if the Congress adopts an acquisition-type approach. It could be fantastically expensive. Recreaction and conservation are splendid objectives. But the cost to the taxpayer could be far too great if "Uncle Sugar" gets into the acquisition business 50–50 with the temptation to buy and profiteer on available shoreline.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator for his useful observations. The question of price tag bothers us all. In the Point Reyes bill we were able to reduce the amount from $20 to $14 million. So we saved $6 million by getting the dairymen, recreationists, conservationists, and lovers of parks to live together. As a result of the decision that the dairymen can live side by side with the recreationists and conservationists, we were able to save some $6 million. I hope we can continue to do that as we go into this subject project by project.

I promised to yield first to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. Then I will yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. HOLLAND. I congratulate the Senator and his committee for this very forward-looking measure, of which I heartily approve.

I have two or three questions to ask the Senator. I note on page 4 of the bill, in section 3, that the bill relates to assistance in the establishment of State areas. The shoreline areas referred to are along the Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf coasts, and along the Great Lakes and inland river systems.

In our own State there are several large bays, almost the size of gulfs. This is true of many other States. The bays reach well back into the land, and some of them are almost closed, having very narrow entrances into the Atlantic and the gulf. Are we to understand that where the words "Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf coasts" are used, they would be applicable to bays and indentures in the mainland of the type I have referred to?

Mr. BIBLE. That question did not specifically come before the committee, nor was it covered by the testimony of any of the witnesses who appeared before the committee. In making the legislative history, it is my thought that the bays referred to by the Senator from Florida would be included in the description of Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf coasts, and would be subject to assistance on a 50–50 matching basis.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Nevada. That is my own feeling. At the same time, I think the legislative history should appear in this RECORD, showing that Congress had in mind not only the beaches of the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific, but also units thereof which reach well back into the mainland.

Mr. BIBLE. I think that is true. There is one further factor which nails down the definition, and that is that the Interior Department studies themselves take cognizance of and cover surveys of the bay areas referred to. So I am sure they are embraced within this language.

Mr. HOLLAND. I notice reference to inland river systems. We have in our own State—and this is the case along a large part of the South Atlantic coast—areas of salt water which are not gulfs, bays, or anything of the kind, but really are long stretches which are called rivers, but which are salt water in which there is no flowing of water except as a result of tide. I refer to the St. Lucie River, the Banana River, and the Indian River. I suspect that perhaps some of my colleagues have fished or hunted along those areas, and if not, I hope they will have an opportunity to do so.

Am I to understand, from the use of the words "inland river systems," that that wording in the bill of the committee goes so far as to reach these long inland reaches of salt water which are referred to as rivers in many parts of our coastal areas?

Mr. BIBLE. I think they would be embraced within the terminology of "inland river systems." I am informed by the staff that the Department of the Interior considers them either in the inland river systems or bay systems. So they are taken care of in both areas.

Mr. HOLLAND. We may assume safely, then, that the committee considers them as water frontage?

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct. That may be better terminology.

Mr. HOLLAND. Water frontage that may lend itself to the purpose of preserving recreational areas to be covered by this act, whether they be on either of the oceans. the gulfs, bays, or flowing rivers, or salt waters which are colloquially called rivers, or sounds. As the Senator well knows, in the case of North Carolina there are many of what are referred to as sounds.

Almost all along the South Atlantic coast are inland waters which are generally the areas through which the Inland Waterway passes, but which are connected with the ocean only at very long intervals, as a rule, through tiny inlets.

I think we may safely leave the record now with the understanding that what we are talking about is water frontages of such impressive nature that they afford real opportunities for recreation and real invitation to be saved for their recreational values for our people, whether as national institutions or as State parks or State recreational areas.

Mr. BIBLE. I concur in the Senator's statement. I am sure that is the thinking of the committee. It is certainly my thinking as chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, which has charge of park and seashore problems.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

In my home State of Florida there are some 12,000 miles of outside coastline and from 4,000 to 7,000 miles of inside shore water lines, including all of the lake frontages. I believe there are great opportunities, particularly, for the State to work with the Federal Government. We already have a number of State recreational areas and State parks which preserve minor portions of the shore areas. We badly need to preserve more.

I thank the distinguished Senator and his distinguished committee for presenting the bill, which I think will bring to pass many things which are worth while throughout the Nation.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the distinguished Senator.

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

Mr. BIBLE. I yield to the Senator from Utah. I know of no member of our committee who has been more faithful in his duties in looking at the seashore and park problems. The Senator has visited many of them with me. He visited many of them before I visited them. He has made a real contribution in this area, and I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah at this time.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the senior Senator from Nevada, my distinguished colleague on the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee considering seashore, park, and public land needs. Since the Senator has assumed the leadership of the subcommittee we have been moving forward at a very good rate in accomplishing some of the things which need to be done with respect to our public lands, particularly in the area of the shorelines.

Since I became a Member of the Senate and began service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs I have had an opportunity to visit a number of the places to which reference has been made heretofore—Cape Cod, Padre Island, Point Reyes, the Indiana Dunes, and other points —and to study each individually. We have passed the bill with respect to Cape Cod, and it is a law.

Certainly it is time to move into the area of preserving our shorelines.

When the Congress first became concerned about shorelines in the 1930's we could have acquired vast stretches of shoreline for a relatively small amount of money. For one reason or another, that was not done. The only area which was acquired at that time was the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, which has proved to be such a great benefit to the whole Nation that it would appear, from hindsight, that we made a great error in not moving sooner.

This is particularly brought home to me in my State of Utah, because in Utah we have the Great Salt Lake, a body of water unique in the Northern Hemisphere and, in fact, in some ways unique in all the world. For some time I have been trying to find some way to preserve a part of that shoreline for its scenic and geologic wonder, to be presented to the people of Utah and to the people of the United States. We encountered the problem of an inadequate study of the shoreline. Hearings were held in Utah a year ago. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] attended those hearings, at which a great deal of testimony was assembled. Finally we reached the point where we needed a full-scale study and evaluation made by experts in the field.

I am pleased that the committee has accepted the Great Salt Lake shoreline as one of the areas to be subject to study under the terms of the bill. This will enable us to have a final evaluation to determine the merits of preserving that unique shoreline, which I believe should be preserved and should be available to our people.

Our population continues to grow. Our people have more time for leisure and for vacation travel. More and more people accumulate in our cities and populated areas. There is a greater need for outdoor recreation. The recreation needs continue to grow, and this is the time to face the problem.

The expense is, of course, of concern. We have discussed the amount of money involved. This is an investment in America. It is an investment in lands which will be ours, which will be owned by all the people of the United States. Certainly the time will never come when the land can be acquired at a lesser figure than that for which it can be acquired now, because the trend of land values has been upward.

I associate myself with the remarks of Senators who have commended the senior Senator from Nevada and the committee members, who have worked so diligently on the bill. I express the hope that the Senate will today pass the bill and that it will become law.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I am very happy to yield now to the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I also think it is interesting, remarkable, and appreciated that "inland" Senators are sympathetic toward some of the shoreline bills, and especially those referring to ocean shorelines. I am also appreciative of the concern of several of my colleagues who have come to me, including the Senator from Illinois, to say, "Where are the Oregon Dunes?" As they looked at the bill, they were concerned. When I showed not a great deal of unhappiness because the Oregon Dunes were not included, I hope I allayed their fears.

The reason why, Mr. President, is that long ago it was established by a committee which went to Oregon that the Oregon Dunes were one of the most remarkable areas in the United States deserving of preservation.

I carry with me yet a wonderful letter from the Secretary of the Interior preceding the current Secretary, in which it is flatly stated that the Oregon Dunes are the most spectacular sand dunes in North America.

I am interested to comment at this time that I find near the end of the committee report a statement from the Governor of Oregon, demonstrating an interest in the passage of S. 543. I, too, am interested, and I am glad my Governor is concerned with passage of the bill, even though it does not affect his State and my State. I only wish he could have been as forthright and as determined in coming to the support of the Oregon Dunes legislation, which has been before the Senate for some time. I hope, if he is interested in preserving all shorelines, that he will be especially interested in preserving the shorelines of his own State of Oregon. I invite him at this time to come to the Congress next year and to make a plea before the committee so ably headed by the Senator from Nevada, to urge that the Congress do what the Senators from Massachusetts were successful in having done in respect to their particular scenic shoreline.

I also wish to comment on a section of the bill which refers to aid to State areas. One of the arguments used in our own State of Oregon against the establishment of a national park was to the effect that the State had already set aside the coastline for preservation. That is very true. A very narrow strip of our entire coastline was seen by a Democratic Governor of 50 years ago as necessary for preservation. I believe it was the very first conservation measure of this sort ever passed by any State.

The National Park Service has pointed out that to provide a suitable recreation area, more of the inland area adjacent to the seashore needs to be included.

Before I conclude I wish to warn Senators—and this is thereby a warning to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture—of a situation which has occurred in my State of Oregon. I think the Oregon Dunes are not now a national seashore park because of a rivalry which exists between the Park Service and the Forest Service over which one should establish some of the areas for recreation. Last year a great Justice of the Supreme Court who is interested in our area—Justice William O. Douglas—came to Oregon. I was in attendance, at a meeting of conservationists and those interested in recreation, in Bend, Oreg., where Justice Douglas spoke. He questioned whether the Congress of the United States did the right thing when it passed what is called a multiple-use bill, which gave the Forest Service some privilege of establishing recreational areas. I find in trying to work with the two great organizations—and I am fond of both Secretaries and have been very active in working with both groups—that there is a natural rivalry, and as a result, some of us are left "holding the sack."

We now have had a statement of cooperation between the Secretaries. I am hopeful that they can "bump some heads" together and see that the good of this country depends upon conservation and preservation of these areas. Therefore, I read with special interest the two sections, one of which is an admonition or advice to the Secretary of the Interior, and another to the Secretary of Agriculture, that if both Secretaries were to make a report on the Oregon Dunes and then come before the committee, we would end where we are now, without a national seashore park. I hope that prevailing upon them will bring forth a little more cooperation, and if we pass the bill, perhaps it will help to bring about that result.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. There has been an area of conflict in a number of places in the country, but we are doing our best to try to adjust differences. I hope we may be successful in working it out even in respect to the Oregon Dunes. If we schedule some hearings, we will do our best as committee members to reconcile some of the differences, because our purpose is preservation and not interdepartmental rivalry. We shall try to reconcile the differences.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Relative to what has been said so ably by the Senator from Oregon, undoubtedly there are places in the West where there are conflicts of jurisdiction between the Department of the Interior, with reference to its handling of the public lands, and the Department of Agriculture, in its handling of the national forests. In the eastern part of the country, where there are many national forests but practically no public lands left, we would be without the benefit of literally hundreds of recreational areas which have been developed in the national forests if the multiple-use bill had not been passed, and if authority had not been conferred, along with the responsibility also, upon the Department of Agriculture in its development of the national forests to make available recreational spots there.

While I join the Senator from Oregon in hoping that conflicts may be ironed out as a result of the bill and that we may not find departments standing in each other's way, and in the way of the realization of public benefits of great value, I think it is completely necessary for us to have the Department of Agriculture fully authorized, directed, and responsible for the development of the many recreational areas in the national forests. Having enjoyed a good many of them myself, I wish to say that in such areas as, for instance, the Ocala National Forest, and the national forests in western North Carolina, northern Georgia, and in numerous other places in the East, literally millions of people in the eastern part of the country are enjoying the benefits of the legislation to which the Senator has referred.

I thank the Senator.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I was interested in the comments of the Senator from Florida. I do not wish to be understood as opposed to the National Forest Service, because I have enjoyed many pleasant camping experiences in the national forests. But I am reminded of the recipe for horse and rabbit stew, which is to take equal parts—one horse and one rabbit. This is the way the U.S. Forest Service has felt. If it established one campsite, it could cut down millions of board feet of fine timber, some of which encroached on wilderness areas and primitive areas. Such a thing happened under the previous administration, and I am hopeful that the present administration, knowing of the disapproval of this system—at least in my State—will see that it will not happen again. I have assurances that it will not.

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

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On page 6, lines 22 to 24, there is an authorization of $400,000 for a study to be conducted by the Forest Service. My question of the Senator from Nevada is whether or not the Forest Service has provided any justification for this sum. It seems to the Senator from Wisconsin that the amount is a substantial sum, and particularly remarkable in view of the fact that only $400,000 is provided in the first section of the bill—on page 4, lines 8 to 10—for a study of the 16 areas, none of which is in the public domain. This first study, therefore, will require a great deal of title search, legal fees, and so forth. But the justification for the second $400,000 would seem to be far less since none of such study would be required by the Forest Service of lands under its control, all of which is in the public domain.

Mr. BIBLE. I am happy to respond to the Senator from Wisconsin. Beginning at page 41 of the hearings, and running to page 43, there is a very detailed justification made by Mr. Crafts who is the Assistant Chief of the Forest Service. He is an expert in this particular field, and appears before our committee many times. I think that he made a very fine justification as to the need for the amount of money stated in order to study the national forests, the seashore areas, and the lakes and reservoirs that are at the present time within the national shorelines.

If the Senator would like, I could read his statement in full. It is very explicit. I think it was a complete justification for the necessity of appropriating $400,000 for the proposed examination.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am wondering why this study cannot be done in each area, and why the information is not so readily available that it would not require $400,000 to organize and provide it for Congress.

Mr. BIBLE. Many things are embraced in the study. There would be the economic effects on the lumber industry, the economic effects in certain areas in which there is grazing. For example, on page 44 Mr. Crafts testified that, if we were to examine the 50 areas stated in the bill that are of substantial size and develop the information requested, the plan, and reports to Congress, it would require an expenditure of about $8,000 per area. We do not think we could carry on the study for much less than that amount. I think he made an excellent justification for the expenditure of the $400,000 which was allowed by the committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I am sure that if the Communist dictators were to read the debate of the past hour they would logically reach the conclusion that the American people today are solely concerned about expanding recreational facilities, and have little, if any, interest in responding to the President's clarion call for building up our national defenses in the face of the Berlin crisis. I hesitate to sound a discordant note, because, as we sit here today and debate the features of this bill, of course, we recognize that it has much merit. It is a subject about which we ought to be concerned. But I think the timing is entirely wrong, as also later this week we will observe when the wilderness preservation bill is brought up for consideration.

The situation exists primarily because the 85th Congress passed legislation creating the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. The Commission is composed of 15 members, including 4 Members of the Senate and 4 Members of the House. The Commission has been functioning for more than 3 years and has had an appropriation of $2 million.

I wish the RECORD to show that I was not one of those who took an active part in proposing the creation of the Commission. However, I contend that if we ask a Commission of 15 persons to spend $2 million in 3 years to study all phases of outdoor recreation, and ask the Commission to make a detailed report next January to Congress, along with its recommendations for various recreational programs, in all fairness to the Commission Congress ought to wait until early in the next session to consider bills like the one we are now considering and the wilderness preservation bill. We know that no action will be taken on these bills by the House of Representatives during the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

So why are we expediting action on the pending bill? We shall sit around and do virtually nothing for the entire month of January during the next session. Next February we shall have little to do. However, by next January, we shall have before us the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. I believe we have a moral obligation to wait until the report is submitted to Congress before we take any action on programs like the one now before us.

Congress, with the cooperation of the executive departments, has been making good progress in developing, in a somewhat cautious and deliberate manner, our recreational facilities for this and succeeding generations.

The report at page 3 states:

> In 1954, the National Park Service was again asked what were the remaining opportunities to preserve desirable stretches on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, not only for their scenic and recreational values, but also for preservation of botanic and animal communities of significance.

I read further from the report:

> A second, similar survey of 1,700 miles of Pacific coastline was released by the National Park Service in 1959, including 241 miles of shoreline on the Channel Islands off California.
>
> The Great Lakes—Superior, Michigan, Huron, Erie, and Ontario—have 5,500 miles of shoreline.
>
> In its third major shoreline study of this "fourth shore" the National Park Service reported 66 areas of significance for acquisition for public use, rating 5, with 118 miles of shoreline, worthy of national status—Pigeon Point, the Huron Mountains, the Pictured Rocks, Sleeping Bear, and Indiana Dunes.

In addition to this activity by the Park Service, I am sure there is comparable activity by the U.S. Forest Service with respect to the public domain included within the forest boundaries. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which has reported the pending bill, within recent weeks has seen successful consummation also of a bill to create the Cape Cod Seashore Area and reported the Point Reyes Seashore Park in California, north of San Francisco.

The chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee stated a few moments ago that action probably will be taken this week by his subcommittee and by the full Interior Committee on the proposal to establish the Padre Island recreational area in Texas on the Gulf of Mexico.

I maintain that great progress has been made. While I can see considerable merit in the pending program, as represented in the proposed legislation, I believe the timing is entirely wrong. I am not one of those who in a spirit of subservience respond to every request made by our Commander in Chief. However it seems to me that in the past few months an appeal has been made to strengthen our national preparedness. There has been a calling up of young Americans in our Reserve units. Recently the Defense Department was given authority to add 10,000 civilian employees to the Defense Department, and within the past few days another 10,000 employees were authorized to be added to the rolls of that department.

Not much money is involved in the pending bill, but certainly it creates psychologically the situation that Americans do not have to be concerned about austerity, contrary to the point the President featured in his inaugural address. Apparently we are more concerned about recreation. While we play, perhaps the Russians will work. Then some day we must realize that we do not build up effective national preparedness by appealing to the people to give emphasis to recreation at a time of national crisis involving national survival.

I did not intend to belabor this point. I know that I sound a discordant note.

I am as much concerned about young Americans and about the coming generations, and providing the kind of national preparedness that will make it possible for them to live in this country and to work and to play, as are the ardent advocates of recreation, who say, "We do not have to worry about anything; just play, play, and play some more." That is being said at a time when we are facing a crisis in Latin America, Asia, Africa, Europe, and everywhere else in the world.

So the call for patriotism in this country is to emphasize day by day and week by week the necessity of providing more recreation for Americans and psychologically to discourage them from giving priority to national defense.

That is the reason, along with the need of waiting for the report of the Recreation Resources Review Commission, why I cannot support the pending bill, whereas I might do so very vigorously at a more appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 543) was passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar 763, S. 2156.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2156) to expand and extend the saline water conversion program being conducted by the Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 2, line 8, after the word "thereto", to insert "As used in this Act, the term 'saline water' includes sea water, brackish water, and other mineralized or chemically charged water, and the term 'United States' extends to and includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States."; on page 4, line 11, after the word "cause", to strike out "on-ite" and insert "on-site"; on page 5, after line 13, to insert:

(b) All research within the United States contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or authorized under authority of this Act, shall be provided for in such manner that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from such research developed by Government expenditure will (with such exceptions and limitations, if any, as the Secretary may find to be necessary in the interest of national defense) be available to the general public. This subsection shall not be construed as to deprive the owner of any background patent relating thereto of such rights as he may have thereunder.

On page 6, line 14, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "such sums" and insert "$75,000,000"; on page 7, line 6, after the word "further", to strike out "That contracts or agreements made in pursuance of this proviso shall provide that the results or information developed in connection therewith shall be available without cost to the program in the United States herein authorized" and insert "That every such contract or agreement made with any public or private agency in a foreign country shall contain provisions effective to insure that the results or information developed in connection therewith shall be available without cost to the United States for the use of the United States throughout the world and for the use of the general public within the United States.", on page 9, after line 13, to strike out:

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF CONVERSION PLANTS

Declaration of policy

SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this title to stimulate, through cooperative arrangements with water supply utilities serving the public, the construction of plants for the production, from sea water or brackish water, of water that is suitable for municipal or other beneficial consumptive uses, and thereby make maximum use of the research for the development and utilization of saline waters that is authorized by the Act of July 3, 1952, and maximum use of the demonstration plan program authorized by the joint resolution of September 2, 1958.

Application for financial assistance

SEC. 302. (a) Any State, or political subdivision or agency thereof, or publicly or privately owned utility organization (any such entity being hereinafter referred to as "organization") may submit to the Secretary of the Interior, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, an application for a loan, or an offer to sell to the United States securities of the organization, to finance the design and construction of a plant to produce, from sea water or brackish water, water that is suitable for municipal, industrial, domestic, or other beneficial consumptive use.

(b) Any application for a loan or offer to sell securities hereunder shall include a showing that the organization (1) holds or can acquire, pursuant to State law, all lands and interests in land, and rights to the use of water, which are necessary for the successful construction, operation, and maintenance of the plant, and (2) demonstrates ability and willingness to finance by other means the portion of the cost of design and construction that is not covered by the loan application or offer to sell securities.

(c) No application for a loan or offer to sell securities under this section shall be approved in an amount which exceeds 90 per centum of the estimated cost of design and construction, exclusive of land and water costs.

(d) As used in this section, the term "State" includes any of the Several States of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any of the territorial possessions of the United States.

Terms applicable to loans or purchases

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Interior may negotiate and execute an agreement with the organization which shall set out, among other things:

(1) the maximum amount of the loan or the securities to be purchased;

(2) the time and method for making the money available to the organization;

(3) a plan for the repayment of the loan in not more than forty years in periodic installments that need not necessarily be in equal amounts, and for the payment of interest on unamortized balances, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury; or in the case of an offer to sell securities, a plan of redemption that is consistent with the foregoing requirements with respect to a loan;

(4) provisions for assuring and securing the prompt repayment of the loan and interest or for the redemption of the securities; and

(5) provisions making the liability of the United States under the agreement contingent upon the availability of appropriations for the purpose.

Use of plants for which assistance is extended

SEC. 304. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to contract with a borrower under this title for the use of the borrower's plant facilities to further the demonstration program authorized by title II of this Act, and the Act of July 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 328), and to provide in the contract for a credit on the organization's loan, or for a cancellation of its securities, as compensation to the borrower for the use made of its facilities in connection with such programs.

Authorization for appropriations

SEC. 305. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and any such appropriation shall remain available until expended.

On page 12, after line 21, to strike out:

TITLE IV—GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

SEC. 401. It is the purpose of this title to cooperatively assist in assuring that ample potable water is made available to cities and communities where economic growth has been retarded or where the public health and welfare is endangered by the lack of sufficient natural fresh water of a quantity and quality suitable to meet municipal water supply requirements.

SEC. 402. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make grants for the construction of saline water conversion plants or to negotiate contracts with any State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, a territorial possession, or political subdivision or agency thereof, or a publicly or privately owned utility organization (any such entity being hereinafter referred to as "organization") in order that the organization may provide adequate water suitable for municipal, industrial, domestic, or other beneficial consumptive use.

(b) Grants for saline water conversion facilities are to be made only after it has been ascertained that other sources of suitable natural water supplies are not available to the city or community making such application. In addition, grants will be made only to those cities or communities where the existing fresh water supply is inadequate and where a saline waterplant would not be geographically, technically, and economically justified, but would also serve to advance science and technology in the field of saline water conversion.

SEC. 403. Any application for a grant hereunder shall include (1) a showing that the organization is in need of supplemental

supplies of fresh water, (2) a showing that additional natural supplies of fresh water are not readily available, (3) the cost and quality of present supplies of fresh water, (4) the estimated cost of new sources of fresh water including (a) the cost of development, and (b) the cost and quality of delivered water, (5) an estimate of the amount of additional water required to meet anticipated demands, and (6) a price that the organization can afford to pay for potable water.

SEC. 404. (a) A grant to an organization pursuant to this title may cover necessary capital investment of saline water conversion facilities in an amount great enough to reduce the organization's cost of the product water to an economically competitive price, but a grant may not exceed 90 per centum of the total investment;

(b) A contract with an organization negotiated pursuant to this title may provide for a Federal payment for the cost of product water obtained from the conversion facility that is in excess of a fair and equitable price, mutually agreed upon the organization and the Secretary.

SEC. 405. Any organization that receives a grant or contract under the provisions of this title shall be required to provide operating, engineering, and economic data as may be set forth in the agreement with the Secretary of the Interior in order that this information may be used to further the development of low-cost saline water conversion processes in the national interest.

SEC. 406. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, with such funds to remain available until expended.

And on page 15, line 5, to change the title number from "V" to "III"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—SALINE WATER RESEARCH

SECTION 1. The Act of July 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 328), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951–1958), is further amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. In view of the increasing shortage of usable surface and ground water in many parts of the Nation and the importance of finding new sources of supply to meet its present and future water needs, it is the policy of the Congress to provide for the development of practicable low-cost means for the large-scale production of water of a quality suitable for municipal, industrial, agricultural, and other beneficial consumptive uses from sea and other saline waters and other mineralized or chemically charged waters, and for studies and research related thereto. As used in this Act, the term 'saline water' includes sea water, brackish water, and other mineralized or chemically charged water, and the term 'United States' extends to and includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

"SEC. 2. In order to accomplish the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall—

"(a) conduct, encourage, and promote fundamental scientific engineering research and basic studies to develop the best and most economical processes and methods for converting saline and brackish water into water suitable for beneficial consumptive purposes;

"(b) conduct engineering research and technical development work to determine, by laboratory and pilot plant testing, the results of the research and studies aforesaid in order to develop processes and plant designs to the point where they can de demonstrated on a large and practical scale;

"(c) study methods for the recovery and marketing of byproducts resulting from the production of water for the purpose of ascertaining the possibilities of offsetting the costs of such production by commercially valuable byproducts; and

"(d) undertake economic studies and surveys to determine present and prospective comparative costs of achieving water for beneficial consumptive purposes by the leading saline water processes employed in various geographical areas in the United States.

"SEC. 3. In carrying out his functions under section 2 of this Act, the Secretary may—

"(a) make grants to educational institutions and scientific organizations and enter into contracts with such institutions and organizations and with industrial or engineering firms;

"(b) acquire the services of chemists, physicists, engineers, and other personnel;

"(c) utilize the facilities of Federal scientific laboratories;

"(d) establish and operate necessary facilities and test sites at which to carry on the continuous research, testing, development, and programing necessary to effectuate the purposes of this title;

"(e) acquire secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, licenses, land and interests in land (including water rights), plants and facilities and other property or rights by purchase, license, lease, or donation;

"(f) assemble and maintain pertinent and current scientific literature, both domestic and foreign, and issue bibliographical data with respect thereto;

"(g) cause on-site inspections to be made of promising projects, domestic and foreign, and, in the case of projects located in the United States, cooperate and participate in their development in instances in which the purposes of this Act shall be served thereby;

"(h) foster and participate in national and international conferences relating to saline water conversion;

"(i) coordinate, correlate, and publish information obtained with a view to advancing the development of low-cost saline water conversion projects; and

"(j) cooperate with other Federal departments and agencies, with State and local departments, agencies, and instrumentalities, and with interested persons, firms, institutions, and organizations.

"SEC. 4. (a) Research activities undertaken by the Secretary shall be coordinated or conducted jointly with the Department of Defense to the end that developments under this Act which are primarily of a civil nature will contribute to the defense of the Nation and that developments which are primarily of a military nature will, to the greatest practicable extent compatible with military and security requirements, be available to advance the purposes of this Act and to strengthen the civil economy of the Nation. The fullest cooperation by and with the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of State, and other concerned agencies shall also be carried out in the interest of achieving the objectives of this Act.

"(b) All research within the United States contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or authorized under authority of this Act, shall be provided for in such manner that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from such research developed by Government expenditure will (with such exceptions and limitations, if any, as the Secretary may find to be necessary in the interest of national defense) be available to the general public. This subsection shall not be construed as to deprive the owner of any background patent relating thereto of such rights as he may have thereunder.

"SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary may dispose of water and byproducts resulting from his operations under this Act. All moneys received from dispositions under this section shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(b) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter existing law with respect to the ownership and control of water.

"SEC. 6. The Secretary shall make reports to the President and the Congress at the beginning of each regular session of the action taken or instituted by him under the provisions of this Act. Any such report may include recommendations for further legislation.

"SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior may issue rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

"SEC. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated $75,000,000, to remain available until expended, as may be necessary (a) to carry out the provisions of this Act during the fiscal years 1962 to 1971, inclusive; (b) to finance, for not more than two years beyond the end of said period, such grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and studies as may theretofore have been undertaken pursuant to this Act; and (c) to finance, for not more than three years beyond the end of said period, such activities as are required to correlate, coordinate, and round out the results and research undertaken pursuant to this Act: *Provided*, That funds available in any one year for research and development may, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State to assure that such activities are consistent with the foreign policy objectives of the United States, be expended in cooperation with public or private agencies in foreign countries in the development of processes useful to the program in the United States: *And provided further*, That every such contract or agreement made with any public or private agency in a foreign country shall contain provisions effective to insure that the results or information developed in connection therewith shall be available without cost to the United States for the use of the United States throughout the world and for the use of the general public within the United States."

TITLE II—DEMONSTRATION PLANTS

SEC. 210. The joint resolution of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1706), is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection 1(c) is amended to read:

"(c) As used in this joint resolution, the term 'demonstration plant' means a plant of sufficient size and capacity to establish on a day-to-day operating basis the optimum attainable reliability, engineering, operating, and economic potential of the particular sea water conversion process or the brackish water treatment process, including variations and combinations thereof, selected by the Secretary of the Interior for utilization in such plant."

(b) The following new subsection 1(d) is added:

"(d) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, pursuant to the provisions of the Act of July 3, 1952, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951–1958), and in accordance with this joint resolution, to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of additional demonstration plants for the production, from sea water or brackish water, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses. Some of such demonstration plants shall be capable of producing not to exceed fifty million gallons per day, in order to demonstrate the complete operating and economic potentials of the most advanced saline water processes. Wherever possible such demonstration plants shall be established in cooperation with a State or a political subdivision thereof that participates in other saline water programs."

(c) Section 4 is amended to read:

"The authority of the Secretary of the Interior under this joint resolution to construct, operate, and maintain demonstration

plants shall terminate upon the expiration of fifteen years after the date on which this joint resolution is approved. Upon the expiration of a period deemed adequate for demonstration purposes of each plant, but not to exceed such fifteen-year period, the Secretary shall proceed as promptly as practicable to dispose of any plants so constructed by sale to the highest bidder, or as may otherwise be directed by Act of Congress. Upon such sale, there shall be returned to any State or public agency which has contributed financial assistance under section 3 of this joint resolution a proper share of the net proceeds of the sale."

(d) Section 7 is amended to read:

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the demonstration plants and for the administration of the program authorized by this resolution."

TITLE III—ASSISTANCE TO OTHER AGENCIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

SEC. 501. It is the purpose of this title to provide technical and other assistance to departments, agencies, bureaus, and components of the Federal Government toward the establishment of land-based saline water conversion plants throughout the world where there are limited other sources of fresh water supply and where national defense and the interests and benefits to mankind are enhanced thereby.

SEC. 502. The Secretary of Defense (including subdivisions thereof) and the heads of other concerned agencies shall seek the cooperation and assistance of the Secretary of the Interior in the design, construction, and operation of land-based saline water conversion plants for the purpose of utilization of saline water as a strategic water supply resource in the defense of the United States.

SEC. 503. The Secretary of State, whenever he deems it appropriate in order to accomplish the objectives of any Act of Congress designed to assist in the economic development of foreign nations, shall seek the cooperation and assistance of the Secretary of the Interior in establishing saline water conversion plants in those areas of the world where natural supplies of fresh water are in limited supply.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the bill has been made the unfinished business. There will be no debate on the measure tonight. It is quite possible that tomorrow it will be laid aside to enable the Senate to return to the consideration of other matters.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO MEET DURING SENATE SESSION ON WEDNESDAY MORNING NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate on the morning of Wednesday next.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO MEET DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader agree to a unanimous-consent request to have the Committee on the District of Columbia meet tomorrow morning for the purpose of considering the very important proposed election law, in which the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] is interested? The hearing relates to the constitutional amendment providing voting privileges for the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I anticipate no difficulty in according the committee the right to sit during the session of the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, because of the persuasion of the able Senator from Nevada and the able majority leader, I shall not object, but seeing my Republican leader now in the Chamber, I simply look to him and ask him whether he concurs in the request.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I fully concur.

Mr. KUCHEL. The concurrence is unanimous on this side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the distinguished Senators for the favorable action they have taken.

ERADICATION OF GRASSROOTS ANTI-COMMUNIST DRIVE AND GAGGING OF MILITARY SPEAKERS3 AND SEMINARS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate has performed an invaluable service by making public the testimony of Mr. Edward Hunter and the documentation of Mr. Hunter's testimony. Mr. Hunter has authoritatively described in detail both the method of operation of communism in the United States today and the circles utilized by Communists to conduct their campaign of psychological warfare.

Mr. Hunter's experience in this field is extensive, as is appreciated by all of those familiar with his published works, both in the field of Communist propaganda and psychological war. Among the published works of Mr. Hunter are "Brainwashing in Red China," "Brainwashing: From Pavlov to Powers," "The Story of Mary Liu," "The Black Book on Red China," and "The Past Present." Particularly pertinent to the testimony given by Mr. Hunter to the Internal Security Subcommittee are his books on brainwashing. In "Brainwashing: From Pavlov to Powers," Mr. Hunter in the last chapter of this book points out the vulnerability of Americans to Communist brainwashing techniques and stresses the need for anti-Communist educational efforts in our own country. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the last chapter of "Brainwashing: From Pavlov to Powers," entitled "Now It's Our Turn," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NOW IT'S OUR TURN—WE ADOPT A CODE

When this book originally appeared, after our exchange of war prisoners at Panmunjom, under the title "Brainwashing: The Story of Men Who Defied It," it ended with the preceding chapter. The dismal exhibition put on in a Moscow court in mid-1960 by the American pilot, Francis Gary Powers, and its sinister ramifications, impels the republication of this book, retitled and with this new concluding chapter.

When "Brainwashing" was first published, I felt sure that one of its theses that would certainly go unquestioned was the underlying importance of a man's convictions in his maintenance of mental stamina. Not only has this been questioned, but some people have violently rejected it. My first experience of this kind was on the "Tex and Jinx" radio show in New York. The outstanding liberal lawyer, Morris Ernst, who had just returned from a trip to the Soviet Union, shared the program with me. Tex McCrary asked me how brainwashing could be resisted. When I mentioned a man's convictions as his strongest defense, Mr. Ernst reacted at once and loudly: "I don't believe convictions have anything to do with it," he cried into the microphone.

In a talk before an adult education class in Great Neck, N.Y., I mentioned faith as a strength-bestowing element. Two women bent toward each other over the aisle and one said, "What can he mean by 'faith'? Surely he can't be talking about religion." "I don't understand what he means by it, either," the other replied. They were middle-class mothers. What do parents with that outlook teach their children?

These were two of innumerable illustrations I came across of the softening up of American character, the primary process in brainwashing. The same people who had said that Mao Tse-tung was no Communist, only an agrarian reformer, were now insisting that brainwashing meant only its indoctrination process, with physical atrocities. This left the field open for the softening up process, the only one in which the Reds are interested at this time in the United States. We are fast submitting to it as a nation.

These reactions in America seem to indicate that the enlisted men and officers who fell into Red hands in Korea were a representative segment of our people. Their vulnerabilities were those of the population generally. The distinction was that they were caught.

This corrosion of American character was documented vividly in the searing facts collected by Maj. William E. Mayer, a neuropsychiatrist of the U.S. Army Medical Corps, who was sent abroad for a special study of the returnees. He cited the failure, unique in our history, of any captured American to escape. Yet few guards were posted at the POW camps. (In one instance there were 6 guards for 600 Americans, and this without barbed wire, searchlight, or any of the other equipment usual for a detention area.) Three thousand of more than 7,000 Americans died in captivity, whereas out of 229 captured Turks, almost all sick and wounded, all 229 survived. The difference was in morale and resistance: a reflection of the sense of values taught from the cradle up. Captured Americans discarded discipline, and made personal advantage—a dog-eat-dog policy—their sole criterion of conduct, whereas each Turk was sure of the tender care and protection of his fellows, and found refuge in his convictions. By defying death, displaying a readiness to die, the Turks lived; by fearing death, being unwilling to die, Americans perished.

Major Mayer disclosed in a lengthy interview in the U.S. News & World Report of February 24, 1956, that a third of the captured Americans collaborated to some extent with the enemy, at least to the degree of signing "peace" petitions.

The available information that could have prepared them to face the ordeal of capture was hushed up, first because of our effort to

get along with the Communists, and then because of our desire not to annoy them during negotiations.

A Washington Embassy official informed me that somewhere between the White House and the Pentagon, when orders were issued to suppress all reference to Red atrocities in Korea, someone included brainwashing in the injunction, on the correct but unfortunate premise that it, too, was an atrocity. Our Korean command officially asked that the book "Brainwashing in Red China" be put into the book kits for the troops. It never got there. The high officer in charge couldn't find out why when he returned to Washington.

Meanwhile. Red China, backstopped by Moscow, was broadcasting peace petitions and germ warfare confessions by American POW's. A movie of the confessions was distributed in Asia, Africa, and anywhere else that it could be shown secretly or by invitation. Our official reaction was to make believe all this didn't exist, thus in effect collaborating with the Communists in their propaganda maneuver. Our Government took the stand that the charges were so patently untrue that they were unworthy of refutation. This, likewise, played into enemy hands; Red propaganda made sure that our official silence looked like a form of confession. American POW's were discouraged and misled by it. Some found justification in it for acceding to Red demands. "Why didn't Washington give us a lead if it wanted us to deny those things?" they asked.

Our negative approach, utterly contrary to our traditions of "open skies" on information, was not the result of any planning, but the consequence of hesitation and infiltration. We had been maneuvered into discarding our historic adherence to principles, substituting for it a popularity race in international affairs.

Information coming to the Pentagon made it evident that the Chinese Communists were preparing a major propaganda coup. What it was was not difficult to figure out from the pro-Red broadcasts being attributed to American captives, and the pro-Red propaganda in the letters from GI's that wives and mothers were taking to the FBI; letters that caused the women to say that some strange and vicious influence was being exerted on their sons and husbands.

After the information that could have made the situation understandable had been hushed up for so long, we now issued uncertain warnings of Red trickery, but much too late for them to be intelligently digested. The taboo word "brainwashing" began to appear, but no information explaining it. Readers suddenly came upon headlines such as "U.S. Plans Rewashing of Washed Brains," and were understandably repelled. They found incomprehensible such leading paragraphs as: "Army officials said today they are ready to administer an immediate psychological antidote to any released Korean war prisoners whose minds have been poisoned by Communist propaganda. A carefully thought-out program has been set up to 'reorient' them to the American way of life, and to help them discover for themselves how the Communists have dinned lies into their ears during their months of captivity."

Tabloids appeared with enormous, black headlines reading: "Brainwashed POW's Reach United States." One news agency spoke of a "mystery plane" that was taking returnees from Little Switch to Valley Forge Hospital in Pennsylvania "for psychological treatment." Another referred to "a cloak of military secrecy" over returnees, who were called "victims of Communist brainwash propaganda" by the Air Force.

The identical organs that had suppressed the background information which would have made this comprehensible were quick with interviews saying not to believe any of it, that it was a dirty smear on our heroes. A number of sociologists lent academic standing to this campaign of refutation, after having fought a rearguard battle to hush up the word "brainwashing." Indignant editorials appeared demanding "an apology from the Pentagon," and Congressmen attacked "Army bungling." The result, of course, was the usual: a retreat to hush-hush.

Yet a miracle had taken place in the POW camps, something of which every American could have been proud. Although just as uninformed as their buddies, a fair number of men (labeled "reactionaries" by the Reds) had nonetheless preserved their own and their country's honor, and had mapped out the road to survival: they knew the face of communism and were determined to describe it. Only then would their sufferings not have been in vain. Some told me they had preserved themselves from collapse by clinging to this objective.

The red carpet was almost literally thrown out for them when they alighted back home from ship or plane. They were received by brass bands, wined and dined, and photographed—and then whisked away from reporters to scattered posts and forbidden to speak out; unlike the period of Little Switch, in the time of Big Switch we had the situation under control. Those few who had been able to slip out some pictures of the true situation were railroaded to faraway posts. Hurt, angry, and well knowing the tragic consequences of a blind, negative policy, the bulk of these highest caliber, war-tested officers left the service as soon as they could arrange it; practically all the airmen did so.

What stunned them, too, was what seemed to them to be a whitewash of the progressives, as the Reds called those who had abetted the Communist cause. The most notorious of the latter were quickly demobilized or otherwise put beyond the reach of prosecution.

Unknown to the resisters, while they were still in captivity, a scene took place in the Pentagon that could have been a turning point in our history, and may yet be so if sufficient people are alerted to it. At the time, I was a consultant on mind warfare, employed by the Air Force. The incident was a matter of public concern, unrelated to military secrets.

High-level officers from all the services occupied both sides of the traditional long and narrow green table for several days of analysis of what was occurring in the Communist-run POW camps. It became evident that this reflected character, directly involving home, school, and church. Character had deteriorated. For the first time in our history, a code of conduct was ultimately drawn up for our Armed Forces. President Eisenhower proclaimed it, along with explanatory material and the text of the report made by an Advisory Committee on Prisoners of War for the then Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson. Here is the code:

"1. I am an American fighting man. I serve in the forces which guard my country and our way of life. I am prepared to give my life in their defense.

"2. I will never surrender of my own free will. If in command I will never surrender my men while they still have the means to resist.

"3. If I am captured I will continue to resist by all means available. I will make every effort to escape and aid others to escape. I will accept neither parole nor special favor from the enemy.

"4. If I become a prisoner of war, I will keep faith with my fellow prisoners. I will give no information nor take part in any action which might be harmful to my comrades. If I am senior, I will take command. If not I will obey the lawful orders of those appointed over me and will back them up in every way.

"5. When questioned, should I become a prisoner of war, I am bound to give only name, rank, service number, and date of birth. I will evade answering further questions to the utmost of my ability. I will make no oral or written statements disloyal to my country and its allies or harmful to their cause.

"6. I will never forget that I am an American fighting man, responsible for my actions, and dedicated to the principles which made my country free. I will trust in my God and in the United States of America."

Some time later I met one of the officers who had been intimately involved in these proceedings. "Some of us who followed it through from the beginning waited outside Secretary Wilson's office that day while he was deciding whether to approve the advisory committee report," he told me. "We were so tense we could hardly speak. The tension had been unbearable, the pressures unbelievable. When the door opened and we were informed that he had signed the document, tears gushed from some eyes; I admit from mine."

Some years elapsed before I saw him again. In contrast to his previous exuberance, he was now downcast as we walked along a Virginia street. "I can't put my finger on it, but it was as if nothing had happened," he said. "As if it were a dream. Once the documents were signed and proclaimed, they were filed away, then that was the end of them. I never thought it possible. The program that was to restore American stamina and teach our forces to understand the wiles of communism has been sabotaged. I am terribly fearful for our future."

The commander of a small airbase told me that discipline at his training center had been destroyed because every time an effort was made to implement any provision in the new program, it was stymied in some way or other. This was the shadow world of the committee system.

When an attempt was made to simulate prison camp conditions, in order to acquaint trainees with what they would confront if captured, it was publicly exposed as harsh, and was hastily abolished.

Education concerning communism was harassed until it became vague and dealt only in generalities. One could be against sin, but not against any particular sin. The withdrawal of the Air Center Training Manual early in 1960 was an instance of how brazenly this suppression operated. The Defense Department admitted it had ordered the manual destroyed without regard to the truth or falsity of the statements made in it. The charges in the manual were undoubtedly true, it was admitted. Members of the House of Representatives, who were making an inquiry into the affair, were told that training on such matters "must not include the specific"; probably the most revealing declaration made. We teach our students that generalities should not be believed, and to insist on the specific. With generalities and the specific both excluded, the only alternative was to avoid the subject entirely, leaving the explaining to the Communists by default. The policy of being all things to all men and making popularity the objective of policy, took precedence over the teaching of mental stamina and character.

That was the situation later in 1960, when the Powers case erupted in an environment made artificially calm by the use of two Communist code words, "peaceful coexistence," mystically repeated like a spell.

THE POWERS CASE

Francis Gary Powers stood in the dock in the heavily chandeliered Hall of Columns of the House of Unions in Moscow on August 17, 18, and 19, of 1960. He had flown some of America's most needed cold war missions, on which the survival of the free world

might well hinge. He had been equipped with everything of a physical nature for which a need could be foreseen. Had he possessed the will he might have made that the date of his rebirth, and perhaps that of his country's as well. Powers needed only to have shouted his defiance to have become an ageless war hero, and an inspiration to all peoples. One need only recall the conduct of Communists and patriots who were put on trial, the Dimitroffs and the Nathan Hales of history, to realize what great use can be made of such a forum.

The Soviet Union wanted the world to see Powers as the image of the United States, and to believe that it was America on trial. We officially disregarded this brazen maneuver; what a difference there would have been had we been morally prepared to meet this challenge. We ought not be surprised that others saw in Powers the image of his country and a manifestation of its sense of values. The question in their minds was not whether he was formally delegated to represent the United States, but whether he was the typical American of 1960. We may not like the image, yet there it stared back at us, like our face in the mirror.

Powers might have stepped forth from a POW camp in North Korea back in 1953, for all the knowledge he showed of the ways and wiles of the Communists. The intervening years had been brushed away, as if we had learned nothing from that dreary experience. One new code and its accompanying documents had only lulled the American public's anxieties, not provided the internal reforms promised.

No more depressing display of a lack of motivation can be imagined than that given by Powers. He told the court he "felt very lucky" to get a job with Central Intelligence Agency—not because it provided an enviable opportunity to serve his country, and to help preserve the freedoms for which other countrymen had suffered and died—but because his pay would equal that of the chief pilot of a commercial airline. "I was pleased with the idea of flying service with a big salary," he said. Nowhere in his testimony was there any allusion to patriotism. He was not even an adventurer. He could not have better filled the role that the Kremlin gave him: that of an individual activated by the desire for money and bodily comforts.

The Communists had two psychological objectives. We should have known them; they did not differ from what they had been all along. The same method had been used in accusation meetings against missionaries and foreign educators by Red China.

The immediate goal was humiliation. The accused, as a symbol of his profession and his country, must be humiliated.

Moscow sought to thoroughly humiliate Powers, and to transfer this image of disgrace to the whole body of American society. Powers' family was expertly exploited toward the same end. Also, the Kremlin was pictured as the all-powerful father, from whom all favors flowed and to whom submission must be shown. Nothing that Powers said or did conflicted with this part of the image, nor did anything said by our State Department. Our treaty with the U.S.S.R. guarantees us the right to contact any American prisoner; Washington avoided unpleasantness by simply not bringing it up. Only in one heroic gesture did the American Government act with dignity. This was when Washington admitted the espionage character of the flight, blamed Soviet aggressive acts, and declared we would continue overflights as in the past. Unfortunately, the forced character of the announcement detracted from its effect.

The Kremlin's second psychological objective was a display of weakness on the part of the defendant, and an identification of this weakness in the world's eyes with the American Nation. In no instance did Powers demonstrate resistance. He declared he had no feeling against Soviet Russia. "I never took much notice of political things," he said, as if communism were just another political philosophy. He declared he had never even voted in his own country. In commenting on the noiseless pistol found among his supplies, he made the amazing statement: "Unfortunately nobody but myself knows I could not kill a person, even to save my own life. I could not do it." Yet he had been a lieutenant in the Air Force. For what sort of combat had he been trained?

His U-2 plane was packed with supersecret instrumentation. A cardinal rule is that such a plane must never fall into enemy hands. It was equipped with explosive devices for its destruction. Powers had a cunningly contrived poison pin with which to take his life if he felt he was being broken. The Communists made much of his failure to utilize any of this. "Smart man," Khrushchev remarked satirically in his speech to the Supreme Soviet.

Powers never specifically said his plane was struck by a rocket. This is particularly significant in view of the strange fact of his capture alive, and the capture of so much equipment intact. Was Powers a sitting duck? Had his plane been sabotaged? The Peshawar Airport in Pakistan can hardly be considered secure from agents. I remember wandering into it once when I lost my way.

The political objectives of the Kremlin were as definite as their psychological ones. The immediate purpose was to provide an alibi for torpedoing the summit conference. Powers cooperated by assuming that it broke up "as a direct result of my flight," for which he felt "sincerely sorry." The long-range political objective was to draw our allies away from us by making them mistrust our motivations and lose faith in our reliability. Powers accordingly incriminated practically every ally we had.

He spilled out names left and right, naming those with whom he had worked in his 10-10 detachment, officers he had seen there, even passing visitors such as Cardinal Spellman.

All of our friends abroad, involved in these operations, must be worrying over what is contained in the hundreds, possibly thousands, of pages of material Powers gave the enemy. Only small, selected portions were read at the trial. The existence of this great mass of unrevealed testimony was made plain by references frequently made in the indictment to four volumes of interrogation material, numbering at least hundreds of pages each.

Moscow lost no time in using the evidence Powers gave by putting direct pressure on other nations. America's allies were officially threatened with rocket attack if they continued to permit their soil to be used as bases. Jittery England was threatened in highly insulting language.

Powers was brainwashed. As with his predecessors in North Korea, the Reds did not seek to indoctrinate him, except as this might develop naturally in the softening up process. Just as did our captured men in Korea, he fell into enemy hands with the softening up already begun by his own country.

In a press conference the day the trial began, President Eisenhower answered the first question by saying that the flier's plea of guilty "doesn't show evidence that he was brainwashed." Because he had not been given a massive brain-changing, complete with physical torture and drugs, the brainwashing was not recognized. Once again Eisenhower demonstrated his lack of understanding of modern psychological warfare, especially the Communist strategy of mind attack. His off-the-cuff reply naively helped clear the air for the Communists, giving credence to their twisted language and falsifications. Nowadays it is as useful to the Reds to have brainwashing considered only as an indoctrination process, accompanied by physical torture, as it was for Mao Tse-tung, during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, to be called an agrarian democrat and not a Communist.

Powers was cut off from contact with Americans for 109 days from his capture until he was brought into the courtroom. He was exposed all this time only to the Communist brand of interrogation, which is inextricably interwoven with brainwashing. Indictment in Russia is practically equivalent to being found guilty in Western jurisprudence. The role of the Soviet defense attorney is to determine how the guilty individual can be made useful again to the party and the state, and to bring out any doctrinal considerations in his favor which might have political bearing. This is what Mikhail I. Grinyov, Powers' defense attorney, did by stressing that Powers came of a workingman's family, that he violated his country's orders by "testimony he had repeatedly given of his own will to the investigator," and particularly by his cryptic reference to "the internal change he [Powers] had begun to experience since the moment he came into contact with Soviet people."

The lengthy isolation imposed on prisoners is itself a drastic softening up pressure. This showed throughout Powers' own testimony, by such telltale remarks as: "I understand a lot more now than I did before." He was "profoundly sorry" he had "taken any part" in such missions. He was "sincerely sorry." Never once did he hint that his work had anything to do with his country's protection, even when his "defense" lawyer castigated the United States as viciously as did the prosecutor. The words Powers did speak sounded strangely like the self-accusations and confessions that came from brainwashed POW's in Korea.

In letters received by Barbara, his wife, signed by him, he wrote: "Needless to say my life would be much different if I had it to live over again." He wrote her of "getting more than I can eat and plenty of sleep," that he was "smoking too much—these cigarettes here are pretty good." As time went on, he was given American novels to read, and even a Bible. He told the court: "All the time I was treated very nicely."

Communist routine is never to give a prisoner proper sleep or a balanced diet until they had what they want from him. They provide ordinary comforts as psychological or actual bribery, when they wish to keep a prisoner in a state of good will and gratitude, or after they are sure of him. They obviously concluded quite soon that Powers was giving all they required.

Nevertheless, on our side of the ledger is an incalculable psychological victory, the extent of which cannot possibly be assessed at this time. The main line of the Moscow-Peiping axis, and Khrushchev's specialized mission, has been to remove all hope of assistance from the peoples on the dark side of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains while persuading the free world that the populations in the Soviet bloc support the Communist regimes, when in actuality their hatred for it is very deepseated. This propaganda strategy has been progressing according to schedule. Khrushchev's visit to America deflated hopes everywhere within the Communist countries. Every propaganda facility the Communist hierarchy possessed was mobilized to exploit his trip. One glossy Red magazine I saw, published in many languages, was full of colored photographs of Soviet leaders in virtual bear hugs with American authorities everywhere from Washington and New York to San Francisco. On its back cover was a map of the world, the hammer and sickle superimposed over it.

Yet the U-2 flight suddenly brought home to the peoples within the Red domains that an American airplane had actually penetrated 1,250 miles inside Soviet Russia's supposedly inviolable borders. They then learned that we had been crisscrossing the U.S.S.R. for 4 years. This was all these people must have had ears for. What renewed hope it must have stimulated. No greater evidence can be found of the paucity of our psychological warfare agencies, and the failure of our leaders to understand the kind of war in which we are engaged, than their failure to take advantage of this plum.

The Communists are extraordinarly practical in their choice of which of their enemies' vulnerabilities to exploit. They drill away at these weaknesses until they bring about the collapse of their victim, whether an individual or a nation. Communist documents captured in the Korean war objectively analyzed the American soldier as opportunistic, lacking in staying power, loyalties, and discipline, and having little knowledge of his Nation's history. These points were the ones on which the brainwashers focused. In Powers' case, they concluded they had in their hands an American who thoroughly exemplified the negative traits they wished the world to regard as typically American.

The primary lesson we can learn from the Powers spectacle is that we still must close the moral gap exposed by the cold war. The Communists were correct in equating Powers with his country. This should warn us that there has been a serious deterioration since the early 1950's. Nothing in life can remain static. The change in this case has been a pronounced extension of the softening up process in our own people.

This conforms with the analysis made earlier in this book by the neuropsychiatrist, Dr. Freedom, of the creation of national neuroses by communism for purposes of subversion and conquest, under a perverted use of the clinical findings of Dr. Pavlov. Unless our people are alerted to this most evil strategy, they cannot be expected to take effective steps to immunize themselves against its spread. No less than the corruption of the whole moral fiber of our Nation is sought. Once this is achieved, the enemy will have no worry about being able to complete the remainder of the brainwashing treatment.

Instead of falling into the trap of making Powers a scapegoat, we must recognize that this concerns a common ailment. The softening up of the United States has been Khrushchev's most ambitious project. The Kremlin knows that the longer this goes undetected, the more difficult it will be to recognize and counteract.

This creeping neurosis has, like any other disease, its symptoms. Foremost among these is the loss of a sense of indignation. Ours has been fading away in every sphere of life, from our sluggish attitude regarding teenage murders on city streets, to our supine reaction to Moscow's brutal suppression of the Hungarian freedom revolt, and to genocide in Tibet. This deterioration in feelings, as was pointed out by Dr. Freedom, is a common medical phenomenon, found for instance in neurotic depressions.

We cannot bank on having the time we expect. A dangerous theory that has become increasingly accepted is one which holds that we shall have communism with us all our lifetime, and possibly during our children's lives as well. This assumes that communism does not contain within itself an aggressive dynamism that makes struggle a permanent fact of life. In Communist language, struggle has war as a subordinate factor. Whether this struggle takes a psychological, cold or hot war form is a matter of tactics and timing. The Communists have never waited on the initiative of others.

The pat proceedings of the Moscow trial of Powers, the false logic of the evidence presented, the threatening declarations and notes by the Soviet Union, the violent speeches and menacing off-the-cuff statements by Khrushchev and other Red chieftains, all point to one conclusion: the Moscow-Peiping axis has built up a spurious case for itself internationally, wording it in a manner that would seemingly justify a Pearl Harbor sputnik or rocket attack against the American mainland, or anywhere else Communist strategists feel advantageous for conquest of the world. They have already exploited the Powers case in such a way that any attack of this kind would be labelled "defense" against "American aggression."

Heaven will not help us if we are so foolhardy as to fail to be on watch and prepared every moment, particularly during any negotiations. Instead of relaxing our guard at such times, we must increase it. We must not forget the timing of the Pearl Harbor attack in Hawaii.

The Korean war gave us a second chance by showing the Communist hand in brainwashing. We failed to learn from this. The Powers case has given us a third chance. We may not have a fourth chance to implement the program we set up to restore marrow to our bones.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this chapter is indeed a prelude to Mr. Hunter's testimony before the Internal Security Subcommittee and should be considered in conjunction with the Internal Security Subcommittee hearing. The entire book is of inestimable value, and the country as a whole would benefit if every citizen would read it. As is the case with many books of such a nature, it can rarely be found on the shelves of local bookshops. It can, however, be obtained from the Bookmailer, Inc., Post Office Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York, N.Y.

Mr. President, in his testimony before the Internal Security Subcommittee, Mr. Hunter supplies the details of how and why the anti-Communist campaign is being conducted. Perhaps the most potentially helpful lesson we can gain from Mr. Hunter's comprehensive analysis is that the Peiping-Moscow axis works more effectively in its psychological warfare through non-Communists and even naive anti-Communists than through Reds themselves. The Communists are too obvious. Without non-Communists and even anti-Communists who can be maneuvered or trapped into taking some position helpful to the Reds, they would get nowhere.

This is particularly so in the communications field—in the press. Of course, persons such as those named in the Internal Security Subcommittee document by Mr. Hunter as the authors of dispatches that appeared in the New York Times and certain other papers need by no stretch of the imagination be Communists. As Communists their usefulness to the Red mechanism would be gone.

This provides a special responsibility, however, to such newspaper correspondents and editors, and others whose work influences attitudes. Mr. Hunter brings this out in his testimony. Writers of such distinction as Cabell Phillips and Marquis Childs, therefore, and their editors, have a duty to guard themselves against being used as fronts for a Red objective. They surely must know after all these years that one of the main tactics of the Reds is to bunch together all types—from a Milquetoast, to a middle-of-the-roader, to a hysteric, and to call them all extremists and Fascists. These writers must have known this, and they, therefore, had the responsibility, as do all other writers in this cold war, to avoid being utilized in this way. Yet they did not do so. The fact remains, however, that they should and must know better, yet they allowed themselves to fall into the Red trap. This is what can destroy our country, and this is what we all have the duty of guarding against. There is a difference between being hit by a booby trap and walking deliberately into it.

Mr. President, we can win the war against communism only through the medium of an American public educated in the wiles and devices of the international Communist conspiracy. Mr. Hunter's testimony provides an unparalleled insight into the methods of the Communists. The Internal Security Subcommittee has performed an invaluable service and has made a great contribution to our efforts for survival by making this document public. The more widely distributed this testimony becomes, the greater will be the strength of the United States and the free world. I ask unanimous consent that particularly pertinent excerpts which I have extracted from the report be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, by and large the hearing of the Internal Security Subcommittee which was released yesterday received objective treatment by the press and the wire services, although, in my opinion, the importance of this material merits even more detailed coverage. In reviewing the coverage of this hearing in the press, I could not help be somewhat disturbed by one particular aspect of the press treatment. For all our efforts to disseminate, through the U.S. Information Agency and other publications media, the free world's point of view and the American attitude on the cold war, possibly the impression conveyed to foreign nations is contained in the reports of the diplomats of those foreign nations stationed right here in Washington. I sincerely hope that the diplomatic corps does not fallaciously assume that the Washington Post and Times-Herald, the only morning newspaper published in our Capital city, reflects either the consensus of the American press or the attitudes and sentiments of the American people. A perusal of the press treatment of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee hearing aptly illustrates how out of tune the Washington Post is with both the majority of the press across the country and the thinking of the American people.

The Washington Post and Times-Herald published an editorial concerning the testimony of Mr. Hunter which is very distorted and misleading concerning Mr. Hunter's testimony and the documentation of his statements. The Post editorial states that Mr. Hunter substantiated his testimony of an anti-anti-

Communist drive with documents showing the protest against "Operation Abolition," which the Post alleges to be spontaneous, and by editorial denunciation of the John Birch Society and the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, Mr. Hunter did no such thing. The first documentation supplied by Mr. Hunter consists of the "Statement of 81 Marxist-Leninist Parties," as officially translated by Moscow, and published in the Red theoretical organ of the United States, Political Affairs, in the January 1961 issue. This, Mr. President, is the first piece of evidence to which Mr. Hunter pointed.

Another piece of evidence, among the many supplied by Mr. Hunter, is an elaboration on the dictates of the December 5, 1960, Communist manifesto by Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., published in the Worker dated July 16, 1961. These documents, of course, are not mentioned in the Washington Post editorial. The Post editorial unfortunately also attempts to smear an organization called the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, which it lumps together with other organizations and labels "neo-Fascist." This smear technique, I am thankful, is not representative of the American press; and I sincerely trust that the diplomatic corps and other representatives of foreign nations in our Capital will not be misled by such statements or judge the American press thereby.

The Christian Anti-Communism Crusade is the name of the organization created by an Australian surgeon, Dr. Frederick S. Schwarz, who turned evangelist against communism while still in college, and who for the past decade has given his full time to this motivated work. He is also a lay preacher, and he has been working closely with the Baptist Church.

He came to the United States about 10 years ago, when he was horrified to find the lack of knowledge of communism here as great as that in his native Australia. However, he felt that America's role was decisive, and he gave a number of talks, out of which he formed the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade. After a couple of years, he found community after community desirous of either obtaining background on Communist evils or wishing to learn more about how to fight them. In response to this, he set up classes on communism.

That was the start of the courses now being given by the Crusade itself, and by a number of other similarly motivated groups since set up in cities throughout America. The idea caught on. Panels of specialists on the Communist menace participated. When the 1958 directive of the National Security Council instructed that home, school, and church be brought into this preparation of our youth for the sort of mind attack dealt our young men in the prisoner-of-war camps in North Korea, these courses were at once a model. The grassroots movement came out of this environment.

The Crusade, of which Dr. Schwarz is executive director, with its address Box 890, Long Beach, Calif., has made it an inviolable rule since its start that all books and periodicals sold at its meetings avoid extremist claims and name-calling, and that its speakers do the same—focusing on issues, instead of people. Hence, no criticism of the Crusade has been possible until the recent, intensified Red anti-anti-Communist drive led to the bunching together of all sorts of groups and personalities, branding the Crusade and other anti-Communists as being "right, extremist, and Fascist."

As one result of the Crusade, branches have been set up in various parts of the United States, each of which acts as a headquarters for the creation of new schools in localities in its area and for the distribution of the texts of speeches and other literature of its anti-Communist courses.

A typical program now going on, from August 28 to September 1, 1961, is being held in the Los Angeles Sports Arena, with the faculty consisting of Herbert Philbrick, Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Representative Walter H. Judd, Dr. Edward Teller, professor of physics at the University of California, Rear Adm. Chester Ward, U.S. Navy, retired, professor of law at George Washington University, and Capt. E. Richard Barnes, former district chaplain in the New Orleans area, among others.

Mr. President, the American people are awakening to the total nature of Communist efforts. They are vigorously seeking information concerning the enemy. We must not allow that information to be withheld from them by such conspiracies as the present anti-anti-Communist campaign. Smear campaigns against such organizations as the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade must be denounced, for such organizations are performing a vital service, and should not be restricted; rather, they should be assisted. It is heartening to see that Members of this body and the other body of the Congress are assisting them in spreading the truth about communism. The personnel in our Military Establishment and the facilities of the military service have a great potential for use in this field. Present efforts to gag them are a disservice to the country and contribute immeasurably to the weakening of the free world. As I pointed out in a number of speeches, the last of which was on last Friday, the efforts to muzzle the military are bearing more and more and larger and larger fruit. It is up to the Congress to reverse the trend. A full investigation, as I have proposed in Senate Resolution 191, to be conducted by the Armed Services Committee, should be the first step in this direction.

EXHIBIT 1

EXCERPTS FROM HEARING BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT AND OTHER INTERNAL SECURITY LAWS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. SENATE, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, JULY 11, 1961

Senator COTTON. This hearing is being reopened as a regular executive session, to provide opportunity for Mr. Edward Hunter to elaborate on a point he touched upon only briefly during his testimony in May; namely, the new counterdrive in the United States against anti-Communist alertness and training programs.

Mr. Hunter, you have already been sworn.

Mr. SOURWINE. We are informed, and have on the record, your very extensive background in psychological warfare generally, and the war against the mind specifically. We know of the research and the books you pioneered in this field. Have you given any particular attention to the subject of this phase of our hearing, as Senator COTTON has stated it?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, indeed. I made extensive trips throughout the United States during the past couple of years, after my return from Afghanistan, for purposes of research, writing, and lecturing. This put me in close touch with the local situation in each community as regards communism. I watched an actual grassroots movement develop. With this background, I have lately been noticing a new, highly coordinated drive go into high gear to tear this anti-Communist movement up by the roots and destroy it. Whereas the grassroots movement was a spontaneous local development in most areas, there is nothing spontaneous nor local about the drive to crush it; it is an organized psychological warfare operation that had all the markings of staff planning.

Mr. SOURWINE. We hope you will go into detail on these matters. So that we may have a general idea of where these details fit in, could you begin by summarizing the present stage in this fight?

Mr. HUNTER. A quick, Red operation is being attempted, like that of a sleight-of-hand artist, to push this administration, the press, and public into a trap that would eliminate the anti-Communist program in the United States. We should know by now that this is the way Red strategy operates, as it did in the concluding period of World War II. When communism has an opponent's attention diverted, or has him confused or reeling, the Reds push forward as fast as they can in their psychological warfare, grabbing all the advantage and booty they can. They are using this time-tried method of theirs against the Kennedy administration in its first year. They have carefully analyzed its conciliatory or goodwill traits as vulnerabilities, and are exploiting them as much as they can. Those traits, as you must know, are held in contempt in Communist teachings—their dialectical materialism—regarded as sentimentalism, a crime in Communist society. Sentimentalism is considered a bourgeois contradiction to Marxist's objectivism.

Mr. SOURWINE. Do they have any special plan or ruse by which they hope to achieve this purpose?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes; very much so. A new "psywar" line that constitutes very clever propaganda is being pushed. The argument is simply that communism is no danger here in the United States, that it's abroad where the danger lies. They want us to stop paying attention to Communist activities here in America, to drop the alertness and training programs that would enable our public and our troops to avoid Red traps, and to recognize the face of communism, so that we won't repeat the disastrous scandals of North Korean prisoner-of-war camps, and of Captain Powers of the U-2. This isn't really a new line, any more than coexistence was when it was taken out of the Red bag of tricks for use again. But it's now their major line, and the major danger to us. If the Reds can put it across—and they've already achieved some great successes with it—we will have disarmed ourselves in the realm of mind warfare—the war for the mind—right here at home. Our submersion into communism would inevitably follow, unless we are able to awaken from the trance in time.

Mr. SOURWINE. Where do we stand now in this fight?

Mr. HUNTER. When we look at it from the overall point of view, we see a race taking place. It is a race between those trying to give the American people the knowledge they require of the weapons and the tactics employed in the so-called cold war, and those seeking to deprive them of this vital information. This is the part of the Red disarmament drive that is being waged in the field of mind warfare, what might best be called mind attack, a military label for brainwashing. What we are discussing now falls into the scope of the softening-up process, one of the two processes in brainwashing, the other being indoctrination. Softening up is disarmament in the cold war. Exactly as the Red objective in weapons disarmament—as evidenced by their one-sided demands—is to deprive us of the hardware for defense and attack, while leaving themselves loopholes to avoid such deprivation, their objective in cold war disarmament is our moral softening up, depriving us of the means of spotting Red traps and Communist intrigue, and sapping our will to do anything about it, while leaving communism no such handicap to conspiracy and subversion.

A growing grassroots movement has developed in the United States against communism—one which constitutes a powerful anti-Communist movement. This evolved in spite of anti-anti-Communist maneuvers—against anticommunism—that have been going on for some years in our country, utilizing mainly Red fronts and hush-hush methods, as well as economic pressure against those who are frankly anti-Communist. This subtle, comparatively concealed anti-anti-communism has now been merged into what can best be called a Red anti-anti-Communist drive, that was openly initiated, under orders issued to the Communist forces of the world, especially to those in the United States, through the Red manifesto of December 5, 1960. The manifesto was made public at the conclusion of the strategy conference of 81 Communist parties of the world, including our treasonable own, that met in Moscow all last November. The race is what the *Reds call* struggle, and is for keeps. "Struggle" in the Communist lexicon can include all forms of conflict, from smiles and leaflets to hand grenades and nuclear fission, according to opportunity and need. The protagonists are the growing anti-Communist movement in the United States and the Red anti-anti-Communist drive. The Reds are seeking to put this over as a quick operation, catching us off balance, to crush the entire anti-Communist movement in our country.

Mr. SOURWINE. What do you mean by an anti-Communist movement in the United States, and by your references to a grassroots movement?

Mr. HUNTER. This can only be understood against the backdrop of the Communist position generally on matters concerning inquiry by non-Communists and anti-Communists—by anyone—into what the Reds consider their own business, their "psywar" operations to weaken, conquer, and take over other countries, especially the United States, so as to complete their conquest of the world. They have always demanded that inquiry of any kind into Red manipulation should be forbidden. They have called it undemocratic, a reactionary or Fascist activity, and illegal. All these words have their own, separate meaning in the Communist dictionary. They also insist, from the same Red point of view, that all such inquiry is unfriendly and hostile, and are using "rightist" and "extreme rightist" as smear words against anti-Communist teachings generally. The new conservative surge in the United States has been accompanied by anti-Communist efforts, mainly along educational lines, to spread information about the real nature of communism. The Reds equate this new conservatism with anticommunism, and equate this with fascism. This lumping together opponents of every description—mild or tough—branding them with some predominantly objectionable label, is an old Red tactic. It produces some of the more obvious of the patent falsehoods that come out of Red logic, called dialectical materialism, and reaches such perversions of Socratic thinking as the teaching that war is peace, black is white, and opposition to communism is illegal, whereas pro-Communist activity is perfectly legal. The former may be as timid as you like, it is called McCarthyism by the Reds; the latter may be as unprincipled as hades, it is still regarded by them as irreproachable. Here we have the actual meaning of the term "McCarthyism" in dialectical materialism, and it has nothing whatsoever to do with the manner by which communism is opposed, it is a matter of so-called principle—Red principle.

We can understand much more about Communist procedure, which otherwise seems so incomprehensible, if we keep this difference in approach in mind, as well as the strategy that communism pursues to prevent frontal attack on specific Red tactics and evils, or their disclosure, by bunching all the opposition with whatever can be found that might be branded "off balance" and "haywire," and calling the whole thing right extremist—meaning to us anti-Semitic, racist, and Fascist, irrespective to how far-fetched these accusations are to the particular cases under discussion. By insisting, as they actually did in the prisoner of war camps in North Korea, that any inquiry into communism shows a hostile attitude and an unconciliatory spirit, they have consistently obtained invaluable concessions without giving up anything in return, everywhere from the questioning of a prisoner to the grilling of a diplomat. We're going through this process all over again, it seems.

Mr. SOURWINE. How do they seem to get away with it all the time?

Mr. HUNTER. By calculated, minutely planned staff work, and by the utilization in particular of the double standard.

Mr. SOURWINE. What do you mean by "the double standard"?

Mr. HUNTER. This is basic in Communist strategy. Enforcement of the double standard leaves the door open for the Communists to make headway. Otherwise, their aggressive and conspirational methods would be seen through, and once this happened they could not survive. The anti-anti-Communist drive is a vivid example of this double standard in practice. The Reds for years have had phenomenal success in suppressing criticism of communism that was in any way specific, and therefore effective. The poor Republic of China suffered tragically from this. Books extolling the Chinese Reds as agrarian reformers and Chinese "New Dealers"—not at all real Communists—were the only ones reviewed favorably in the United States, often the only ones reviewed at all, and were given bestseller treatment, with all publicity buildup that ultimately made them bestsellers. The participation of writers and political analysts in pro-Red Chinese propaganda became extremely lucrative, and they were given additional easy income from fat lecture contracts. All this was laid on for those who held the line in the right direction, from the Communist standpoint that is, toward the extreme left. Anti-Communists were excluded. They just weren't given a look-in. It happened with such consistency that it cannot be considered a coincidence. We now know that this was manipulated by the Reds themselves. They benefited politically, in psychological warfare, from what constituted a monopoly, or a squeeze play. This embraced the film and drama and took over our communications channels generally. Yet all this time it was considered perfectly proper for the Communists to lambast their foes without the least consideration for truth. Any attempt to stop them was at once branded as interference with free speech and civil rights, and cynically, as a threat to the free enterprise system.

When this monopoly of theirs was finally exposed, the Reds howled suppression. The double standard to them is not a clever maneuver that they have gotten away with all this time: they consider it their right.

We must understand this if we are not to be bewildered each time we come up against it. From the other aspect, that of Communist ideology, it is something "proper" and "right" in their terminology. The double standard is part of dialectical materialism—built into it. The Reds, as a matter of ideology, do not grant their enemies the same privileges they claim for themselves. They claim the advantages of the double standard in our society, as in their own, as a right. It hasn't anything to do with what we call a liberal approach. It isn't being liberal to recognize this travesty of thought as logical, unless we are willing to go right ahead, too, and recognize that peace is war and white is black. This, incidentally, was the mental state into which our prisoners of war were edged in the Red brainwashing camps in North Korea. What is hard to realize is that this is exactly the state of mind the Reds seek to impose in close quarters in any negotiation.

Under the double standards, Communists can be anti-United States, but we are not to be allowed to be anti-Communist. Anti-anti-communism is simply the enforcement of this piece of Red logic, that is really a piece of lack logic. But it has been perpetrated for years. The Reds at no time are willing to accept fair play, or a give-and-take situation in the press, any more than in a summit negotiation with President Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower or, now, Kennedy. It makes no difference whom. They are now insisting upon a return to what they claim as this right of theirs, the monopoly of our press and book facilities for pro-Communist arguments, and their exclusion to anti-Communists. They're making headway, too, in the same channels that lay low for a while.

The Red insistence on the double standard has reached its peak with the Communist claim to ample and complete—de facto exclusive—facilities with which to destroy us. They are specifically demanding complete elimination of anti-Communist programs from our schools and in the military, and from public meetings. This is the culmination of anti-anti-communism. If we are buried in accordance with the decree of that specialist in genocide, Nikita Khrushchev, it should be memoralized on our collectivized tombstone by the words: "Here Lies a Nation—Martyr to the Double Standard; Americans Could Never Learn."

There is a semantic gimmick that usually greases the mechanism for the upside-down Red thinking that is sometimes called double-think. This is anti-Communist bias. Americans are justifiably opposed to bias. Opposition expressed to communism is labeled "anti-Communist bias" by the Reds, and at once we are supposed to avoid it. The simple objective is to eliminate free inquiry into Red machinations in our midst. But we are not supposed to refer to a pro-Communist bias, for to do so is, to them, "McCarthyism." This is the double standard. We are pressed not to engage in anti-communism, but if we don't, we leave the field open to the pro-Communists by default. That is the trap.

One of the most glaring examples of the double standard is in Red racism. The Reds use the term "racial liberation wars" in the native languages of Asia and Africa, and make no bones about it being a war against the white man, specifically the Western white man. So-called liberals who fall

into the trap of equating defense of freedom with racism, following the Red line, never raise a voice against the obvious racism engaged in by Communists.[1]

Somehow, if we're going to have a double standard, I would prefer we use it to our own advantage once in a while, and without any concealment about it, either. Is there anything wrong in favoring our own side, if we do so aboveboard, and honorably? One of the main reasons we are having setbacks around the world, losing respect, is that we have become known for not helping our friends, and for letting them down, while we help our enemies, trying to make ourselves popular with them, as if this were the way any person or nation can truly become popular.

The double standard is now in operation in many sectors of our society, if we would only look. The double standard is the main tactic in the perennial drive to put Red China into the United Nations and to give it American recognition. In our communications channels—from television to our daily papers—we constantly come across remarks favorable to the Red Chinese on this issue. This is considered being objective. However, when did you last hear anyone on television, for instance, casually remark that it was inevitable that freedom be restored to the Chinese people? Such statements are called controversial and discouraged or even suppressed. They're only controversial, however, when they're anti-Communist. This is the double standard in operation. Mao Tse-tung was whitewashed by its use. The same tactic is now being employed on his behalf once more, and by mostly the same people. We seem to accept past errors as the best recommendation for trust in this through-the-looking-glass world. What seems unforgivable is to have been right all along about communism.

Mr. SOURWINE. You said something about planned staff work by the Communists, presumably in reference to their activities in our country. Will you elaborate on this, please?

Mr. HUNTER. During the war, we had a clandestine propaganda warfare section in the Office of Strategic Services. I was part of it. These were, for the most part, experimental stations, with little implementation done. Theater commanders knew nothing about this approach, and next to nothing about psychological warfare, and had no time to find out, with a war going on, and certainly no patience for it. Psychological warfare of this clandestine nature had been part and parcel of Communist attack from the start, filling a major role in their conduct of war. The British did not draw a strict line between what we called white and black—between the overt or open, and the covert or clandestine. They put it all through much the same mill. When the war ended for us, the United States disbanded this section. The war didn't end for the U.S.S.R., though. We had ample knowledge of this, but made believe it wasn't so. Only one phase of it had closed for them: that requiring new weapons to be given the main emphasis. The Soviet Union kept its psychological planning bureaus operating as always, for Moscow had an entirely different concept of war than we. The Reds simply changed targets, and began aiming their psychological warfare guns at us, now that the Nazi target had been punched full of holes. We always had been an enemy, too, in their book, to be temporarily used and then destroyed—the traditional class warfare tactic. Significantly, we now are hearing of class conflict between nations—between poor and rich countries—now that class warfare has been exposed as utterly meaningless inside any modern, free nation. Coexistence, to the Reds, is merely the shift of class warfare from the domestic to the world stage, from so-called classes of people inside a country to entire nations. Indeed, the Red manifesto of December 5, 1960, says: "The coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism."

Throughout the manifesto, the Red hierarchy equates socialism with communism, as different phases of the same movement.

The Red hierarchy began its shift of targets even before the end of the shooting war in Europe. We replaced the old target for them to such an extent that international communism has been referring to us as Fascists and Nazis. The Reds change or retain labels irrespective of contents, wholly in accordance with the impression they seek to convey.

Unavoidably, we were pushed into seeking a defense against this psychological warfare offensive against us, that our State Department and the White House well knew about, but kept secret from the American public which had a right to know, being the most critically concerned. Defense against intensified Red assault forced Washington to set up an operational arm in the Central Intelligence Agency, which reinstated the clandestine section of OSS. Old OSS records had been cavalierly dealt with, even destroyed, especially those that could have been used as guidance, which could have helped us learn from old mistakes. CIA had to start at the beginning once more, as if we had never had this OSS experience. There was a deliberateness about this diversion and loss of documentation that goes beyond carelessness and slipshod methods.

What is relevant in this situation is that it just doesn't make sense to say that the Reds would abandon their "psywar" operations against the one country they consider their primary foe—the United States—whose free existence makes their world conquest impossible. Of course they have a psychological warfare planning section, specifically given the responsibility of operations within the United States. We are naive, to be sure, but we wouldn't be naive—we'd be criminally stupid—to insist otherwise. Yet on such life-and-death factors, we sometimes seem to be the latter.

The pattern is too plain, its details stand out too conspicuously for me not to recognize them. What is as sure as anything I have ever known in this "psywar" field is that the Moscow-Peiping-through-Havana axis maintains a clandestine warfare planning and operational section directly dealing with the United States, and has had it at work certainly since the end of World War II. The pattern is too obvious. Whether it is located on American soil, in Washington, or technically on foreign soil, in the United Nations, or in Canada, or Mexico, may be argued. I feel it utilizes the Communist Party of the United States in a subordinate position, to provide informational and implementation facilities rather than for policymaking. I doubt whether the Kremlin regards the American Communists as sufficiently "reliable"—this word has special meaning in Communist language—to be entrusted with such knowledge. The FBI presumedly has it too effectively tapped. Foreign Reds on our soil, directly under Moscow's orders, do the programing. They determine tactics dealing with day-to-day tasks. The operational headquarters might even be in Cuba. Remember, the present Soviet Ambassador to Cuba was, at the time of the Gouzenko disclosures, the Red spy chief in the Soviet Embassy in Canada whose espionage ring robbed us of our atomic secrets, under the protection of a hush-hush by the American authorities on Red spy activities. This hush-hush seems one of the few points on which the U.S. Government can be said to have a policy.

Lesser loyalties—to political party, profession, or office colleagues—were allowed then to take precedence over higher loyalties and responses. This mentality was epitomized by such attitudes as "Why stick your neck out?" "What's in it for me?" and "The customer is always right." They replaced our old maxims of morality. The Australian cynicism, "I couldn't care less," became worldwide. All this fertilized our soil for subversion and treason. We have not yet rid ourselves of those noxious and poisonous weeds. Of this, I am convinced by the pattern I have seen forming.

Mr. SOURWINE. Perhaps you could go into some detail regarding this that you call a pattern.

Mr. HUNTER. Yes. It will require an extended explanation, though.

One date should be kept in mind as a starting point for the new phase in "psywar," the new Red anti-anti-Communist drive, to differentiate it from the Red-manipulated, covert anti-anti-communism we had heretofore. The former is outright Red managed, part of disclosed policy of the Communist hierarchy, and immensely more aggressive. Something new has been added to the old, and it is direct action—demonstrations and riots, unbridled smears in the traditional Red manner, and what in practice amounts to an overt manipulation of non-Communist and even anti-Communist personalities and groups, in and out of government, for a basic Red objective, the liquidation of the growing anti-Communist grassroots movement in the United States. The popular movement to which I refer is a healthy, public reaction against the character-sapping official policy of setting standards by a fluctuating popularity poll. Actually, that's a degraded form of dialectical materialism, which also rejects eternal values as principles common to human experience down the ages.

This overt operation is a reflection of Khrushchev's frequently uttered contempt for the United States. He is basing his war against us on the premise that we have been sufficiently softened up to be unreachable by patriotism or loyalty, what I have referred to as mental survival stamina, and that we are sure to be a pushover, needing a mere concluding coup de grace perhaps, without appreciable danger of retaliation in any effective manner. This, gentlemen, is the psychological basis on which the Reds are working, and they consider themselves objective and practical.

They surely know, in Moscow, those on whom they can depend to do their dirty work here in the United States, especially in Government and communications circles in Washington and New York. Of this much we can be sure: They have a strategy for our defeat—our burial, as Khrushchev euphemistically terms it. Realization of this in government as well as by the public could be the stimulation to awaken us from our corrupting trance. That way we could exploit Red strategy against themselves, and save ourselves.

We have made believe that this Red contempt doesn't exist by hushing up on it. I stress it here because it is one of those factors that are integral portions of psychological warfare—the cold war. The extent of truth in it, whether really false, is irrelevant. "Psywar" proceeds on what minds can be induced to accept, not on what actually exists, or on accuracy based on Judeo-Christian standards. The Communist conspirators deal primarily with influences, as levers and weapons. The best expression of his attitude was provided by Khrushchev himself in his inimitable, boorish manner, when he described Americans to satellite and other foreign correspondents in Moscow as people whom: "You spit in their face and they

[1] Cf. "The Soviet Empire, Prison House of Nations and Races," a study by the Internal Security Subcommittee, available at many libraries.

call it dew." Could anything be more insulting? Instead of responding, we have ignored the insult. This quotation is obtainable in the Moscow-published material which we receive as part of our cultural exchange program with the Reds, in return for the so-called objective material we send them, in which we tell them about our blemishes. Of course, cultural exchange on this basis is satisfactory to Moscow. This one-sidedness is what they insist on as a cooperative attitude, on a take-it or leave-it basis. We are taking it.

The anchor point is this date of December 5, 1960, when the Red manifesto was adopted in Moscow. This set the new, expanded Red policy. For the first time, the world Communist network, in a basic policy and operational document, specifically referred to the anti-Communist movement in the United States, recognizing that it had reached proportions large enough to constitute a main—if not the main—danger to Communist progress in our country, outlining tactics to combat it, so as to regain the virtually unobstructed field it had once occupied in its American operations.

While the anti-anti-Communists, with fake liberals as their working media in the communications field, were telling each other, and being widely quoted in the Pavlovian manner of the conditioned reflex, about the ineffectiveness and hopelessness of the anti-Communist movement in America, the Red psychological warfare staff in our land was not allowing itself to be diverted by such balderdash. It well knew who pulled the strings in this belittlement of anti-communism, and it knew who were the ventriloquists in this softening-up and defeatist propaganda. The tightly organized, keenly observant group that runs Red "psywar" in the United States was surely observing the anti-Communist movement in a professional objective manner. This Red operational group, made up of persons with diplomatic entree in Washington and at the United Nations, with perhaps some few vassals from the Communist Party of the United States, watched the anti-Communist movement grow in grassroots manner, and fast, and saw it reach sizable proportions without benefit of publicity, in the face of discouragement from official sources in Washington and a hush-hush in the press.

The new, coordinated, aggressive Red anti-anti-Communist drive was launched by the Red manifesto. Until then, anti-anti-communism had been conducted mainly as a hush-hush operation in the manner of the "united front," enlisting the help of any person or organization, no matter whether non-Communist or even anti-Communist, so long as he aids and abets the Communist objective of strangling anticommunism at birth, wherever is showed up.

Anti-anti-communism was interpreted to mean opposition to anticommunism, on the assumption that the latter is an obstacle to negotiations with Soviet Russia, and is contrary to "peaceful coexistence." Coexistence was suddenly taken from Red ideology and publicized as if a product of American thinking, making it less unpalatable to our people. It was a cliche in Communist language and tactics, a decise for weakening and confusing, for setting up the victim—ourselves—for the kill.

Anti-Communists in political, educational, literary, clerical, and other spheres of American society were boxed in and squeezed out, quietly, one by one. This was the hush-hush strategy. However, it did not fully work, thanks to the American people themselves, and a few isolated segments in Government, who were persistently harassed and kept busy battling for their own survival. Even if they couldn't be "liquidated," their efforts could be held to a minimum.

The conference of Communist parties of the world, holding strategy meetings in Moscow over a period of 6 weeks or more last year, came forth with this manifesto that laid down the new, or rather the intensified strategy for war against the free world, principally the United States, inside the framework of what the Reds mean in Communist language by the word "struggle."

We must not let out of our minds the fact that "struggle" in dialectical materialism embraces all forms of conflict which have a common objective, whether hot or cold, including military destruction among other means of winning, considering everything and anything as a weapon if it can help weaken a foe and bring about his surrender to the Reds. This is its rendering in a society based on Pavlovianism, which creates conditioned reflexes by signals and symbols, relegating men to the status of a dog.

The manifesto ordered a frontal attack upon the anti-Communist movement, for the first time recognized as a fundamental obstacle to Red aims. This made hash of the line taken until then, that had downgraded anticommunism as futile, not worthy of mention, which ridiculed it by such artifices as saying it really helped the Reds—the "Wasn't McCarthy a Red agent himself?" sort of heavy joke. The manifesto made plain that anticommunism had to be combated by a major counteroffensive.

The role of anti-anti-communism in the United States, as it existed until then, was to employ diffusion, confusion, and hush-hush to leave the "psywar" field, by default, open to pro-Reds alone. Whether done knowingly, or as a Pavlovian reflex, it was all the same to the Reds.

Surely by nowise can this Red manifesto be honestly described other than as a strategy for the defeat of the United States and its absorption into the Communist empire. Yet organs of anti-anti-communism, such as the New York Times, in heavyweight, comatose gibberish, brushed it off as a moderate document, as merely a compromise between Soviet Russia and Red China, in what they had played up as a virtual split between them, hence not putting any new heat on the United States. This was a dangerous distortion of the facts, and yet our leading prestige papers retailed it, brushing off the document. This, too, is part of the pattern to which I'm referring. These things don't just happen in a "psywar" world. They are brought about by calculation, planned this way by "leaks" and string pulling.

Such operations require a new sort of agent, on which the Kremlin places its main trust nowadays. While we continue looking exclusively for the old-style cloak-and-dagger man, who buys or steals secrets to pass along to his headquarters, Red emphasis has been put on a rationalized, new-type agent, without neglecting the old, of course. We are still focusing on the old, as we were in World War II. Then, along with the British, we were putting the low men on our totem pole, who had slight if any useful data anyway, under rigorous and penalizing security checks. Moscow simply acquired agents who mingled with the new, intellectual elite at the top on terms of equality, were sometimes members of it themselves. They infiltrated the White House and other topmost Government offices. These were gentlemen all. Gentlemen talked frankly between themselves in comradely manner. Secrets were much easier to steal this way, and immensely more reliable. We might cringe at the idea that Red agents, bought and paid for by the enemy, had entree and became members of the White House entourage, but we can brush it out of our minds only at our own peril. As such things happened, they can happen again. Making believe they never did would make sure of it. But they would happen in the new form, while we would be looking for the old, as usual.

The new-style, pro-Red agent has his role to influence policy, stalling or frustrating it, making it fail or end up by hurting ourselves. Need any more be done to wreak the destruction of a nation, no matter how many billions it pours out in defense and foreign aid? This is an integral portion of the pattern I'm speaking about, the heart of it, the main gears in the pattern for failure that we have now devised as a built-in mechanism in our Government, with coordinated ramifications in the prestige press, in educational circles, and in whatever other professions the enemy considers worth penetrating.

If we doubt that the Reds infiltrate these honored professions, let us think for a moment of how it has been fundamental Red technique to do so in every nation which it has already subverted, or is seeking to subvert abroad, and then let us ask ourselves if it is possible this is not being done in the one nation in the world which Moscow regards as its main target. Or course, it is being done here. Suppression of inquiry into communism is one way of lulling ourselves into thinking we've solved the problem of the Red agent. We can seem to get along better with Moscow this way. We aren't accused of being "antisocial." Where basic principles and survival are at stake, we'd better be very willing to be as "antisocial" as need be, and come to realize that this whole "antisocial" gambit of a popularity race is a part of the diffusion mechanism in the cold war.

These new elite agents need not—usually must not—give evidence of pro-Red bias. They operate best when they work as anti-Communist perfectionists, insisting that we make sure that every project devised to hurt the enemy is 100 percent certain to succeed, and that it won't be approved until it is perfect. This approach is enough to strangle most good projects at birth. If this doesn't work, and a project cannot be stopped, there can be some clause inserted which makes it operationally useless to our own side, or even helpful to the enemy. I include in this our late, ill-fated and betrayed Cuban expedition. I've already referred to such instances at a previous session.

Nothing is every perfect, of course, and anything and everything can be interpreted to its own defeat. This is one of the most effective tactics in our pattern for failure. The problem of Red manipulation and espionage has become more complex, exactly as our precision instruments, but we must go on to solve it, with the realization uppermost in our minds that the fundamental law of the land is its survival as a free and viable nation, and that this law is higher than any other, inviolable—except at the price of a futile and unforgivable death. The kindest thing a rewritten history could do for any American who had helped bring about our defeat would be to not mention him, to make him an unperson.

This is the background against which I'm analyzing this Red manifesto. It inferentially recognizes that under the hush-hush of anti-anti-Communist pressures, a grassroots movement against communism had nonetheless developed in American society. I watched it grow. As yet, it is composed for the most part of local groups and, even neighborhood folk who come together out of a natural sense of there being something raw put over on our country on behalf of communism.

These local groups have even yet little or no contact with each other, and get little or no normal publicity. They range over the board in other respects, from left to right, from labor to management. Of course, as in any big, growing organization, some crackpots can be found.

In this atmosphere, some national organizations have formed, and various groups have been organized, that arrange seminars on communism, and give courses on communism

in various cities and communities. Some collaboration was achieved for it from the official American training program that came out of our degrading experience in the prisoner-of-war camps of North Korea. After all, the American people were told, by Presidential directive, to enlist home, school, and church in a drive to help restore those submerged or displaced elements in our good character, as part of the national training program of the military, on which our survival would certainly depend. Our North Korean experiences showed our youth to have been the butt of softening-up pressures subtly incorporated into our own society, weakening and corrupting his fiber. In the past, the teaching of physical survival stamina was sufficient. The home, clergy, and schools could be depended on to provide the morality. This wasn't true any more. Mental survival stamina had now to be specifically taught. We are given no alternative except surrender.

The anti-Communist sentiment of the public, generally, was still being effectively blocked by the hush-hush imposed by the anti-anti-Communists. This gave the anti-Communists the feeling of being boxed in and isolated, being all alone. It led to frustration, creating a sense of hopelessness and bitterness. Creeping defeatism was brought into our midst during this time, and soon started changing form from an enemy tactic to a social characteristic. This is propaganda climate.

Mr. SOURWINE. What do you mean exactly by propaganda climate?

Mr. HUNTER. Propaganda climate is one of the most effective techniques of the Red cold war, especially applicable to the anti-communism. I can tell a roomful of men, for instance, to put on, or take off, their coats, and they'll laugh at me. I can go outside and quietly raise or lower the thermostat, and in a few minutes, they'll begin removing or putting on their coats without me saying a word. This, in propaganda, is what I mean by creating a climate. Once achieved, what otherwise would be recognized as treason, as the Amerasia case during World War II, seems otherwise to ordinarily intelligent people, and they justify this by calling it sophistication, or applying some other high-sounding label that gives them special privileges as, say, intellectuals.

One of the many ramifications of anti-anti-communism is in our personnel selection and personnel screening. The squeezing out of personnel motivated in an anti-Communist direction, and the screening in of so-called anti-anti-Communists, has been one of the long-range activities of the Red mechanism through the years, at which it has had marked success. Much of this success comes from the creation of a propaganda climate favorable to this attitude.

Obviously, the more the anti-Communist issue becomes confused and smeared as controversial, and the more the impression spreads than those in positions of power, who must be depended upon for advancement, want anticommunism softpedaled, and anti-Communists boycotted, the greater will the Red success be in implementing this personnel policy, in and out of government.

Propaganda climate has had the effect of eliminating from consideration for jobs in the cold war practically all—there are a few, notable exceptions—who have records of accuracy and steadfastness in this field. This propaganda climate more and more broadened beyond the mere word-of-mouth stage to drastic economic pressures and cruel social pressures, which lately have included even overt discussion of the sanity of persons who are anti-Communist generally, soberly referring to this as if it were something to be taken for granted in the mental health field. This has spread out, too, into fields which have anti-Communist implications, as in our national defense. Participants in organizations for a so-called sane policy allude to the insanity of their opponents.

The double standard, it is plain to see, is of great encouragement to pro-Reds and discouragement to anti-Reds. A Hiss can be sure of a good-paying job; the person branded anti-Communist is eliminated from consideration. He is treated as if there were something criminal about anticommunism, as if it were the same, only the opposite extreme, of pro-Red espionage. This upside-down situation has developed in such a one-sided, disadvantageous manner to the anti-Communist that he must be particularly strong-willed, if not bullheaded, in order to survive, unless he has an income of his own, possibly inherited—or a pension. The new Red anti-anti-Communist drive is hitting particularly at those who have a pension for their support.

The trait of inflexible will that an anti-Communist requires for economic survival then is thrown against him as fanaticism, therefore dangerous thinking, in the so-called liberal lexicon. Certain words have come to apply especially to the anti-Communist, such as "controversial." This exploits a basic vulnerability of American business, to please the customer—"the customer is always right." Extended into politics or diplomacy, this could become the means for our destruction, for in spite of the aid program, the people we deal with abroad are not "always right." They can be willing conspirators against us, if they feel it of advantage to their own country. This is a particular advantage that the Reds are exploiting in their so-called aid program, and in their propaganda about the assumed "inevitability" of their victory. The bandwagon reflex is an unconditional one, not like our popularity race, an artificiality or conditioned reflex.

This is the propaganda climate for softening us up. To be effective, it must operate in the manner called "voluntary" in Communist language, meaning induced, enforced, operating as a conditioned reflex, unthinkingly—the Pavlovian way.

We must not know about this strategy, for it to work. So the pattern for failure, at taxpayers' expense, has the concealment of brainwashing and Pavlov as one of its tactics. Just before coming here, I was given one product of this thinking, a book called "Coercive Persuasion." Here a little group of soft-minded psychiatrists and sociologists, who all along have been seeking to hush up this subject, admittedly without first-hand knowledge, admittedly basing their findings on a selected, very small segment of persons who had been put under mind attack, came forth with the predictable conclusion that brainwashing didn't exist in the POW camps in North Korea, that Pavlov had nothing to do with it, that our men who were exploited against us in a treasonable manner in those Red camps were merely presented with better arguments.

This book should be put on the same shelf as "Strategic Surrender," a U.S. Government-financed book. It was the first time in history any nation paid to have a book written on how to surrender. The preparatory, appeasement word we hear more and more—getting us used to it nowadays on such matters as Red China—is "inevitability." That's the sleazy word brought forth by those who lack the courage to admit they are urging us to give in to blackmail. "Better Red than dead" is their slogan, and it emanates from closed minds in scholarly circles, such as Lord Bertrand Russell's.

This appeasement and surrender library, financed by our own Government, directly or indirectly, and by foundations, is growing steadily and stealthily. It constitutes the reading matter for the pattern of failure. The nuclear fission field is a prime target. Each step leads to another sophisticated argument for capitulation in one way or another. First we must sit back philosophically to accept the brunt of the first blow. Then, because we will have been so disastrously shattered, so-called massive retaliation presumably can't win for us, anyway. Retaliation—actually resistance—then would be merely a form of revenge, according to this thinking—beneath the dignity of so high-minded and socially conscious a people as the Americans. So we should forego even retaliation. These are not vaporings of my imagination; they're to be found (in more sophisticated language, I admit) in the publications of Government-financed or foundation-supported publications and programs. They're part of the pattern for failure. It works out as a pattern for self-destruction, or suicide.

The anti-Communist movement, pounded by all these pressures, might well have found it simply impossible to reach any meaningful proportions if it weren't for our experience in the Korean prisoner-of-war brainwashing camps, and the resultant program instituted during President Eisenhower's administration, with a code set up for the first time for captured Americans, and a directive for the restoration of character through concerted effort in all strata of our society.

This helped to compensate for the hush-hush in the anti-anti-Communist press, and even for the smears accompanying it. This restored enough of the balance and gave persons of anti-Communist motivation the hope and proof that they weren't alone, that they had friends. Members of our Reserve Forces, who certainly had every right to express themselves as civilians, became the connecting link, and often provided the know-how. They participated in seminars and discussions and went to lectures, by their mere presence constituting a great morale incentive. At times, as is customary in our democratic society, persons still in uniform were invited to come and give talks, providing further know-how for the public.

The grassroots movement spread. Old-fashioned character was its theme. Anti-communism was its immediate expression. The code for captured military personnel, the report to the Secretary of Defense by a special board set up to survey the subject generally, and President Eisenhower's proclamation that went along with it, gave this a perfectly legal base. Why a legal base was needed for a perfectly natural and normal approach in a free society is beyond me, but apparently, under our double standard, what is excluded is only anticommunism.

The program as officially enunciated by our Commander in Chief was to train and alert our people in the tactics used by Communists. The Reds couldn't get around this effectively, and so the grassroots movement began to flourish.

The program to train and alert our youth, hence our public, could be sabotaged, though, and so it was from the start. I told about it in a recent book, "Brainwashing: From Pavlov to Powers." This is an expanded edition of an earlier book. In a chapter that I added at the end, entitled "Now It's Our Turn," I told of the sense of great achievement that the adoption of the program for character building gave to American officers. I met one of them some time later. Here is how I describe the experience:

"In contrast to his previous exuberance, he was now downcast as we walked along a Virginia street. 'I can't put my fingers on it, but it was as if nothing had happened,' he said. 'As if it were a dream. Once the documents were signed and proclaimed, they were filed away, and that was the end of them. I never thought it possible. The program that was to restore American stamina and teach our forces to understand the wiles of communism had been sabotaged. I am terribly fearful of our future.' "

Education about communism was harassed until it became vague and meaningless. The withdrawal of the Air Center Training Manual early in 1960 is an instance of how this operated. The charges in the manual were undoubtedly true, it was admitted. Congressmen were told that the training "must not include the specific." We teach that generalities must not be trusted. With generalities and the specific both excluded, the only recourse was to drop the subject, leaving the field to the Communists by default.

The policy of being all things to all men and making popularity the objective of policy, took precedence over the teaching of mental stamina and character. Referring later in the book to the case of Captain Powers, captured by the Reds, I said:

"He might have stepped forth from a prisoner-of-war camp in North Korea back in 1953, for all the knowledge he showed of the ways and wiles of the Communists. The intervening years had been brushed away, as if we had learned nothing from this dreary experience. Our new code and its accompanying documents had only lulled the American public's anxieties, not providing the internal reforms promised."

The reception given this book, too, was hush-hush, as if to prove its point.

What has become quite evident by now is that our people are far ahead of the Government in realization of the Red danger, and desire to do something positive about it. The people's voice, however, was muffled, misinterpreted, and lied about. So-called social engineering became the order of the day. An engineering job is now being attempted on the public mind, conditioning it to the same sophistries that had proven disastrous to our foreign policy in the years since we ended the war. Then we were more powerful than any nation in history. We were coercively persuaded to forego or betray the responsibility that went with this power.

But the seed sown by many lone workers and groups in the anti-Communist vineyard had not fallen on barren soil, as they had been told, but had grown. As the Communist network now saw, it was being harvested as our grassroots, anti-Communist *movement*. Hence the Red manifesto's expanded anti-anti-Communist drive.

The primary target, as it is developing, is the Pentagon, specifically the program to train and alert our troops and our people to the Red techniques, and the inherent evil in communism. The Reds have seen that this program, and the directives issued to implement it, in spite of sabotage, do make the big difference. Unless this program can be destroyed, the anti-Communist movement cannot be liquidated. So the forces are joined between enforcement of the Red manifesto and the implementation of the training program that came out of the Korean war.

The experience of recently retired Lt. Col. Gunther Hartel, who knows Nazi and Communist tactics from rubbing up against them in Germany and Austria as an intelligence chief, and who later experienced Red cold war at its boiling point in Vietnam, alone could bear out much of these findings. He learned the hard way.

He recently retired from the military, and as a civilian, went into a New York City organization created by public-spirited men in private life, called American Strategy, Inc. Here, he felt, was an opportunity to share his knowledge of the totalitarian menace—he equates the Nazis with the Communists, as interchangeable—and help alert our public to the facts of life in cold war.

Remember, about this expression "cold war," the Reds put their emphasis on the word "war," understanding that "cold" is merely an adjective, indicating a temporary war tactic, while we put our stress on the adjective, "cold," lulling ourselves to the coexistence lullaby of the Reds.

The termites in the woodwork soon began to detect this new effort in which Colonel Hartel was a participant, and started boring away in accordance with the anti-anti-Communist pattern.

The smear began in the New York Post on May 25, in an editorial which for compactness and technique deserves whatever is the equivalent of a Pulitzer Prize for the expertly executed in propagandized misinformation. All the derogatory trigger words were brought in. Why? What possibly could be the real motive?

Colonel Hartel, nonetheless, is kept busy giving talks on Communist tactics throughout Greater New York. His experience is much the same as I came upon elsewhere. Suburban newspapers, and of course the public generally, are anxious to obtain all the facts they can, and to help as much as they can. Not so in the major cities, though. In New York, there was the same anti-anti-Communist press blackout, except for smear material. "Anywhere outside the big city, we get terrific publicity," he told me. In New York City, such ventures get practically nothing, or smears. From my personal experience, I can say that public feeling is misrepresented, not mirrowed, by this anti-anti-Communist maneuver.

Gradually, even in small towns, obviously prepared attacks now are beginning. They are still the exception, but nonetheless constitute an effort to duplicate, on a smaller canvas, what is the prevalent situation on the big city canvas, as I came across it in places as far apart as Atlanta and Milwaukee.

I cannot stress the importance of this Red manifesto too much in connection with these various developments, for it outlines the tactics to be used against the United States during coexistence. After referring to "concrete historical conditions"—as emphatic a label as we can find in dialectical materialism—it brings up the anti-Communist movement in the United States. This is unprecedented in a Red document. By it, Moscow recognizes the importance of this popular movement, a great tribute to those who have been working against seemingly hopeless odds. Moscow ought to know what is hurting the Communist effort.

Anticommunism is recognized in the manifesto as not confined to the rich or the privileged, which is the propaganda line the Reds take, but to be spreading through the masses. This was implied, in Red lingo, in the injunction to "wage a resolute struggle" with "greatest effort" to keep anticommunism from the "working people" and from those whom the Communists call "the masses," meaning the public in general.

The manifesto declared that anticommunism was "the principal ideological weapon" of the opponents of communism, thus recognizing it as a major peril to Red advance. Hitherto, world communism had brushed off anticommunism in the United States as a purely local phenomenon of very limited scope, not requiring any attention from the international heirarchy. The anti-anti-Communist movement in the United States was supposed to be fully able to blanket it satisfactorily.

At the time of the sensationalized McCarthy era, we had no grassroots movements, or anything comparable. World communism leaped into the "struggle" then, revolving its propaganda assault around this one man. The present anti-Communist phenomenon is of immensely greater depth, for it is now a people's movement, that derives its direction from the public. When Senator McCarthy was active, the public was not alert to communism as any special danger to the United States. We were still in the World War II stupor into which we had been put when Nazi Germany attacked Soviet Russia, forcing Moscow onto the Allied side. This is no longer the situation, for the public now wants to do something about communism, and waits to see something positive come out of official circles.

During the years of hush-hush, our channels of communication, to all practical purposes, closed their pages to anticommunism, ignored or downgraded anti-Communist books and writings, neutralized or squeezed out anti-Communist editors, authors, and speakers, and made the anti-Communist a socially undesirable person—labeled "antisocial." All the forces of propaganda were focused on his annihilation by discrediting him and his works. Nonetheless, an anti-Communist movement developed.

The Red manifesto makes plain that ideological differences are not to be allowed to stand in the way of crushing this anticommunism in America. Non-Communist and even anti-Communist elements are to be employed for Red anti-Communist ends, to be exploited as far as possible under the hackneyed "unity" program, or without any overt program at all, just so long as a popular or even a desirable end can be diverted into bringing about the Communist objective, which is the liquidation of the anti-Communist movement, with the carpet to be pulled out from under the Pentagon program, to assure a Red victory in this cold war battle.

Anti-anti-communism, since the appearance of the manifesto, has come out into the open, taking the offensive, as anyone acquainted with Red tactics should have been able to predict. Open attack has begun to supplement the former hush-hush, without replacing the suppressive aspects. All the well-known tactics employed by the Reds in their pressure campaigns are more and more being brought to bear. Such Red campaigns start with smears and character assassination and go on to vicious rumor mongering and the employment of the "big drive" technique, in which all forms of public pressures are focused on the target, from petitions and demonstrations to blackmail and corruption.

The use of united front and youth group tactics places a special and heavy responsibility on our public-spirited people, those who genuinely seek the betterment of our society, especially our youth, imbued with an idealism which must not be lost. The Moscow directive, in an insulting aloofness, as if our best motivated citizens were just another breed of Pavlovian dog to be conditioned, has started the exploitation of our youth and civic-minded citizenry in an utterly callous, overt manner, to use them to strangle the anti-Communist grassroots movement, and to put pressure on the White House and the Pentagon to interpret the anti-Communist training program into confused inaction, while awaiting its formal cancellation.

People must not allow themselves to be used this way. As in any fight, they have to determine each step they take by the degree of aid and comfort it gives the enemy, and the dangers involved. This is no easy choice in the fluid cold war arena.

The attrition of the Pentagon training and alertness program, and its abolition in practice, whether its formal abolition can be put over or not, is by a propaganda flank attack. Communism cannot be meaningfully discussed without reference to Soviet Russia, the satellites, and the Red aggression, and infiltration in places such as southeast Asia and Africa. Examples must be given, taken from life. These concern international affairs, of course, and the different personalities in those lands. Those who would hamstring or abolish the program in the Pentagon can be expected, therefore, to ignore cold war factors, and "psywar" in general, and to lay all their stress on the traditional separation of politics and nonmilitary matters from military discussion. By for-

bidding the participation of the military in seminars or forums where politics and policy are discussed, anti-Communist preparedness can be torpedoed, and the character-building aspects of the program can be eliminated. As became evident in the Pentagon while prisoners of war were still being exchanged, it is just too late to instill convictions—mental survival stamina—into our youth when they already are of military age. It has to be done before.

This attrition process is already underway in the Pentagon. Anticommunism is being interpreted in such a manner through prompt censorship of all such material, as to take the sting out of it, and leave it a sterile, philosophical concept. The Reds don't mind this. The impression has been given that to be anti-Communist is to "stick one's neck out," and selling this impression to the public is a suppression tactic in itself. People speak vaguely of "White House" or "State Department" wishes, as if this meant President Kennedy's expressed will, or Secretary Rusk's. Even if it were so, there would be highly questionable factors in an American President or a Secretary of State "passing the word along," instead of proceeding through formal channels, on matters on which the public has been led to believe a certain policy was being implemented. Rather, I have come to believe that "the White House" and "State" have gradually come to mean any one of the hundreds of staff members who work in the executive offices, and in practice any one of the extremely contrasting characters used as advisers, or for any other purpose of background or guidance, by any one of the men formally designated as aids or advisers to the President, including his official spokesman, and the multitude of State Department officials. Thus it has come about that an impression has become quite common that the White House (or State Department) wants the Communist issue soft-pedaled, is against anticommunism, thinks the Red menace is abroad, not at home, and that we ought to focus our attention on Communist intrigue in, say, Laos, and not go hunting for Reds here in America.

The proffered justification for this is a numbers game; proportionately there are few known actual Communists. So, it is argued, they must be ineffective. Yet one Fuchs can be all the Reds need in a situation of decisive strategic importance, and one opportunist—he doesn't even have to be a knowledgeable Red—would be sufficient to draw the sting from, say an anti-Communist training program on a military base, whose personnel has to come directly to grips with communism.

All sorts of signs, which in themselves would be without implication, do take on significance on this issue through their repetition in varied form. The cold war has reached its most intense stage, and the need for the backing and understanding of an informed public is unquestioned, or is supposed to be.

Some of the congressional publications contain material on the Red menace that is available nowhere else. Many of these are offered for sale by the Government Printing Office, which issues a biweekly list of new publications and occasionally a special list of publications on specific subjects, including one "relating to various aspects of communism." There is a greater need than ever for such publications now. Various States, New York and Florida among them, have provided courses in the schools which explain and expose Communist tactics.

Unfortunately, not all departments and agencies of the Government are consistently supporting anti-Communist efforts.

Surely it didn't just happen that the fine champion of liberty postage stamp series is being faded out of existence. Only the Moscow-Peiping bloc could have found anything to object to in it. The proclamation of a Captive Nations Week, when such actions take place, has its impact diminished. If we think we're pleasing all sides this way, my experience of many years abroad convinces me that we only succeed in disgusting all sides by such devices. Technically, this may be a decision of the Post Office, but so far as public impression is concerned, it is supporting evidence for the rumors about "the word being passed along," a distinctly morale-breaking device, amoral in its nature. It's the old anti-anti-Communist movement in more vigorous form. The Reds again are able to demonstrate that when the talk is over, they end up by getting what they want.

Where youths abound, as on college campuses, we can witness their exploitation in accordance with the instructions in the Red manifesto. I am always somewhat astonished, although I should be accustomed to it by now, by the frank manner in which some enemy of the United States tells exactly how he intends to attack us, and how each time he can depend on confusionists and people who refuse to believe that he really means what he says, to cover up for him. The manifesto plainly declares: "There are new opportunities now to draw the younger generation into the struggle for peace and democracy, and for the great ideals of communism," and we make believe these words mean what they do in our dictionary, instead of in the Red language, in which peace means submission by all to communism, and the regimented procedure of the Communist bloc is called democracy. In this manifesto, too, the Red tenet is repeated "that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily."

How more clearly do we expect the Peiping-Moscow Axis to say that, when we're sufficiently softened up, we'll be put out of our capitalist miseries with a collectivized space punch? They won't say so more openly until after the event.

No wonder our foreign friends grow desperate over our limitless naivete, if it can any longer be correctly labeled by such a nonviolent term. Our naivete certainly had violent consequences for the freedom fighters in Hungary.

Mr. SOURWINE. How would you summarize Communist strategy in the Red anti-anti-Communist drive that you are describing?

Mr. HUNTER. In a new anti-anti-Communist drive, the Reds are exerting more intensified pressure, in a more obvious manner, employing such distinctly Red techniques as followthrough and coordination.

Coordination and followthrough, used as "psywar" tactics, can make almost anything possible of achievement. Without these two supports to reinforce and broaden the front, the best-thought schemes, and those with the mightiest potential, become duds, or fade out with such small impact that the net result is frustration, with all the disastrous effects this leads to. I have watched these tactics being successfully exploited by the enemy again and again. The Communists owe much of their consistent and stupendous victories in propaganda and in psychological warfare to their use of coordination and followthrough. We have had fairly consistent results, too—only these were failures—because we lacked coordination and followthrough. Indeed, the first evidence I've seen of it on our side seems to be the strange support for the new Red anti-anti-Communist drive.

Coordination and followthrough in "psywar" apply with the force of law, the same way as natural law, to all indiscriminately, irrespective of the right and the wrong of an issue. They're tools of the trade that can be employed as weapons on any side. The present Red anti-anti-Communist drive is a glaring example of their employment in psychological warfare, and it only recently began. Its signs are still few—visible mainly to the specialist who has the time for this kind of research. But they will be many, and broadly apparent to all, within a short time.

Coordination means the enlistment of all possible—at least all needed—persons of influence and groups of various kinds in support of or against a project. In this way, attack can be launched simultaneously from all directions, the enemy position infiltrated, and hit from flank and rear. Coordination also extends the scope of an attack to other fronts as well.

Followthrough means the creation and implementation of separate supporting and expanding activities and projects, to gain every possible advantage from an initial attack, benefiting from the impetus it gives in throwing an enemy off balance, holding the initiative as long as possible. Perhaps it derives from a different outlook. We've been raised to lift a man up if he falls down. Red technique is to begin kicking when he's stumbled and is already down.

One only has to describe these tactics for them to be recognized as part of a time-tried, Red strategy. The Communists have developed a system to both coordinate and followthrough in their "psywar" offensives, such as the present anti-anti-Communist drive. They do it by using fronts, by granting a virtual semiautonomy to local groups in the fulfillment of policy and projects, although always strictly within the framework of Communist Party line.

Without those two tactics, the Communist network could not have achieved a fraction of its gains, and probably would have been eliminated long ago. Without them, we get nowhere with our propaganda and psychological warfare. Adding funds makes no difference, except perhaps adding to the frustration. This makes it worse for our side. So it has been.

This may be understandable, but hardly forgivable. There is no valid excuse for our failure in this field. We have a system nowadays that in effect eliminates coordination and followthrough by making the procedure too cumbersome, and too vulnerable to negative attitudes, wittingly or unwittingly. I have watched this negative pattern in operation too long to doubt its existence. It has been too effective in the destruction of projects to escape everybody's notice. Efforts to get at it, though, are about as rewarding as an attempt to grab hold of a handful of water. One must be terribly naive to think all this just happened, that there's nothing deliberate about it. I attribute it to those I call termites in the woodwork, who make sure we do not achieve coordination and followthrough.

Our critical need for coordination has been recognized, and remedial steps even devised, but they have always been diverted or paralyzed and when no other means of prevention were of avail, flatly disallowed without explanation, or for whatever irrelevant excuse served the purpose. The same holds true for lack of followthrough. I have watched all this too long to consider it otherwise than as part of a pattern for failure.

The anti-Communist movement that has grown up in the traditional grassroots manners in our country is a heaven-sent opportunity to bring coordination and followthrough into our "psywar" strategy. The really thrilling and inspiring part of it is that this coordination and followthrough was achieved in the anti-Communist movement within the framework of our free democratic and republican society of private initiative. It's just a start, of course, but already effective.

Red strategy is essentially weak because it is artificial; their fronts are false fronts, their unity is a deceit—nothing like what we call our bipartisan policy. Except for our default, communism would have collapsed long ago. Only in a free society can there be

genuine coordination between all strata and classes of society, in and out of government, united in common purposes. This is what we have begun to achieve in our anti-Communist movement, in spite of timidity and even antagonism in high places, and a hush-hush in communications channels.

This is the genuine collaboration that the Red anti-anti-Communist drive is out to destroy. Fundamentally, the whole process of anticommunism in the United States is diametrically opposed to the Red manner of operation and would be fatal to it once it could become stable, and sure of its ground. This is why the Red manifesto has summoned its followers, dupes, and opportunists to destroy it by all means, before it can attain solidity. Anti-Communists in the United States now have to fight a two-front war, against attack from their rear, as well as in front.

This is a historic crossroads in our struggle. Some day we shall have to seek unity against Communist attack, if we are to survive. The Reds have made it plain; they will accept only our surrender. If we stand by now and see this genuine, people's anti-Communist movement, with its collaborators in all spheres of our life, certainly in the Pentagon, succumb before the Red call for its destruction, we shall have to rebuild it from the ashes of apathy and frustration. Then it would perforce get so much Government control that we may find it impossible to avoid a regimentation that would be dangerously similar to that which we are fighting. This is the destination of those elements in our society, who might be fooling themselves into thinking they're not helping the Communists, but who nonetheless want power centralized and controlled from the center alone, because they lack faith in the American people and in private initiative.

Once more we come to the double standard. An anti-Communist movement is supposed to be basically undesirable, but an anti-anti-Communist movement is not, whether overtly or covertly, part of Red "psywar" planning. Here, too, if we seek out any logic in this, it is that the common denominator in this attitude is always what is helpful to the Communists. Those who are ignorant of the tactics of "psywar" can guide themselves by a simple, down-to-earth principle. If a policy or project helps the enemy, it is probably against our interests and certainly should be avoided until the balance is brought over to our favor.

We should take great encouragement from the fact that the anti-Communist movement in America was a spontaneous development, in the American manner, out of needs and worries felt locally. We should keep in mind, too, that only when the anti-Communist movement began to go places, and to have success—alerting people to the evils of communism, teaching them how to spot it [2]—did the roof fall in with this Red, anti-anti-Communist drive.

Again we see how the Communists employ coordination and followthrough, with high places involved. The Red manifesto specifically opens the door to an involvement tactic called unity. By ignoring ideological differences and excessive control factors, they give people a sense of real participation and a false sense of initiative. All that is demanded by the Red network is action in accordance with the needs of the anti-anti-Communist drive, so as to pull the carpet out from under the Pentagon, for instance, in our anti-Communist training and alertness program.

[2] A study entitled "The Technique of Soviet Propaganda," published by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, is available at the Government Printing Office and may be consulted at some libraries.

The signs show that once again the Reds are being able to exploit high places in support of a Communist objective. The tactic is gradually to surround each central figure with fait accompli and vested interests in pronouncements made without full grasp of their significance, until he is a prisoner of the anti-anti-Communist drive, irrespective of the individual's actual dislike for communism.

This isn't difficult to put across in the narrow framework of opportunistic thinking, with the restricted loyalties that gloss it over. Anything that can be considered to have political overtones or undertones—and what doesn't—becomes fair game, irrespective of the harm done our country in the process. The pro-Reds have no serious problem exploiting this. It's made to order for them—their order. Indeed, once brought into this realm, even shipments of strategic products of our factories to the Communists, which ordinarily would be recognized at once as treasonable, receive mysterious approval and, through backstage pressure, get into Red hands without the information slipping out to the American people.

Opposition to such shipments then falls into the category of "anti-communism," and receives the smear treatment, if the hush-hush isn't sufficient. Somehow, an official who blocks such shipments may confidently expect to be penalized from some well-concealed direction. Perhaps a columnist or a self-seeking politician will come forth with a smear against him on some extraneous matter. Soon everyone will be barking in the Pavlovian manner, chasing him down the garden pathway, off on a trail that makes no sense. The poor victim doesn't know what hit him. The grim joke about it is that few in the wolfpack know why they are barking.

Where matters end up by helping a Communist objective, such as the Red anti-anti-Communist drive, all too often of late, we can detect obvious collaboration and followthrough between some Government offices and certain sections of the press.

This is part of our now built-in system, with its concealing committee complex. Under such circumstances, steps taken to control the diffusion of information to the public results in giving the edge, or the monopoly, to clandestine exploitation of it. The Reds have certainly shown themselves to be masters in that kind of play. They've had years of experience in perfecting it around the world. The obsession of the American reporter to get an exclusive makes him the world's most vulnerable for a planted news item. An exclusive is all too often, in this environment, a reward for closing one's eyes to the background of an item. This is a part of the pattern.

Don't confuse "exclusive" with "scoops," gentlemen. Exclusives have come generally to mean rewards for favors done; scoops are won by personal initiative. They're as different as seeking news from gathering news.

If you don't think there's a vast gulf of difference, read the reams of debate on the subject during discussion in the U.N. General Assembly's Social Committee over the wording of the so-called free-press provision. The Red bloc insisted on the right to gather news, which obviously would be handouts, or exclusives discreetly distributed. We wanted the right to seek—seek out—news. The last I heard, as was to be expected, we had compromised by accepting—certainly not vetoing—the Red bloc's version of a free press. This is in accordance with our popularity obsession, of course, as contrasted with our abandoned adherence to principles. Each time we think we've added to our popularity this way, we've only chiseled away a bit more of freedom, which then makes us even less popular than before.

It's also part of the double standard. When an item is printed that is pro-Communist in effect, it's called enterprising journalism—being objective—and we let it go at that. When it's anti-Communist, it's being objective and branded a breach of security, or at least a breach of confidence, and indignant voices are raised demanding the practice be rooted out and made impossible of recurrence.

We've been conditioned to this double standard, so that unless we stop and think about it, making a deliberate effort, we are inclined to let the most glaring examples go undetected. So-called liberals are demanding that the military drop its anti-Communist training and alertness program. Those who take this line say it's because the military should be held to strictly military matters, and should let other, civilian, departments deal wholly with the rest. The impression is given that this is a matter of principle, and has nothing to do with the anticommunism of it. They're such people of principle.

But aren't they the same persons who were silent when pro-Communist indoctrination courses, glossing over the most extreme Red excesses, giving the Red slant on such matters as Chinese politics, dealing frankly with the political aspects of world problems, were being given by the U.S. Army? Our wartime information and education instruction sheets were sometimes as Red as Mao Tse-tung. They were frequently slanted to the Red side. So-called liberal circles were in favor of this program. Then, too, it was called a matter of principle. Then they said that soldiers had to learn for what and whom they were fighting. When principles switch abruptly, they're not principles, they're expressions of dialectical materialism, sugar-coated to American taste, sheer opportunism or plain hypocrisy.

Everyone knows about the political commissar system of the Red army. That's been improved upon since Stalin's day—integrated, as it were. Let me quote from an article by the Red army Gen. F. Golikov, head of the Chief Political Administration—what a title—of the Soviet Army and Navy. He wrote in Krasnayazvedzda of May 27, 1959, as follows (Current Digest of the Soviet Press, p. 12, vol. XI, No. 22):

"For the successful accomplishment of the tasks of ideological and educational work in the armed forces we place great hopes in the rapidly growing ties of the chief political administration and the lower level agencies with the professional organizations of writers, artists, composers, journalists, and theater and motion picture workers.

"The military discipline of the personnel must be further strengthened with all the means of ideological work."

The way we're heading now, with the pressure tightening on our most experienced and trustworthy Pentagon officers to restrict public statements to a constantly intensified central control, particularly as concerns communism, we're edging into a situation where we will find that, in effect, we will have adopted the method described by General Golikov. We will not have ceased indoctrination, but we will have regimented it—opposite the way we intended. If anticommunism is hushed up by default, we'll find that we'll be returning by default to the World War, pro-Red tone of our military's information and education program. The hush-hush really silences only one side; that is how it has consistently worked out.

In this modern world of mind warfare, that is being waged against us, it is impossible to remain static. If we're not allowed to train and alert people against communism, they will be softened up to be victims of it. The communications field is just too vast, having expanded even faster in the transportation of messages than in the transportation of people and freight.

Let the Red anti-anti-Communist drive attain its immediate objective, and we will make sure its long-range objective will be attainable, too. This will be the mental and moral disarmament of our people, in and out of military service.

Suppression of the anti-Communist training and alertness program is to mind warfare what our one-sided disarmament would be in the weapons field. We would have no alternative to surrender, to the fulfillment of the creeping defeatism best characterized by the horrible slogan, "Better Red than dead."

Mr. SOURWINE. You say a definitive stage in this new Red program against anticommunism has now been reached?

Mr. HUNTER. The new Red, anti-anti-Communist drive has been ordered by the Soviet Communist hierarchy, speaking through and by the voice of the Communist Parties of the world, gathered in a rare conclave. This becomes fundamental law and basic strategy, obligatory on all Communists. There can be no question of its implementation. The only possible question left to Communist Party people are the most effective methods, guaranteeing the maximum impact, by which these orders can be put into effect. Let me stress again that they constitute orders to combat the anti-Communist movement headon in the United States, no longer through the comparative restraint of what might be called the pseudoliberal anti-anti-communism of the past.

Ideological differences are to be submerged. This means that we can expect the Red objective to be cloaked in every kind of disguise, made palatable to every important grouping in our society, the pro-Red aspect concealed where possible. We can expect, too, to find our idealistic youth, especially in our institutions of higher learning, callously employed as a front in this Red drive. This will present us with a very difficult problem, to prevent or expose such intrigue for these young people who of course lack the background themselves to distinguish between a Red maneuver and an expression of sincere opinion, uninstigated by ulterior, anti-American purposes. Even more difficult it will be to persuade them to separate this chaff from the grain, when the chaff has been so tastefully sugar-coated.

Mr. SOURWINE. You say this has just started, in effect, that this new anti-anti-Communist drive will intensify in the near future?

Mr. HUNTER. Although this may appear as a prediction, it isn't one at all, at least it shouldn't be to anyone who has watched and understands the ironclad pattern of Communist Party procedure that they call discipline. Certain steps must follow, as surely as night follows day, and then night comes again. We shall witness a seemingly spontaneous outpouring of articles and persuasions of every character, that will arise all along the fringes of the communications field where the Reds have influence, and from then on, in the manner by which the "McCarthyism" drive was built up, penetrating all channels of the press and all attitude-changing segments of our society, such as schools and churches. The pro- or anti-Communist leanings of the participants will have nothing to do with the case, as seen from the surface.

The Communist Party organs will set the key. Orchestration will gradually spread from one section of the orchestra to the other, until all will be playing the same music, in a rising crescendo. This is the Red technique, to make the pressure of what will appear as public opinion so relentless and so loud that everybody will begin to dance to the same tune, and those who don't want to dance will be grabbed by their friends and neighbors and brought onto the floor, as in an American barn dance. By then, nobody will be thinking about who called the tune in the first place, and those few who do will appear as queers. This would be a hopeless situation except for one thing. If it is exposed in time, the whole Red psychological warfare gambit can be defeated with comparatively little effort.

Exactly as knowledge of brainwashing was found to be vaccination against it, knowledge of the Red intent of a propaganda drive destroys its effectiveness. We will only have to witness the orchestration, as it will begin developing very shortly now, for us to recognize this Red anti-anti-Communist trap wherever it appears. This "psywar" booby trap will lie visible on the top of the road from then on. If we don't expose it this way, though, it will easily cripple or kill us—Khrushchev's expression for it is "burial."

Mr. SOURWINE. Could you gather this evidence—the written material that you say will appear as sure as night follows day?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes, I could.

Mr. SOURWINE. Mr. Chairman, may we ask that the witness do this, and bring us the material he has gathered, with analyses, by perhaps the end of the month, to be included as appendixes to this hearing?

Senator COTTON. That will be the order. Mr. Hunter, we expect you then to provide us with material found by you, appearing in the public press this year up to the end of July 1961, directly bearing upon the implementation of what you have described as a new Red anti-anti-Communist drive, with your own notes or analyses of the various items.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you, I will do so.

(The material referred to, submitted by Mr. Hunter on August 1, appears hereafter as appendixes.)

Mr. SOURWINE. There is one thing more, perhaps. I have several papers here. I wonder if you will glance at them, tell me if you have seen them before, and in any case, give us your reaction. Here is the first one.

Mr. HUNTER. I have not seen this before. Should I read this aloud?

Mr. SOURWINE. Yes, please do so.

Mr. HUNTER. This is a Secretary of Defense document dated March 10, 1961, for the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force reading:

"1. There is presently being established within the Office of the Secretary of Defense centralized procedures for evaluating materials designed for indoctrination of personnel of the Defense Department in the general area of international affairs and related fields. This evaluation will apply to all materials, written, pictorial, or audio, used in training programs and troop information programs, and will be in conformance with the security and policy review regulations of the Defense Department.

"2. The film 'Operation Abolition' will be retained in the film libraries on an on call basis for those requesting to view it, but will not be prescribed in the training of personnel. A memorandum of January 31, 1961, from the Office of Armed Forces Information and Education stated the on call policy for information programs and described the production of an OAFIE film covering the tactics employed by Communists seeking to manipulate youth. This film is being produced within the framework of material set forth in the House Committee on Un-American Activities print entitled "Communist Target—Youth," a report by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"3. Another film coming within the scope of paragraph 1, which recently has been brought to our attention is entitled "Communism on the Map." Determination as to the use of this film will be deferred pending its evaluation pursuant to the procedure prescribed in paragraph 1."

This is signed by Roswell L. Gilpatric, Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Mr. SOURWINE. What is your reaction?

Mr. HUNTER. Considering the date, and recalling the publicity about these films, which I have seen, it is obvious to me that, removed from the legalisms, the document can be paraphrased as saying: "Use any of these anti-Communist films at your own risk. Heaven help you if you do." I would regard this as one of the early successes of the Red anti-anti-Communist pressure drive.

Mr. SOURWINE. Here is the second document on which we want your comment.

Mr. HUNTER. This, too, is new to me. This is a similar type of document, signed "Carlisle P. Runge," on stationary of Assistant Secretary of Defense, dated April 21, 1961, and reading:

"Subject: Narrator Filmstrip 'Communism on the Map.'

"The commercial, narrated filmstrip, 'Communism on the Map' has been determined, by official review under DOD evaluation procedures, as not required for the Armed Forces training of troop information or public information programs and that it should not be purchased by the Department or used by Department of Defense personnel.

"Attention is invited to the many materials in the area of anticommunism including pamphlets and motion pictures produced by the Office of Armed Forces Information and Education, which are available for troop-information programs."

The pattern, gentlemen, is being nailed down. Hard-hitting or specific training and alertness material, if this is any indication, is on the way out. Officers know the contents of this film. They will get the anti-anti-Communist message in this order. It puts them in what, I feel, is an unfair dilemma. They can't possibly arouse fighting men to risk their lives with mamby-pamby stuff that takes the sting out of communism. Yet if they use the hard facts, they know they're probably going to have difficulties. This is the propaganda climate being created by such memorandums in the Pentagon. It couldn't be otherwise. Incidentally, to call this a commercial film is not quite true; it was produced by a college.

Mr. SOURWINE. Here are two other documents.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you. This is dated May 16, 1961. I haven't seen this, either. [Reading:]

"From: Secretary of the Navy.

"To: All ships and stations.

"Subject: Commercial filmstrip 'Communism on the Map.'

"1. Purpose: To promulgate the findings of an official review of subject filmstrip.

"2. Background: The commercial, narrated filmstrip 'Communism on the Map' has been determined, by official review under Department of Defense evaluation procedures, as not required for Armed Forces training, internal information, or public information programs. Attention is invited to the many officially approved materials in the area of anticommunism, including pamphlets and motion pictures produced by the Office of Armed Forces Information and Education, which are available through Navy and Marine Corps information programs.

"3. Action: The filmstrip 'Communism on the Map' shall not be purchased by Navy or Marine Corps activities nor shall it be used by Department of Navy personnel.

"4. Cancellation: This notice is canceled for record purposes on October 31, 1961. Its retention beyond that date for reference purposes is authorized."

This is signed "Paul W. Fay, Under Secretary of the Navy."

I shall proceed at once to the reading of the second document, dated March 17, 1961. I have not seen this before, either. [Reading:]

"From: Chief of Navy Personnel.

"To: All ships and stations (less Marine Corps field addresses not having Navy personnel attached).

"Subject: Materials for indoctrination of personnel in the general area of international affairs and related fields.

"Enclosure: Secretary of Defense memo to the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force dated March 10, 1961.

"1. Purpose: To forward enclosure (1) for information and guidance.

"2. Discussion: Enclosure (1) announces the establishment of procedures for the centralized evaluation of written, pictorial, and audio materials designed to indoctrinate personnel in the general area of international affairs and related fields. Such materials are used in the information and education program and in some parts of certain related programs.

"3. Action: Pending further guidance, official material (listed in the I. & E. catalog or other Navy Department-approved catalog, curriculum, or training publication) previously issued or approved may continue to be used as required. Nonofficial material should not be used hereafter until evaluated in accordance with enclosure (1)."

This is signed "W. R. Smedberg III, Bureau of Navy Personnel."

The second of these documents merely makes sure that if there is any other hard-hitting material against our enemy lying about, or in the files, obtained in collaboration with the public in pursuance of the Presidential directive declaring this to be a problem of the military and the public both, it will not be used.

The other document merely backstops this new line. Frankly, I am quite concerned over what material will substitute for what has been withdrawn, in effect. If the withdrawn material is too strong, what replaces it obviously will be weaker. While Moscow is firming up its anti-American stand, we are softening ours, so far as the minds of the men who would have to do the fighting and dying are concerned. Yet Korea was supposed to have taught us that disaster lies along that road.

Mr. SOURWINE. Here is still another document. Have you seen it before?

Mr. HUNTER. No.

Mr. SOURWINE. Please read it, and let me know your reaction.

Mr. HUNTER (reading):

"From: Secretary of the Navy.

"To: All ships and stations.

"Subject: Commercial filmstrip 'Communism on the Map,' May 16, 1961.

"1. Purpose: To promulgate the findings of an official review on subject filmstrip.

"2. Background: The commercial, narrated filmstrip 'Communism on the Map' has been determined, by official review under Department of Defense evaluation procedures, as not required for Armed Forces training, internal information, or public information programs. Attention is invited to the many officially approved materials in the area of anticommunism, including pamphlets and motion pictures produced by the Office of Armed Forces Information and Education, which are available through Navy and Marine Corps information programs.

"3. Action: The filmstrip 'Communism on the Map' shall not be purchased by Navy or Marine Corps activities, nor shall it be used by Department of the Navy personnel.

"4. Cancellation: This notice is canceled for record purposes on October 31, 1961. Its retention beyond that date for reference purposes is authorized."

This is signed "Paul B. Fay, Jr., Under Secretary of the Navy." It brings the anti-anti-Communist drive a very big step forward, if "forward" is the proper word to use. It's certainly to the Communist advantage in the war for the mind. A fundamental objective of the Red drive is to cut off Pentagon participation in the grassroots movement that is at long last awakening our people. The American people as a nation must learn these facts, as our Government had already officially recognized, if we are to attain mental survival stamina. This order goes far—it is a tremendous step—toward forbidding such participation. We disarm unilaterally to this extent in the sphere that is crucial in this war—mind warfare. It is shocking.

Mr. SOURWINE. Here is one more.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you. This also is new to me. This is from Atlantic Command, Headquarters of the Commander in Chief, Norfolk 11, Va., June 14, 1961, and is signed "Horatio Rivero, Deputy Chief of Staff." I will read it:

"1. Purpose: To provide policy guidance of news and classification of material within the Department of Defense.

"2. Discussion: At a news conference in Washington, D.C., May 26, 1961, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara discussed the subject of dissemination of information to the public and classification of material within the Department of Defense. The following extracts from the Secretary's remarks are quoted:

" 'The public information policies of the Department of Defense require a deliberate accommodation of two competing values. As President Kennedy has observed, the challenge of our times imposes two requirements that seem almost contradictory in tone, but which we must reconcile and which we must fulfill. There is the need for greater public information and the need for greater official secrecy.

" 'In order to provide some further guidance for those of us, all of us, both military and civilian officials alike, who must deal with this problem, I suggested four principles to help the members of the Department to meet both these requirements. The application of these principles, although they might restrict the flow of properly classified information to some extent, would encourage more open, more responsible discussion of the pros and cons of the national defense policies and practices. The four principles are:

" '1. In a democratic society the public must be kept informed of the major issues in national defense policy, because the most important issues are likely to be the most difficult ones; the arguments on both sides must be made clear so that there can be a consensus of coincidence in the ultimate decision. We are under a special obligation to disclose mistakes and ineffective administrative operations.

" 'The public has at least as much right to bad news as to good news.

" '2. It is essential to avoid disclosures of information that can be of national assistance to our potential enemies, and therefore weaken our defense position. It is equally important to avoid overclassification; when in doubt, underclassify. In no event should overclassification be used to avoid public discussion of controversial matters.

" '3. Public statements of what appears to be Department of Defense policy must reflect that policy in effect.

" '4. In public discussion all officers of the Department should confine themselves to defense matters. Avoid discussion of foreign policy matters, a field which is reserved for the President and the Department of State. This long-established principle recognizes the danger that when Defense officials express opinions as to foreign policy, their words may be taken as the policy of the Government.'

"3. Action: Information contained in paragraph 2 above is forwarded for information and guidance.

Mr. SOURWINE. What do you say to this?

Mr. HUNTER. If the fourth point were obeyed, in the kind of conflict in which we are engaged, we would return to the condition of mind disarmament we were in when the Reds struck in Korea. It cannot be obeyed without disobeying the directives that were supposed to enforce the code for our men who may be captured by Communists, and it cannot be obeyed without making believe there is no such thing as brainwashing, that what took place in the prisoner of war camps was a bad dream, a hallucination, perhaps, that never happened. We are rewriting history, in effect. We are also betraying ourselves. In the arena of the cold war, the Red anti-anti-Communist drive, as ordered by the Red manifesto of December 5, 1960, won a stunning victory for itself on—let me see, what is the date of the document I just read—June 14, 1961. Why do we do these things? Oh, well——

Mr. SOURWINE. This completes my questioning.

Senator COTTON. We will be waiting to receive your compilation of press material. Thank you, Mr. Hunter. The hearing is adjourned.

The appendixes and the accompanying prefatory notes were provided by the witness, Edward Hunter, who had been instructed to supply such written material from the press generally, to the end of July 1961, as had a direct bearing upon what he described in his testimony as the new, Red anti-anti-Communist drive, with whatever brief analysis might be required. Mr. Hunter has pointed out these are examples, with the merely cumulative omitted, and are not intended as an indictment of any individual or publication.

APPENDIX 1

The following are relevant excerpts from the "Statement of 81 Marxist-Leninist Parties" as officially translated by Moscow and published in the Red theoretical organ in the United States, Political Affairs, in its January 1961 issue. (The full text as well as the complete Tass translation as printed in the New York Times on December 7 can be found in the appendix to the testimony of Jay Lovestone before this committee last January 26 and February 2.)

The Red manifesto is a basic strategy paper to outline Communist Party operations and, as such, makes extensive use of the Communist language of dialectical materialism, always giving this slant to its statements. In understanding Communist intent, these words and paragraphs must be translated into ordinary language, often producing the opposite words in non-Communist dictionaries.

When read this way, as the indoctrinated Communist does, Red documentation is extremely revealing of purposes and tactics otherwise successfully concealed.

For instance, a simple sentence from the manifesto, such as, "As long as imperialism exists there will be soil for wars of aggression," actually means, in Red language: "As long as dynamic non-Communist countries exist they may take the opportunity to resist Communist world expansion." In their writing, when Communists attack, it is "liberation" and not "aggression." The dialectical materialist dictionary is composed of the fundamental writings of Red leaders and theoreticians.

Here are the excerpts from the manifesto:

"U.S. imperialism * * * has become an enemy of the whole world.

"In blazing a trail of communism, the peoples of the Socialist countries are creating a prototype of a new society for all mankind.

"As long as imperialism exists there will be soil for wars of aggression.

"To fight for peace today means to maintain the greatest vigilance, indefatigably to lay bare the policy of the imperialists, to keep a watchful eye on the intrigues and maneuvers of the warmongers, arouse the righteous indignation of the peoples against those who are heading for war, organize the peace forces still better, continuously intensify mass efforts for peace, and promote cooperation with all countries which have no interest in new wars. In the countries where the imperialists have established war bases, it is necessary to step up the struggle for their abolition, which is an important factor for fortifying national independence, defending sovereignty, and preventing war. The struggle of the peoples against the militarization of their countries should be combined with the struggle against the capitalist monopolies connected with the U.S. imperialists.

"No political, religious or other differences should be an obstacle to all the forces of the working class uniting against the war danger.

"The policy of peaceful coexistence is a policy of mobilizing the masses and launching vigorous action against the enemies of peace. Peaceful coexistence of states does not imply renunciation of the class struggle as the revisionists claim. The coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism.

"National liberation revolutions have triumphed in vast areas of the world.

"The complete collapse of colonialism is imminent.

"The colonial powers never bestow freedom on the colonial peoples and never leave of their own free will the countries they are exploiting.

"Now that more sections of the population are joining in an active class struggle, it is of the utmost importance that Communists should extend their work in trade unions and cooperatives, among the peasantry, the youth, the women, in sports organizations, and the unorganized sections of the population.

"The Communist Parties reaffirm the propositions put forward by the declaration of 1957 with regard to the forms of transition of different countries from capitalism to socialism.

"The declaration points out that the working class and its vanguard—the Marxist-Leninist Party—seek to achieve the Socialist revolution by peaceful means.

"In the event of the exploiting classes resorting to violence against people, the possibility of nonpeaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind. Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily.

"In our time, when communism is not only the most advanced doctrine but an actually existing social system which has proved its superiority over capitalism, conditions are particularly favorable for expanding the influence of the Communist Parties, vigorously exposing anticommunism, a slogan under which the capitalist class wages its struggle against the proletariat, and winning the broadest sections of the working masses for Communist ideas.

"Anticommunism arose at the dawn of the working-class movement as the principal ideological weapon of the capitalist class in its struggle against the proletariat and Marxist ideology. As the class struggle grew in intensity, particularly with the formation of the world Socialist system, anticommunism became more vicious and refined. Anticommunism, which is indicative of a deep ideological crisis in, and extreme decline of bourgeois ideology, resorts to monstrous distortions of Marxist doctrine and crude slander against the Socialist social system, presents Communist policies and objectives in a false light, and carries on a witchhunt against the democratic peaceful forces and organizations.

"To effectively defend the interests of the working people, maintain peace and realize the Socialist ideals of the working class, it is indispensable to wage a resolute struggle against anticommunism—that poisoned weapon which the bourgeoisie uses to fence off the masses from socialism.

"All the Marxist-Leninist Parties are independent and have equal rights.

"The Communist and Workers' Parties unanimously declare that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has been, and remains, the universally recognized vanguard of the world Communist movement."

APPENDIX 2

In a massive draft program announced at Moscow by the Soviet Communist Party on July 29, the Red hierarchy recognized for the second time the importance of the anti-Communist movement in the United States. The first time was in the Red manifesto of December 5, 1960.

The new document reiterates tactics to be employed against the United States in the Red struggle to conquer the world, with the United States as the primary target.

Moscow's reiterated propaganda theme is that this can be achieved peacefully, presumably by bringing about American surrender through psychological warfare strategy, thereby preserving the Soviet Union against destruction. Hence, the coexistence line serves a dual purpose: (1) lulling the Soviet population, which actually wants peace, certainly abhors the thought of a repetition of World War II horrors, and (2) stirring creeping defeatism in the West.

Meanwhile, of course, new and continued sacrifices are evidently to be required of the Communist-dominated peoples, already suffering from shortages of food and other necessities. The document seeks to take the attention of its enslaved people from such deficiencies, and to prepare them for even more acute stringencies to follow, by making a host of pie-in-the-sky promises of a paradise of plenty in the future.

Here is an excerpt from the text as sent abroad by Tass, the official Soviet Russian news agency, dealing with anticommunism in our land:

"The chief ideological and political weapon of imperialism is anticommunism. Rallied to this black banner today are all the enemies of social progress. Anticommunism is a reflection of the extreme decadence of bourgeois ideology.

"Monopoly capital engenders Fascist ideology, the ideology of extreme chauvinism and racism. Anticommunism is becoming the main instrument of reaction in its struggle against the democratic forces of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

"The rightwing of social-democracy has completely broken with Marxism and has put forward so-called democratic socialism against scientific socialism.

"Historical experience has shown the bankruptcy of both the ideology and the policy of social-democracy.

"Anticommunism has brought social reformism to an ideological and political impasse. This is one of the main reasons for the crisis of social-democracy."

APPENDIX 3

Cabell Phillips has been the New York Times axman in the anti-anti-Communist movement, once it became too widespread and effective to be any longer kept under wraps. Overnight, the activities of the anti-Communist groups became the subject of long articles, which made quite a point of how extensive the campaign to alert Americans on communism had become.

Significantly, nary a whisper of this campaign had hitherto got into the New York Times, or any of the other anti-anti-Communist, prestige newspapers. Anticommunism only became news when the pillorying of the Birch Society gave them the opportunity to refer to all anticommunism as work of "the Birchites," and to smear it all indiscriminately as right extremist. Without exception, each of the articles purporting to summarize the anti-Communist movement followed this propaganda line.

Each time, too, with a similarity that is unmistakable, and certainly enlightening on the source of these purported news articles, there is a backhanded effort to brand the whole thing as Nazi. For instance, this nearly four-column article, of May 21, ends with an anonymous refugee from Germany quoted as saying: "Have you ever thought of the parallel between John Birch and Horst Wessel? I have, and it frightens me when I see this anti-Communist feeling getting out of hand."

If this reportage is to be believed, the right-extremist type is the only kind of anticommunism there is.

The article follows:

"ANTI-RED DISPUTE GRIPS ILLINOISANS—INTENSIVE RIGHTWING EFFORTS AROUSE CONTROVERSY

"(By Cabell Phillips)

"Evanston, Ill., May 5.—A grassroots campaign to inculcate an aggressive form of anti-Communist 'Americanism' in all walks of life is spreading through the North Shore suburbs of Chicago.

"Its intensity is disturbing the social, political, and religious equanimity of many persons in this heavily populated area.

"On one side are a number of conservative activists allied, in fact or in spirit, with the John Birch Society.

"They contend that Communist subversion in the schools, churches and many areas of public life is endangering 'fundamental Americanism,' and, indeed, the very existence of the Republic. They are pursuing an active campaign of 'education' and various forms of persuasion to alert their fellow citizens to the danger.

"Liberals on defensive

"On the other side is a loose coalition of liberals and moderates who argue that the Communist danger is being distorted and exaggerated for political ends by 'rightwingers and bigots.' Placed on the defensive in this conflict, they have confined their strategy largely to protests at public meetings and letters to newspapers and public officials.

"Mutual antagonisms are apparent in most of these well-to-do suburban communities from Evanston north to Waukegan. But they run more deeply in some than in others.

"In Glenview, for example, Americanism became a dominant but widespread issue in a recent village election contest. A Roman Catholic priest and a Methodist minister in the same community have taken to sniping at each other in public over the merits of the anti-Communist crusade.

"In Evanston, a man who ran for the House of Representatives last fall contends that he was victimized by a "smear campaign" that associated him with Communist movements. This episode will soon reach its climax in a Federal court.

"Leftwing assailed

"The motivation behind the Americanism drive was summed up the other day by a resident of Evanston who is generally sympathetic to its objectives but not a direct participant.

"'I don't believe the North Shore has a great many more actual Communists than any other similar area,' he said. 'But we do have a great many leftwing thinkers dug in around the colleges and universities who

seem to do the Communists' work for them. They have a lot of influence.

" 'But even more importantly, we have a lot of apathy and downright ignorance by the majority of the well-to-do people here. They've got good jobs, good incomes and they live in a dream world. They don't know what's going on in the world outside, or even right under their noses.

" 'I don't think there's anything more important than to educate them to the fact that that dream world is about to be snatched out from under them—and all the rest of us, too.'

"Echoed in many areas

"Similar views have been found among conservative groups in many parts of the country. They often gain their most effective expression in an aggressive anticommunism.

"The common denominator in the thinking of these groups, as observed in several weeks of travel, is that 'the American way of life' is being attacked by fifth columnists frequently operating under such socialistic guises as liberalism, the welfare state and one-worldism.

"These ideological convictions are often accompanied by an opposition to existing tax, foreign aid and civil rights policies of the Federal Government, and by a belief that the religious and moral fiber of the Nation is deteriorating because of Communist machinations.

"Two organizations that have been most active in fostering this drive at the community level are the John Birch Society, headed by Robert H. W. Welch, Jr., of Belmont, Mass., and the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, of which Dr. Fred C. Schwarz of Long Beach, Calif., is president.

"Their tactics differ somewhat, but their aims are almost identical. The Birch Society advocates not only education, but also the adoption, on occasion, of Communist methods to combat Communist subversion. Its belligerency goes so far, for example, as to demand the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren for furthering Communist aims.

"Schwarz doctrine

"The Schwarz doctrine advocates much the same sort of education about the Communist menace but stops short of urging particular acts of reprisal. Both groups have been active in the Chicago area for many years.

"Stillwell J. Connor, a Chicago industrialist, was quoted recently as having said that he had inducted more than 400 members into the Birch Society, mostly in the northern suburbs, since 1959. Another Birch member estimated the total membership in the Chicago area at 1,000.

"Dr. Schwarz has appeared on local lecture platforms frequently, but he did not turn on the full power of his Christian anticommunism crusade until late last summer. The current controversy along the North Shore dates from that time.

"On August 29, 1960, Dr. Schwarz opened a 5-day school on anticommunism at the Glenview Naval Air Station. Sessions were held three times a day in an auditorium on the base, with an attendance of several hundred at each session. The audiences consisted of base personnel, naval reservists, and civilians from surrounding communities.

"Philbrick on faculty

The faculty included several Navy officers, Dr. Schwarz, and such professionals in the field of anticommunism as Herbert Philbrick, a former agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; Dr. E. Merrill Root, author of 'Brainwashing in the High School'; Richard Arens, then staff director for the House Un-American Activities Committee; Prof. Anthony Bouscaren of LeMoyne College, Syracuse, N.Y., and others.

"Dr. Schwarz' program at Glenview was similar to others he has conducted in many parts of the country, one recently in St. Louis.

"It is built around a series of lectures supplemented by films, tape recordings and the sale of books and pamphlets, many written by Dr. Schwarz.

"Two films are among those shown most often. One is 'Operation Abolition,' which depicts as Communist-managed the student riots in San Francisco last year that grew out of a session there of the House Un-American Activities Committee. The other is 'Communism on the Map,' which pictures the United States as falling victim to Communist encirclement and subversion.

"The course purports to give a scholarly résumé and analysis of world communism, with particular emphasis on its impact on the United States since World War II.

"The principal theme is that the American way of life is being subtly but systematically undermined by Communist fifth columnists and their 'stooges,' who often operate under the guise of socialism.

"Evidence of their influence, the course points out, is found chiefly on the campuses of American colleges, among the Protestant clergy and in the policymaking levels of the Federal Government.

"School hailed

"The Glenview school was adjudged a great success by its sponsors and participants, and also, apparently, by many residents of this area who had no part in it.

"Jack Mabley, who at the time was a columnist for the Chicago Daily News and president of the Glenview Village Board, wrote approvingly of the venture in his column. He also sponsored a resolution of commendation by the village board that passed with only one negative vote.

"But there were a number of dissenting views. These were based chiefly on the grounds that the school fostered an atmosphere of suspicion and intolerance toward persons of moderate and liberal political convictions, and that it held up to ridicule and criticism certain established foreign policy positions of the Federal Government that the Navy was required to support.

"One of the dissenters was Mrs. Norma Morrison, a housewife who serves on the Glenview Village Board. Mrs. Morrison refused to vote in favor of the commendatory resolution.

" 'I received a number of rather nasty telephone calls about it,' she said recently, 'most of them anonymous and at night. They accused me of being a Red or pink or anti-Catholic—which, of course, I am not.'

" 'And the next meeting of the board,' she declared, 'a resolution was prepared demanding my resignation, but Jack Mabley ruled it out of order and refused to let it come up.'

"Professor's telegram

"Another dissenter was Dr. Tyler Thompson, a professor of religion at Northwestern University and a Democratic candidate for the House last fall. While the school was in progress last September, he sent this telegram to William B. Franke, then Secretary of the Navy:

" 'I wish to protest the apparent official link of the Navy to the political propaganda being disseminated at the Education for American Security [as the Schwarz school was called] at Glenview Naval Air Station. Official program and early publicity clearly indicate naval sponsorship. Please investigate.'

"The result was an official denial of direct Navy sponsorship of the school.

"In the following weeks, there turned up on drugstore counters and in the mailboxes of various North Shore homes and offices a four-page document purporting to link Dr. Thompson with Communist and Communist-front organizations. It bore no name or return address.

"The pamphlet noted Dr. Thompson's membership in or cooperation with such organizations as the Methodist Federation for Social Action, Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, and the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran [immigration] Act. Each of these groups, it said, had been cited for its Communist affiliation or sympathies either by the House Un-American Activities Committee or the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

"Cites the Worker

"It also carried the following entry:

" 'The Worker (midwest edition), official publication of the Communist Party, U.S.A., published an article on June 5, 1960, in which it indicated that Tyler Thompson is receiving wide and significant support in his campaign * * * and is generally favorable in tone.

" 'It should be noted that it is not the practice of the Worker to give favorable publicity to candidates for political office unless that paper has a particular interest in their candidacy.'

"The leaflet was turned over to the FBI for investigation as a possible violation of the Corrupt Practices Act. As a result, Miles M. Vondra, Jr., a Glenview insurance man who claims active membership in one of the many Birch Society units in the neighborhood, was indicted last January. He is scheduled to go on trial in Federal district court on May 22.

"Dr. Thompson was soundly beaten in the election. But he attributes his defeat as much to the overwhelming Republicanism of this district as to the leaflet.

"Letter to the Navy

"Long after the anticommunism school was concluded, an office for the education for American security program was maintained at the naval station. A few months ago, 30 citizens of the area signed another letter of protest to the Secretary of the Navy. Mrs. Morrison was among them. The letter became public.

"In April, Mrs. Morrison was a candidate for reelection to the Glenview Village Board. She was supported by the Caucus Party, in which several of the letter's signers were also active. She said recently that she and several other Caucus candidates had been targets of a whispering campaign in which the letter to the Secretary was cited as evidence that their Americanism was questionable.

" 'We won the election,' she said, 'but there has been a great deal of bitterness left over from it. Our town is divided in a way I've never seen it before.'

"This division has also flared among church groups.

"One of the most articulate partisans of the anti-Communist program is the Reverend John J. Dussman, pastor of the Roman Catholic Church of Our Lady of Perpetual Help in Glenview.

"Nearly every issue of his weekly parish paper, the Clarion, contains an endorsement of the Birch Society or another of the more active Americanist groups. Parishioners are frequently urged to join 'one of our anti-Red cells.'

"Rebukes Protestants

"In an issue a few weeks ago, Father Dussman criticized a local 'Protestant church gathering' for having distributed copies of the Christian Century that contained an article critical of the movie 'Operation Abolition.' The Christian Century is a nondenominational publication that generally reflects the liberal Protestant viewpoint.

"This brought a sharp rebuke a week later from the Reverend Calvin W. Robinson, pastor of a large neighboring Methodist congregation. Mr. Robinson said in the course of his sermon:

"'I am disturbed over the activities of American Pharisees today—closed-minded, self-righteous conservatives who also (as did the Biblical Pharisees) resent having their truths challenged. The John Birch Society is just such a group. It does not have the answers to our problems in international relations, and it only leads us backward into old ways that have betrayed mankind again and again.'

"A possible explanation for the intensity of the controversy here lies in the missionary zeal that both the Birch Society and the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade impart to their converts.

"Dozens of them in this area, individually and in teams, fan out nightly and over weekends, equipped with tape recordings, motion-picture projectors and suitcases of books and pamphlets to carry on their mission.

"Their audiences may be a dozen or more neighbors in a living room, a Rotary Club or American Legion meeting, a school assembly or many hundreds gathered in a public hall.

"A fairly typical meeting was held on a Sunday afternoon late in April at the lakefront estate of Mr. and Mrs. Jay Sheesley, in Glencoe.

"For 4 hours 300 specially invited guests heard lectures and watched a showing of 'Operation Abolition.' The program was presented by three young enlisted men from the Great Lakes Naval Training Center.

"The three-man Navy team is a product of Dr. Schwarz' school last summer at the Glenview Naval Air Station. Its members are Milton J. Fick, Francis R. Mills, and Robert Cocke. In the last 6 months, on their own time and without fee, they have conducted scores of such meetings, in points as far distant as Iowa and Wisconsin.

"'Please make it clear,' Mr. Fick said during a recent interview, 'that we do this independently of the Navy, and that we never appear in uniform.'

"A similar sense of dedication is displayed by Capt. Isaiah Hampton, commanding officer of the Glenview Naval Air Station. A tall, taciturn, career officer of 50, he described himself in an interview the other day as 'a Texas conservative.'

"'Lenin put it on the line 40 years ago,' he said, leaning intently across his desk—'"America will fall into our hands like overripe fruit." He meant it, and it's happening. I think it's important that every American citizen is made aware of it.'

"There is another side to this coin of fear that has become so much a part of the currency on the North Shore. It was noted by a woman schoolteacher in Winnetka the other day. Some of her family had lived in Nazi Germany. Asking that she not be quoted by name, she said:

"'Have you ever thought of the parallel between John Birch and Horst Wessel? I have, and it frightens me when I see this anti-Communist feeling getting out of hand'."

APPENDIX 4

This editorial, one of the keynote attacks marking the start of the Red anti-anti-Communist drive in the press could be used as a textbook example of what has the general title of the "poison pen tactic" in propaganda warfare.

In the style of Red "psywar," the New York Post editorial of May 25 subtly links smear symbols to the new target group, which hitherto had been given the hush-hush treatment, and against which there had been no breath of criticism. The tone of the editorial is gentle satire, along the patronizing, supercilious line that is the hallmark of certain fake sophisticated circles that have appropriated the fine old word "liberal" as a cloak for what is utterly illiberal. So, the New York State Division of Military and Naval Affairs is "hardly burdened with problems of grand strategy" and "has discovered a popular new battle terrain," which is support of meetings "ostensibly dealing with the danger of communism." The word "ostensibly" indicates that this is not its real purpose, but some other, concealed aim. Further on, by linking it to the Birch Society through a spiritual connection—whatever this means—the impression is conveyed, although not said, that this is a Fascist (Nazi) plot. Even a racist slur is gratuitously brought in by a reference to "know-nothingism." Incidentally, this is the line the Red manifesto has ordered implemented in its fight to crush the anti-Communist alertness and training program in the United States, especially in such powerful centers as the Pentagon. The editorial makes its point unmistakably with the sentence "Needless to say, the enterprise bears no serious relation to the Communist problem." The phrase, "needless to say," disarms those who would ask what basis there is for this tissue of pro-Red lies that constitutes the New York Post editorial. They are apparently lowbrows if they do happen to question the pro-Red point of view.

No textbook on clandestine tactics in psychological warfare, particularly its propaganda side, would be complete without this New York Post editorial of May 25, 1961:

"LOCAL WAR GAMES

"New York's State Division of Military and Naval Affairs, hardly overburdened with problem of grand strategy involving the deployment of armies and warships, has discovered a popular new battle terrain on which to exercise its surplus functions. It plans to play war games in the ideological arena by supporting a series of seminars ostensibly dealing with the danger of communism. Its first campaign will be an engagement in Albany designed to get funds for the charade.

"The field of anticommunism has become a game in which any number can play, regardless of their political literacy. Thus, the Militia Association of New York, a private organization of military officers, is sponsoring an 'educational' program under the auspices of a dubious outfit known as American Strategy, Inc. Financial support now comes from private sources, but the State division of military and naval affairs would remedy this logistics problem by tapping the public treasury as an official body and emerging openly as the command post.

"Any connection between American Strategy, Inc. and the Birch Society is not being advertised. But clearly the spiritual connection is unmistakable. Needless to say, the enterprise bears no serious relation to the Communist problem. But that doesn't seem to bother the players.

"We trust that when the division of military and naval affairs invites the legislature to subsidize the game, the answer will be loud, clear and negative. New York needs no new adventure in know-nothingism."

Of significance, too, was the first article on the subject published May 21 by the New York Times, a half-column-long dispatch, dated Albany. Crisply, the article led off with a proposed request for funds, not possible until next January, instead of relating what actually was the news, the start of this effort to acquaint the New York public with the truth about communism.

The article was written in a manner to provide basic material for attack, rather than to relate information even objectively. There isn't a hint that there is any valid reason for the seminars planned. The article follows:

"STATE'S MILITARY ALERTING ON REDS—DIVISION WEIGHS REQUESTING LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

"ALBANY, May 20.—The legislature may be asked to appropriate funds for a series of seminars designed to alert New Yorkers to the danger of communism.

"The State division of military and naval affairs said today it was considering a request to the legislature to support a program now being sponsored by the Militia Association of New York.

"The association is a private organization of about 3,500 officers of the New York Army National Guard, Air National Guard, and Naval Militia. It is headed by Maj. Gen. Collin P. Williams of Syracuse, commanding general of the Army National Guard 27th Armored Division.

"The legislature does not convene for a regular session until next January. In the meantime, the militia association's anti-Communist efforts will be bolstered by a privately endowed organization known as American Strategy, Inc., with headquarters at 95 Broad Street, New York.

"Program is outlined

"At the request of Maj. Gen. Almerin C. O'Hara, chief of staff to Governor Rockefeller, a representative of American Strategy addressed a briefing session conducted by the military and naval affairs division here. The speaker was Lt. Col. Gunther E. Hartel, a retired Army officer who was formerly on the staff of G-2 (Intelligence) of the 1st Army.

"'It is proposed that the effort of American Strategy, Inc., be coordinated with the militia association to provide a statewide program of public education on the threat of communism,' Colonel Hartel said.

"American Strategy will assist the militia association by providing lecturers and material about the nature of communism. The first seminar is scheduled for the weekend of June 24 in Syracuse."

A generally cooperative, indeed enthusiastic reception meets efforts to counter Red subversive warfare, with only isolated exceptions, once one leaves certain metropolitan areas, as New York City, where anti-anti-communism has made deep penetration in the communications field. Part of the reason may be that these interior regions are usually still beyond the effective reach of the pressure groups identified with the appeasement and better Red than dead mentalities.

An example is the following editorial, referring to retired Lt. Col. Gunther Hartel of American Strategy, Inc., and was printed in the Syracuse Post-Standard of September 2, 1960, shortly before he left the service:

"Battle for minds

"As the American Bar Association declines to urge high school courses on international communism, an Army psychological warfare expert warns Watertown Kiwanians 'we are losing the battle for men's minds while preparing for a hot war.'

"Lt. Col. Gunther Hartel, Camp Drum intelligence officer, has considerable knowledge of Communist methods. He was a psychological warfare adviser in southeast Asia.

"He says, 'The Communists are agitating strife to annihilate our Nation from within. This is being promoted through apathy, racial propaganda, and encouragement to defiant ones.' By defiant he means those who rebel against the principles of educational freedom and individual equality on which the country was founded.

"Alert Americans can sense this menace. Can high school pupils be made aware of it without courses on communism to show them just what they are up against? The American Bar Association apparently believes so.

"But if adult Americans are naive enough to be sucked in by Red propaganda, as Colonel Hartel insists, youngsters certainly need a thorough grounding in the psychological methods being used. If not in high school, where and when can the Communist system be explained?

"The greatest danger, it seems to us, is apathy. The ABA could do much to help in dispelling that state by coming out flatfooted for some method of offsetting the subtle conditioning of young American minds by those by whom Colonel Hartel terms 'masters of deceit.'

"It is well to view with alarm now and then. We become too complacent and miss the significance of events going on around us. And if we are indeed losing the battle for men's minds, it is time to find out what is wrong with the defiant ones and see what can be done about them."

APPENDIX 5

The assault on the Pentagon in the stepped-up anti-anti-Communist drive began on Sunday, June 18. The previous coverage by the New York Times apparently had been preparatory skirmishes. The big guns were now wheeled into place, and began firing.

On that day, an article began on the first page, entitled "Right-Wing Officers Worrying Pentagon," and continued three more columns long on page 56, spreading across the entire top of the page. It was signed again by Cabell Phillips, who apparently was now the New York Times anti-Communist movement exposé man.

The target was now shifted from secondary positions, along the periphery, to the heart of the anti-Communist campaign. Anti-Communist activities by military officers were equated with "radically right-wing political philosophies," a more genteel way of saying pro-Fascist or pro-Nazi. This set the campaign plan, heaping together in one propaganda grab bag all who showed energy or enterprise in exposing Communist tactics and explaining the evils of communism. The article was written in unmistakable exposé style, to give the impression there was something highly suspect and dangerous that should be uprooted and done away with, in disclosure of the devious ways by which the Reds are plotting our destruction.

It referred to "the so-called 'cold war policy' evolved by the National Security Council in the summer of 1958," thus setting up this training and alertness program as a primary target of the new anti-anti-Communist campaign.

The article began: "The Pentagon is having its troubles with right-wingers in uniform." Just who in particular was meant by "the Pentagon" was significantly not disclosed. But the article went into extensive detail on "the 'cold-war' activities" of commanding officers in implementing the directive. This has "caused alarm among the new civilian team in the Pentagon," the article declared, making it apparent that "the Pentagon" referred to was not the fighting force.

APPENDIX 6

The weekly Worker, published in New York and dated Sunday, July 16 (though appearing on newsstands July 14, a couple of days earlier), included the directive (signed by Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States) outlining implementation for the Red manifesto proclaimed in Moscow on December 5, 1960.

This occupied the double spread in the center of the paper. It struck out at the "ultraright," offered the Pentagon's 1958 directive as a special target, and laid down tactics to be employed concerning President Kennedy and his administration.

Arrogant and obvious as the directive appears regarding the White House and the administration generally, it cannot be brushed off, because the Reds have given sufficient evidence of their skill and facilities in entrapping non-Communists and even anti-Communists into falling into step behind them on some major pro-Communist issues. Both Republican and Democratic Parties could be forewarned of such traps by finding out this easy way about the Red plan for them. There isn't anything new about the way Communists operate, any more than there was about the Nazis. Totalitarians of such type contemptuously proclaim their tactics, in confidence that the free world, especially the United States, will be too dense to believe what it hears and reads, and unable to see through confusion deliberately fomented as a screen for the intrigue, and too flexible to adopt a firm stand, even if, at last, what is being perpetrated against them dawns upon them.

Gus Hall's directive flatly declares: "If the tactical problem is solved correctly, it will be possible to slam shut the door on the ultraright, defeat it, and force a shift in policy upon the administration itself in the direction of peace and democracy." The Red aim is described here as plainly as Communist language can make it. The words "peace and democracy" are employed in their dialectical materialist sense, "peace" indicating the state of affairs which arrives where all sides accept communism, and "democracy" the police state forms of dictatorship that prevails in the Soviet bloc.

Hall is as obvious as Khrushchev. His directive confirms that no conciliatory move, no negotiation, can possibly satisfy the Reds, except surrender to communism. They are willing to bargain on the form our capitulation to communism may take, but in no respect on whether we will give up or not. This must be accepted as, in their language, "inevitable."

The showdown can be delayed apparently, during what is called the coexistence period. This is the interval to which Hall refers in talking of a "tactical problem" to be dealt with, it being no less than the capture of the administration, as mad an objective as Khrushchev's own, which is to capture the American Nation. We would disregard either boast at our peril, and in disregard of past experience with Red wishes.

The Red tactic is as simple as it is bold. The Communists intend to use whatever crackpot minority exists at the extreme American right—and we even have a minute, pathological group in Arlington calling itself the American Nazi Party, led by a clinical case called George Lincoln Rockwell—as a weapon to destroy opposition to communism in the United States, by employing the American left in a snowballing operation which would bring our moderates into a new "united front," as sought by the Reds, to make this conspiracy succeed.

The appearance of certain other articles, immediately following this additional clarification of Red aims, is not without significance.

Here is the Worker directive:

"FOR PEOPLE'S UNITY AGAINST BIG BUSINESS AND WAR DANGER—THE ULTRARIGHT, KENNEDY, AND ROLE OF THE PROGRESSIVES

"(Our readers are invited to send in their views and comments on this important policy statement by Gus Hall. Our pages are opened for such discussion and for reports of united front discussions and activities in left and progressive circles.)

"(By Gus Hall, general secretary, Communist Parties, U.S.A.)

"The threat from the ultraright continues to mount in the United States. At the same time, the Kennedy administration pursues a cold war, interventionist, and generally antidemocratic course. We are, therefore, confronted with a unique problem of how, under these circumstances, to carry on the struggle for peace and democracy most effectively. The problem can best be posed by a series of questions.

"Is the threat from the extreme right serious, in the sense that it is approaching the position where it can exert the decisive influence in government or itself make a bid for power?

"What is the relationship between the ultraright and the Kennedy administration, and how are they different? Is it necessary to draw a line of differentiation?

"These are complex and serious problems. Much can be learned from our own history, especially the New Deal period, and also from parallel situations in other countries, as in France. But there are also new and special aspects which need serious assessment. Here I propose only to begin such an assessment.

"1. The threat from the ultraright

"In the opinion of the Communist Party, there can be no question but that the threat from the extreme right is serious. It arises from a situation which is new for the United States. This, the most powerful capitalist country, cannot have its way in a world in which the forces of socialism, national liberation, and peace are playing a decisive role. Continuing rebuffs and defeats for the cold war and interventionist policy (most recently in Cuba and Laos) confront the dominant monopoly power with a choice, essentially between two alternatives. One is to end the cold war and to seek some form of accommodation to the socialist and national revolutionary world, which would mean a turn to a policy of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition. Such a shift of policy would meet the most urgent national needs of the country in the present period of world history.

"The other course is to seek to contain and reverse world trends by all means, including so-called limited war and the ultimate nuclear war. It is necessary to recognize that the present cold-war policies of the administration lead in this direction. However, we must also recognize that the most aggressive and extreme expression of this suicidal policy comes from the ultraright.

"War is their prescription for the crisis facing the country. Senator GOLDWATER and Richard Nixon, contending for leadership of the rightwing Republicans advocate a war course, as do their Dixiecrat-Democratic allies, like Senators EASTLAND and SMATHERS. They are ready to take any pressing world issue, whether it be Cuba or Berlin, as an occasion for starting military action. They actively and aggressively seek the brink. In fact, Nixon is now calling for resuming the Dulles brinkmanship policy.

"The Fascist Network

"In back of this political war-minded coalition, there is emerging in the country an organized movement of the Fascist type, financed by the most chauvinist and aggressive sectors of big business. This is more serious than previous developments of this kind, and holds even a greater threat than the movement led by the late Senator Joe McCarthy.

"For one thing, unlike previous Fascist currents, the present movement is taking the form of a membership organization, in conspiratorial action groups, including secret military formations. The spearhead, the John Birch Society, is such an organization, around which is gathering a network of older hate groups, Fascist sheets, and the white citizens councils and other diehard racist groups of the South.

"The Fascist network is openly in a sort of division of labor, in conjunction with legislative committees, like HUAC and the Senate Internal Security Committee, and similar bodies in the States.

"It is developing the demagogy characteristic of Fascist movements, such as repeal of the income tax, and is also beginning to put forth antimonopoly slogans to ensnare middle-class dissent.

"The Fascist network is openly contemptuous of democracy and the Bill of Rights, and

advocates the right of revolution—that is, in fact, counterrevolution. It proclaims the aim of seizing political power. With considerable influence in Government today, it is working to dominate it entirely.

"Military-Big Business Complex

"Another pronounced characteristic of this growing Fascist movement is its spreading influence among the higher military personnel. The case of General Walker was only a symptom of a much deeper affliction. Even the Pentagon had to admit recently that it was worried over the extent of Birchite and similar influences among the ranking officers of the military services.

"It is now known that a secret directive, issued by the National Security Council in 1958, instructed commanding officers here and abroad to enlighten both the Armed Forces and civilians in their areas on the cold war policy. It was followed by additional guides and materials, still classified as secret, issued by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on the basis of which seminars and meetings were organized by the military commands, often in cooperation with local business groups. Complaints have been pouring into the Pentagon against the political activities of the military staffs, especially their wide dissemination of Birchite propaganda and of the obnoxious films 'Operation Abolition' and 'Communism on the Map.'

"The entire line of policy, coupled with CIA and similar training in subversive and putschist activities, cannot help but create our own 'French Generals,' who feel at home in Fascist circles, and are ready to lend themselves to their objectives. It is an outgrowth of 20 years of militarization, of the close cooperation between the Armed Forces and monopoly in handling a $40-billion budget annually, and of a desperation born of a bankrupt foreign policy.

"This complex of monopoly and the military, nurtured on war economy, has diverted science to military uses almost entirely, buying out the main branches of higher education and bringing within this web large sections of the student youth and intellectuals.

"When you get this combination of high-ranking military officers, the Fascist organizations in North and South, the right Republican-Dixiecrat coalition, and deep inroads into governmental bodies and in the educational system, we can surely say that the threat from the ultraright is serious indeed.

"The aim of this movement, shared by the varied elements of the ultraright and reaction, is the complete destruction of democracy, the wiping out of the main social gains won by labor and the people in the past decades, the suppression or subversion of independent people's organizations like the trade unions, peace groups, and Negro societies, and the incarnation of Jim Crowism and racism as a national creed—in a word, a garrison state that will seek to drive the country to war and self-destruction.

"*2. The Kennedy administration*

"The policies and actions of the big business-dominated Kennedy administration during the first 6 months played into the hands of the ultraright. In substance, the main direction of its blows has been against peace and independence, against democratic and civil rights, against labor.

"In this brief period, the administration managed to proclaim a policy of paramilitary intervention against national liberation movements, stepped up the arms race and the cold war, and launched the military adventure against Cuba.

"It sought to cool off the freedom riders, and has evaded legislative and executive action in the field of civil rights.

"It invoked the Taft-Hartley law against the maritime strikers.

"The Department of Justice declares the intention of the administration to follow through on the fateful Supreme Court anti-Communist decisions by renewed vigorous prosecution of the Communist Party.

"By proclaiming communism the real and imminent danger, President Kennedy has acceded to the central pretext under which the ultraright and Fascist trends seek their aims, and has thereby stimulated reaction.

"Not on Fascist Road

"The Kennedy administration pursues this course because it is dominated by the big monopolies and financiers whose interests it serves. This must be kept firmly in mind. Yet, while recognizing that it has taken measures which further curtail democratic rights, it would be a serious mistake to consider the Kennedy administration as embarked at present on the Fascist road.

"To make the proper differentiation between Kennedy and the ultraright is the central tactical problem faced by the entire left and all progressives. It is not simple. Kennedy is not a Roosevelt. Since his election, he has been moving in a reactionary direction. But it is not inevitable that he will continue along this path, giving ever wider openings to the ultraright.

"If the tactical problem is solved correctly, it will be possible to slam shut the door on the ultraright, defeat it, and force a shift in policy upon the administration itself in the direction of peace and democracy.

"Kennedy's Contradictory Course

"It seems to me we must always keep in mind the various necessities and commitments with which the Kennedy administration must operate, and which the ultraright wants to ignore and shove aside.

"The Kennedy administration pursues a contradictory course which flows from the instability of the U.S. imperialist position, from the new relationship of world forces (the growing strength of the socialist, anti-imperialist, and peace forces), which it recognizes but does not fully and properly assess. Its wavering course results also from pressure of the masses of people in our country, particularly from the working class, the Negro people, the peace forces which have been its main support and which elected it.

"This zig-zag, oscillating course is to be seen in a number of facts: For example, even while maintaining a cold-war policy, the administration remains committed to a position of negotiation with the Soviet Union—as on Berlin, Laos, nuclear testing and disarmament. It is no small matter that Kennedy, despite all he said against it, had to resume talks with Khrushchev at Geneva, talks which had been ruptured by the U-2 incident.

"It is also of significance that Kennedy decided not to back up the emigree invasion of Cuba with direct and open U.S. military support, as criminal and reprehensible as was his decision to go through with the military adventure, and as serious as still is the danger of U.S. imperialist intervention. It is also noteworthy that Kennedy must still seek to maintain democratic and anti-colonial pretenses in his dealings with the national liberation movements, although his objective remains to contain and reverse them. This creates certain embarrassments for him in world affairs, in view of anti-democratic measures at home.

"The Important Difference

"It is of course true that these maneuvers, pretenses, and concessions are forced upon him by the strength of the world peace forces, by the deterioration of imperialism, by the declining world prestige and position of U.S. imperialism in particular, and by the deep-rooted peace and democratic sentiment of the American people.

"But the fact remains that the Kennedy administration has not closed the door to accommodation to these world realities, as the ultraright wishes it to do, and this involves a certain recognition of the new necessities of the present-day world at home and abroad. This is an important difference, which the forces for peace and democracy must recognize and exploit in order to bring about the required change in national policy.

"Turning to the domestic scene, we must also recognize that as a consequence of the elections and of labor, Negro, and liberal support, it is difficult for Kennedy to ignore his commitments in the field of social legislation, which the ultraright would like to cancel out entirely. As inadequate as his measures are, they have to be fought for in a reactionary Congress.

"Shedding of Illusions

"It is a good thing that many of the illusions about Kennedy in the ranks of labor, the Negro people, and other popular circles are now being shed as a result of experience. I need only mention the deep cleavage, after the Cuban fiasco, among the liberals who supported Kennedy, the sharp criticism from labor following his use of Taft-Hartley, the scorn with which many Negro leaders and militants greeted the cooling off proposition with respect to implementing of the rights of Negro Americans, the vigor with which the youth movement fights the anti-democratic attack.

"Moreover, there is a growing insistence in the ranks of labor and among other people's forces upon more adequate and far-reaching measures to meet the severe problem of mounting unemployment, which has become a permanent fixture affecting the lives of millions. The paltry measures of the administration leave practically unsolved the many accumulating social problems arising from automation, the impoverishment of entire regions, the permanent eviction of millions of farmers from production, the old and new slum areas, the special suffering of the masses of Negro, Puerto Ricans and other underprivileged Americans, the crisis of the educational system, and the chaotic conditions of the metropolitan areas. Much more needs to be done to even approach the solution of problems of the aged, public health, and the youth. The rising mass movements in the country bear witness to the growing determination of the people to find positive solutions.

"It would be wishful thinking to assume that all liberal or forward-looking forces in the Kennedy camp, who must in their way participate in turning the tide, are equally aware of the double role played by Kennedy. These elements can become an effective positive force once they realize it is necessary to fight Kennedy's cold war and antidemocratic policies in order to defend democracy and to close the door to the extreme right and defeat the threat from that direction.

"AFL-CIO Cold War Resolution

"We need to be aware that when people in large numbers become disillusioned or panicky there is always the danger that they may be entrapped by the demagogy of the ultraright, especially when their leaders become the instruments or allies of monopoly. For example, the recent statement of the AFL-CIO executive council, drawn up by professional anti-Communists, supports the most aggressive warlike incitement in the so-called Berlin crisis, and even urges the resumption of nuclear testing.

"Such a position can only have the most harmful effects upon the struggles of the trade unions themselves for economic and social demands, help the employers weaken the unions, and open the door wide to the ultraright type of demagogy within labor itself. The council resolution, I am sure, does not represent the view of most trade unionists, nor even of all heads and officers of the unions in the executive council. It

is about time that labor leaders with views closer to the feelings of the membership should speak out clearly against the cold war and reactionary position which is imposed by a small group at the top.

"The Main Enemy

"To sum up on this point, it seems to me that the way to meet the unique tactical problem presented by a threat from the extreme right and by an administration moving in a reactionary direction is somewhat along these lines.

"It would be a serious mistake to underestimate the dangers to peace and democracy of the Kennedy administration. It would be no less serious a mistake to underrate the possibilities of pressuring it in another direction. It is essential to fight imperialism, war, and reactionary measures whether they come from the Kennedy government or the ultrarights.

"However, the situation requires that the main direction of the attack should be at the warmongering and Fascist forces, who are pressuring the Kennedy administration further to the right. At the same time, every policy or action of Kennedy that plays into the hands of the right should be sharply opposed and criticized, building up the pressures upon the administration for a change of policy in the direction of peaceful coexistence and defense of democracy.

"It is necessary to work for the widest united front of all labor, Negro people, peace, and progressive forces in the country, embracing democratic elements of all political views, in a struggle against big business reaction and war danger. It is essential to organize a counteroffensive against big business attacks on the people—for improving conditions at the expense of the monopolists, for jobs, for equal rights for the Negro people, and above all for the preservation of peace and democracy. In all this, the working class, the labor movement, should be the basis.

"As I have already said, this is not simple. But it can be done. It has been done before during the Roosevelt days, particularly because of the role played by a resurgent labor movement. It can be done again. It will take great efforts, sacrifice, and fighting spirit.

"Above all, it requires a common outlook and united front activity in all fields by the left and progressives forces, Communist and non-Communist. Without the unity of such forces in the ranks of labor, among the Negro people, in the youth movement, and among the fighters for peace and democracy, the promising popular movements now arising will remain disjointed and apart, prey to the mounting attacks of reaction.

"3. Left-progressive unity

"How is such unity to be attained? First, of course, it is necessary to reach a mutually agreed-upon outlook for the immediate period ahead, agreement on tactics and on programs. This requires discussion among all forces of the left, in which past differences are subordinated to the need to find common ground to meet the onslaught of reaction. Still better, common action should develop around such issues and positions that can be immediately agreed upon, even while broader and long-range discussions proceed.

"Attitudes to Communist Party

"One of the obstacles in some parts of the left is a sharply critical or negative attitude to the Communist Party. Some of it is of older social-democratic or Trotskyite origin, but another current is of more recent vintage. This is the product in one way or another of the intensified campaign by big business against communism, of the renewed reactionary attacks, and of the recent crisis in the Communist Party.

"Undoubtedly, the party crisis contributed to a certain disorientation in the left. While I realize that this cannot be dismissed with a sweep of the hand, the fact remains that the new reactionary attack opened by the Supreme Court decisions has created a new situation both for the party and the entire left.

"For example, how can the position now be defended that the Communist Party is no longer needed in the United States? Those on the left who claimed this should think over how it is that the reactionary majority of the Supreme Court, for its own motives and reasons, came to a similar conclusion.

"Naturally, we have refused to accept this judgment, whether it comes from the High Court or elsewhere. On the contrary, we have made clear our firm determination to defend the constitutional rights of the party against every effort of the Department of Justice to force us to comply with the monstrous registration and other provisions of the anti-Communist laws.

"Is this a service or a disservice to the left and to the cause of peace and democracy? Would it not be a disastrous setback to the left and all forces of progress if those who wished to smash us or dissolve us had their way? Is not the launching of a new attack against us a signal that peace and democracy are in serious danger?

"In fact, it was the clear fighting stand of the Communist Party which made possible the first victory in the struggle against the implementation of the Court decisions—the staying of the mandate pending consideration of the petition for rehearing in the fall term of the Supreme Court.

"A very important lesson is to be learned from this. No matter what one's attitude may be toward the Communist Party, it must be recognized that the fight for its rights as a political party is a matter of defending the Bill of Rights and all democratic rights, and is the concern of all, especially of all left, democratic, and peace forces, and not of the Communists alone. This is an old lesson, but sometimes it has to be learned anew.

"Role of Communist Issue

"Therefore, I think it is clear that the left and progressive forces cannot permit themselves to be split on the Communist issue, if there is to be unity and common action. Refusal to work with Communists for defense of peace and democracy and for the people's needs is the first step, sometimes the decisive one, in splitting the people's forces. It is the wedge driven into the ranks of labor and the people by reaction, as its most potent weapon against the popular movements.

"Anti-Communist attitudes in the ranks of the left and progressive forces can only have the result of contributing to the aims of reaction by spreading the kind of ideological confusion that can render the moving forces of the people helpless and ineffective.

"Therefore, if unity is to be attained in the ranks of the left as a means of stimulating wider activity—if such unity means anything—it must be unity of Communist and non-Communist forces, with the give and take that is required to reach minimum agreement. If there is one thing everyone should have learned from the history of the past decades it is the stalwart and indispensable role of Communists in the struggle against reactionary and war forces.

"United Front Electoral Policy

"Finally, let me emphasize what I think is a central objective toward which all forces on the left are striving. If the tactic outlined in the previous section is correct, and I think it is, the need for an independent electoral policy for the left and progressive forces around which broader peace and democratic forces can be mobilized, assumes extraordinary importance.

"The left and progressives, including ourselves, have not given this the seriousness it requires, for which we have not refrained from criticizing ourselves, as can be seen from our report to the national committee in January of this year.

"The municipal elections in New York and other cities present an opportunity which should not be missed to take the initial steps toward an independent united front electoral policy, around the central issues of peace, equal rights, the people's needs, and democracy. In evolving such a policy and united front electoral tickets, we should also look ahead to the elections of 1962 and 1964, with the aim of presenting meaningful alternatives to labor, the Negro, and other people's forces in terms of their needs and interests. This is a big task, and needs the unstinting attention and energy of the left and progressive forces in all fields.

"Action Needed Now

"I am confident that the onslaught of reaction can be repulsed, and the country again set on the course of peace and democracy. The Communists, for their part, are ready to join with all other left and progressive forces to establish the perspective and unity that is required if reaction is to be defeated and peace defended.

"The Communists have no self-serving interest in urging unity of left and progressive forces. Everyone recognizes that such unity is needed to defeat reaction and end the cold war. The situation itself begs for common actions, united fronts, and broader parallel movements—all serving the cause of peace and democracy.

"It seems to me imperative that left and progressive forces should not lose a moment in beginning now to find the common meeting ground, in fraternal discussions, for the united front approach and programs leading to common action for common objectives.

"There should be a coming together of such forces in the ranks of labor, in the Negro rights movement, in the youth movement, among the advocates of peace. The effort should be made wherever possible, in the localities and cities and communities, not waiting for a nationwide development, but contributing to it, building up the movement, giving it a living base on which it can flourish.

"It is my hope that all elements and currents of the left will set such a movement into motion, that in their publications and organizations discussions of this kind should proceed. I am convinced that once this is set in motion, it will grow and spread with a speed and depth that will surprise all of us."

APPENDIX 7

A Marquis Childs column was published in the Washington Post of July 14 that was remarkable in two aspects: for its timing as well as its content. Its timing was perfectly geared to the shift into high in the anti-anti-Communist drive. It dealt with the main points in the campaign to liquidate the anti-Communist movement generally, especially by pulling the carpet out from under the Pentagon program.

Of significance for those interested in the role leaks play in "psywar" pressures, is its reference to: "A memorandum recently sent from Capitol Hill to the White House and thence to the Department of Defense." Of equal significance is its snide allusion to "an Eisenhower directive of 1958, still in force, that put the military in the business of helping to alert Americans to the need for an overall war strategy."

These points are major ones in the Gus Hall directive. The memorandum was further clarified in the New York Times and Washington Post in articles a few days later, on July 21.

This propaganda barrage is evidence of the finesse with which coordination and follow-through are employed in pursuance of Red strategy in its anti-anti-Communist drive.

APPENDIX 8

The extraordinary synchronization in the Red anti-anti-Communist drive was vividly exemplified by an article that covered the top half of the first page in the editorial section of the Sunday Washington Post on July 16.

The article, signed by Edward T. Folliard, was given a banner headline entitled: "American 'Right' Embraces a Curious Mixture." If one sought implementation of the original Red manifesto's summons, and the tactics in support of it as just published by Gus Hall, here it was. How this could come about, what specific links existed in the shadow world of Red "psywar," what exact strings were pulled far behind, are of course beyond this analyst to say, certainly beyond the ken of the Washington Post feature writer. But this much is obvious: it is impossible for this to have been without propaganda links, for there not to have been any "psywar" string pulling.

Indeed, this sort of propaganda orchestration is what the so-called scientific propaganda pressures of modern "psywar" are supposed to achieve. The players know only the conductor in front of them, and he may be totally ignorant of who selected the music, arranged the program, and why. The extraordinary orchestration in the articles that preceded and appeared in leading newspapers and magazines about the time of the Gus Hall statement is in fullest accord with the new "unity" line of the Red manifesto, which instructed the Communist Party to ignore ideological differences in building up support for the position taken by the Moscow-Peiping-through-Havana axis.

APPENDIX 9

Every so often, an old note is struck along with the new, in support of the anti-anti-Communist drive. The Washington Post located a former Soviet agent, who had been around for some years now, interviewed him, and ran him on the first page. Did he say anything new and startling? What he said or how it sounded in the interview, was the old cliche that anti-Communists are "spreading confusion" and are "more valuable" to Moscow than Red agents.

His interview took the additional line that anti-Communist activity, especially in the Pentagon, was a reflection of Birch Society views and was the "fanning of religion and racial conflict." Just to make this amazing example of modern journalistic enterprise complete, it took a vicarious slap at congressional inquiry into communism.

APPENDIX 10

The Reporter magazine, in its July 20 issue, ran a 4½-page article by its executive editor, Philip Horton, entitled "Revivalism on the Far Right." This was an all-out operation, that outsmeared anything it had attacked in the past by using the word "McCarthyism," now employed by it as a Pavlovian trigger word in propaganda, without relation to anyone dead or alive, except through sheer coincidence.

Guilt by association is said to be held in horror in Reporter circles. Certainly the tag has been freely used by them as a propaganda weapon when it has to do with the uprooting of Reds. But now, employed to uproot anti-Communists, it has been made into a tactic used more than any other in this new Red drive. Indeed, it is the most characteristic part of the anti-anti-Communist campaign. This Reporter article is a vivid example of it.

One organization it attacks this way has always leaned over backwards to avoid implication in anything that might be considered unfair to any individual, forbidding the naming of names, keeping out extremist literature of any kind. Philip Horton was able to find something devilish even in this. He analyzed it as a sort of round-robin smear, that sought to convey the impression that "there are Communists everywhere you look. * * *" When an anti-Communist deed or person is to be attacked, presumedly all is grist to the mill; one can be damned for doing something, or for not doing it.

The Christian Anti-Communist Crusade, referred to here, has been immune to attack hitherto. The article associates it with extremism, nonetheless. No matter how, any criticism of communism apparently must be roundly condemned in accordance with the Red anti-anti-Communist drive. The similarity between the propaganda pitch used, and the numerous outlets it has obtained in the press, would be impossible without there being some central source for it. A comparison of the Reporter outburst with others published about the same time shows a fantastic similarity that cannot be brushed off as accidental.

The article, too, is an example of an intriguing tactic in the manipulation of words. Words, and phrases that have favorable connotation in ordinary language are likely to be put in quotation marks, giving them a sinister slant. This tactic is being met with more and more. It is being done in Communist literature to distinguish words in their so-called bourgeois sense, as found in our dictionaries, from words that the Reds regard as correctly employed in their dialectical materialist meaning. Failure of non-Communists, and even anti-Communists, to put words, when used in a Red sense, inside quotation marks is responsible for a large amount of the enemy's success in putting across its misinformation and propaganda.

The Reporter article in its first column uses quotation marks, for instance, when referring to "schools" and "seminars," if these are anti-Communist. Other words enclosed in quotation marks are "doctors," "scientists," and "authorities." In each case, a slur is achieved on some anti-Communist. The article ends up with an attack on the projected Freedom Academy bill, that would provide a West Point for psychological warfare.

APPENDIX 11

With their usual display of ingratitude, with which the Reds embarass those who have tried to play fair with them, or collaborated, the weekly Worker, which went on sale July 21, though dated July 23, ran an article boasting that it had been the source of the press campaign in which, like a wolf-pack, attacks were being made on "the insidious alliance between military leaders—active and retired—and rightwing groups in the United States."

APPENDIX 12

On July 21, the Washington Post ran a dispatch quoting from a memorandum which it said had been prepared by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for its chairman, Senator FULBRIGHT. The article was credited to David Burnham, a United Press International writer.

The dispatch said the memorandum had been made available to UPI the previous day, and quoted from it, including a warning that purported rightwing activities resulting from a National Security Council 1958 directive in the Pentagon might lead to excesses like that of the revolt of the French generals.

The memorandum apparently was referred to in the Marquis Childs column of July 14, also in the Washington Post, and the 1958 directive in the New York Times of June 18, where the press drive to extend the anti-anti-Communist drive to the Pentagon seems to have been launched.

APPENDIX 13

The New York Times returned to the attack on July 21, with another article by Cabell Phillips that started on the first page and continued inside for a column. This declared that "restraints" had been placed on Pentagon officers as the result of the memorandum from Senator FULBRIGHT.

APPENDIX 14

The Baltimore Sun published an article, 1½ columns long, starting on page 1, from its own correspondent, and the two Washington newspapers ran Associated Press articles on July 22, regarding statements by Senators FULBRIGHT and THURMOND concerning the role of Pentagon officers in the anti-Communist training and alertness program.

APPENDIX 15

The New York Times on July 24 ran an editorial indicating that "rightwing" Pentagon officers were casting doubt on the value of American rearmament, declaring the Communist menace was in the United States, not abroad.

This was a new tack in the anti-anti-Communist line. There has been no supporting evidence—indeed the contrary. Military officers, the same as civilian observers, stressed the universality of the Red menace, pointing out that a Communist is just as much an enemy wherever he locates, and must be spotted wherever he operates, in or out of the United States.

APPENDIX 16

The Nation magazine, in its July 26 issue, ran a three-page article from the west coast, entitled "New Right in Action." It was written in the now familiar roundup manner, categorizing the entire anti-Communist movement in the United States as extreme rightist, and purporting to expose it.

The article, as a number had done, pointed out the big impact of the anti-Communist movement. Much of the material, obviously as scare material, would only appear so to persons already conditioned into believing there is something essentially wrong in teaching people how to avoid Communist propaganda traps, and the evil and danger in communism. Otherwise, what is written in these articles, to the dismay of their authors, if they realize it, probably had the opposite effect on many readers, creating a favorable instead of an unfavorable response. Average Americans, even readers of self-styled "liberal" publications, are good citizens, as anxious as any others that their liberties be maintained and protected.

This Nation article, as the one in the Reporter of July 20 (see app. 10), boasted that orders to soft pedal or suppress the anti-Communist program had come from highest circles in Washington. The Nation said: "* * * objections were being raised in high places to this sort of political activity on the part of the military. Both President Kennedy and the Defense Department had made it plain that statements of policy coming from the military must henceforth be cleared by higher civilian authority." The Reporter article declared: "* * * it is apparent that the new civilian leadership of the Pentagon is taking steps to avoid any possible misunderstandings in the future."

The administration's position was obviously being interpreted as opposing the program that came out of the Korean war, to train

and alert our people to recognize Communist traps and to know how to preserve their mental and physical stamina under Red pressures. Just who was spreading this impression and the rumors was unrevealed.

The Nation's article was written by a husband and wife team, Alex Gottfriend, described as "a political scientist at the University of Washington," and Sue Davidson, "a member of the American Friends Service Committee and of the ACLU."

APPENDIX 17

Never, since the most virulent days of Goebbels' "hate" propaganda, has anything appeared in the United States comparable to a 47-page booklet, dated June 1961, put out by the Communist Party of the United States in connection with its drive to smother the expanding anti-Communist movement in this country.

The 35-cent booklet is entitled "The Fascist Revival," and purports to tell "the inside story of the John Birch Society." The author is Mike Newberry, another Worker specialist in unbridled smear.

The booklet is evidence of the degree to which the Communist Party considers itself immune from libel, through a complex legal barrier it has built around itself, and by exploitation of the double standard. Communists have created an atmosphere in which those victimized by its lies feel it is futile to seek recompense.

The virulent tone of the booklet, with all stops out in vituperative propaganda, indicates that the Communist Party would like to create a new, Pavolian trigger word for this period in its psychological warfare, and believes "Birchite" might be put into the language this way, replacing "McCarthyite." The impact of the latter fabricated word apparently no longer is strong enough to meet Red needs. Communist deeds have deprived it of its effectiveness in Red "psywar."

The Communists now seek to create a new scare word. This would evoke a conditioned response in a background of fear, founded on the specter of a Fascist plot inside the United States, which would attack all minorities and spread terror to everyone. This Red propaganda objective is a terror maneuver. It would be what they call the "correct" line for this time, to make the American public jittery through pressure from abroad, by manufactured crises in places such as Berlin and Laos, and by pressure at home through visions of a "Fascist revival." A jittery United States would be off-balance and vulnerable.

This is the "psywar" aim of the present Red propaganda drive, in which the Communist Party in the United States is working hand in hand with the Red network headquartered in Moscow.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from South Carolina does not question the patriotism of Mr. Cabell Phillips and Mr. Marquis Childs. One may differ with their views; but I hope the Senator from South Carolina does not question their patriotism or their devotion to the country.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as I stated in my address, I have not questioned the patriotism of the persons the Senator has named. But I will say that the persons he named are permitting themselves to be used to hinder the anti-Communist campaign in this country, and they are promoting—by their efforts, their words, their writings, and their acts—the campaign that is hurting the anti-Communist efforts in the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad the Senator has made it clear that he does not question the patriotism of these men. I hope he will also make it clear that he does not question the patriotism of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have not mentioned the name of the junior Senator from Arkansas. I certainly have not questioned the patriotism of the junior Senator from Arkansas. But I wish to say that the memorandum of the junior Senator from Arkansas is, to my way of thinking, the most shocking document I have seen since I came to the U.S. Senate. I will say further that when, in the memorandum, the junior Senator from Arkansas says there is little need to alert the American people to the dangers of the cold war against communism, that is a grave and a dangerous statement and, I think, is a disservice to the American people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course the Senator from South Carolina is perfectly within his rights in doing that. However, it is very important that we not divide the Nation on this question and that we do not question the patriotism of honest and devoted men who may differ with us in regard to tactics.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to say this further, however: When people allow themselves to be used—whether they are duped or in any other way—to promote efforts that promote communism, it is a disservice to the Nation; and when these writers and these newspapers permit themselves to be used to promote the Communist cause, they are rendering a genuine disservice to the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that we respect the military record of the Senator from South Carolina, and we know he is thoroughly patriotic according to his light. I am sure these gentlemen have equal devotion to the Nation; and I am glad the Senator from South Carolina has disavowed any imputation about their basic motives, however much he may differ with them as regards their tactics.

Mr. THURMOND. It is my hope that they will discontinue allowing themselves to be used in a way that will promote the Communist cause in America that is hurting our country today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. These gentlemen are just as opposed to communism as is the Senator from South Carolina, and while their views on tactics may differ, I feel confident that their devotion to this Nation is not excelled by that of any of us. I felt I should say this, in view of the possible implication of what the Senator from South Carolina has said.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have made no implication. I thought I made it clear in my speech that there was no questioning of motives of those whom I have mentioned. However, I want to repeat this paragraph, since the Senator from Illinois has raised the point, and state that I stand on this paragraph:

This provides a special responsibility, however, to such newspaper correspondents and editors and others whose work influences attitudes. Mr. Hunter brings this out in his testimony. Writers of such distinction as Cabell Phillips and Marquis Childs, therefore, and their editors, have a duty to guard themselves against being used as fronts for a Red objective. They surely must know after all these years that one of the main tactics of the Reds is to bunch together all types from a Milquetoast, to a middle-of-the-roader, to a hysteric, and to call them all extremists and fascists. These writers must have known this, and they, therefore, had the responsibility, as do all other writers in this cold war, to avoid being utilized in this way. Yet they didn't do so. The fact remains, however, that they should and must know better, yet they allowed themselves to fall into the Red trap. This is what can destroy our country, and this is what we all have the duty of guarding against. There is a difference between being hit by a booby-trap and walking deliberately into it.

Mr. President, I stand on that statement. I do not say that those two authors are not patriotic. I do say that they have permitted themselves to be used in this Red propaganda, which is calculated to hurt America.

I yield the floor.

CENTENNIAL OF ST. GEORGE, UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, this week marks the centennial of the founding of St. George, Washington County, in the southern part of Utah. This part of Utah is known as Dixie, because the Mormon leaders sent a colony to settle in the southern part of Utah and directed them to plant and raise cotton, which they did. This was in 1861, with the Civil War just beginning, and it was necessary that there be a supply of cotton to the pioneers living in the new land, separated from the eastern part of the United States. So we still know that area as Dixie.

Yesterday marked the high point in the centennial celebration, with a meeting at which three very noted natives of our State participated. I desire to comment particularly on one of them.

The first of the three men who were honored and who made speeches yesterday is George Romney, who is president of American Motors, and a descendant of Miles Romney, who was architect of St. George Mormon Temple, the first temple built by the Mormons in Utah.

The second man is Glen E. Snow, secretary of the National Education Association, and descendant of Erastus Snow, one of the founders of the city, who was sent on the mission by Brigham Young. The third distinguished gentleman was the junior Senator from Nevada, HOWARD W. CANNON, who is the descendant of David H. Cannon, Mormon pioneer in southern Utah.

Senator CANNON was born in St. George, attended schools there, held public office in that city and county, and lived during all of his life, prior to the war, in Utah. After the war he went elsewhere in his profession, and has now come to the Senate of the United States

representing our neighboring State of Nevada. This is also in keeping, I think, with the early history of Utah, because Utah used to include all of Nevada, half of Colorado, part of Wyoming and Idaho, and a good part of southern California. Utah had a seacoast in those days, and an area in southern California still bears marks of the colonization of the early Mormon pioneers.

Senator CANNON delivered a speech yesterday in St. George, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

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

SPEECH OF SENATOR HOWARD W. CANNON, ST. GEORGE, UTAH, CENTENNIAL, AUGUST 27, 1961

Old friends and neighbors of St. George and Utah, it is indeed a privilege and a pleasure to return to the city of my birth and join with you in this wonderful and familiar tabernacle in the joyous celebration of the St. George centennial.

Although life has led me to build my career in an adjacent State, my days of growth and education and public service here, once as a county prosecutor, have enriched my life more than words can ever express.

This country and these people will ever hold a unique place in my heart. I learned lessons of a great people in St. George and of the meaning of public service. Others before me had learned these lessons well.

One was Angus M. Cannon, the first mayor of St. George, who was elected April 7, 1862.

Another was George Q. Cannon, who was sent in 1850 to the Sandwich Islands, now known as Hawaii, our 50th State. His love of people and devotion to humanity made him one of the most successful missionaries ever to be received there; and among his accomplishments was the translation of the book of Mormon into the Hawaiian language. He served as territorial delegate for a session of the Congress in 1862, and again in 1872 went to Congress—this time for Utah—and served for 10 years.

Senator Frank J. Cannon, served as one of Utah's first two Senators from 1896 to 1899. So we Cannons, and I include my mother who is in the audience now, are involved with Utah by kin, by friendship, and by God. In fact, it might be accurately observed that there are more Cannons in St. George than there are Kennedys in Washington.

The history of St. George is as stirring as that of any other section of our great Nation. On July 29, 1776, the same month in which the Declaration of Independence was proclaimed far to the east in Philadelphia, an expedition left Santa Fe, N. Mex., which was destined to discover this region of southern Utah. This early pilgrimage was led by the Spanish friars of New Mexico and sought to establish a direct route between Sante Fe and the California missions, thus uniting the entire vast region under one ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

The success of that journey pushed exploration of our Nation further west. One of the culminations of that tortuous journey was the location of Utah's Dixie. Later, this exploration provided the first definite historic reference to the site of our future town.

Some 70 years later, in February 1846, the advance companies of the famed Mormon trek, under the leadership of the great Brigham Young, crossed the Mississippi. After a migration, which in heroism ranks second to none in history, Orson Pratt and Erastus Snow entered Salt Lake Valley on July 21, 1847; a small body arrived the next day, and 2 days later the greater part of the company reached its destination and plowing was immediately begun.

As for the founding of St. George, it has been remarked by a Utah historian that it partakes of an epic character. Success in raising cotton in more northerly regions induced the leaders of the Mormon Church to undertake large-scale colonization of extreme southern Utah with this end in view. Even then, the region, because of soil and climate and occasionally the menace of hostile savages, had a grim reputation.

Those who were "called" to the Dixie mission "to sustain Israel in the mountains," were as a rule far from happy about it. It was a call for genuine sacrifice—possibly of life itself—and few who were selected for the Dixie mission were under illusions as to what confronted them.

Nor would they fear, nor shrink from the challenge, in fulfilling the prophecy of Brigham Young.

By November 25 of 1861, more than 200 wagons were drawn up on the site of St. George. The town consisted of two long rows of wagons facing each other, with a ditch between. It is an interesting commentary on courage and inflexible determination of these pioneers, inspired with zeal for good works, that before a single house was erected, St. George became an incorporated town. Erastus Snow, one of the first two men to enter the great valley, had been chosen as the apostle to build up Dixie. Under his guidance, the colonists started directly to experiment with growing cotton and fruit and, in the 1870's, silk. Life was heartbreakingly difficult those first years, especially for the wives. Nowhere was the title "Pioneer Mother," now symbolized by the statues familiar to all who cross this continent, more nobly earned.

Gradually, things improved. The pioneers and their descendents prevailed over the soil, if not the climate.

The improvement of U.S. 91 as an arterial highway opened up truck routes to Salt Lake City and as far as the Pacific coast, thus effectively removing the Dixie region from its isolation.

The community itself has been revitalized owing to its central position between Salt Lake City and Los Angeles, together with its availability as a point of departure for nearby scenic wonders of Utah, which the country at large is just beginning to appreciate.

Equally important, among the great traditions and strength of character witnessed here was the Mormon respect for education. This was expressed in the founding in 1911 of Dixie Junior College, my own alma mater, which was given 22 years later to the State of Utah.

The history of St. George is alive with the spirit of heroism fortified by faith and courage. I cannot help but believe that this spirit which animated our pioneer forefathers and their noble wives in the founding of this State is no less exemplified by this generation. Here there is no room for depression and no obstacle will ever diminish the enthusiasm of your residents. The lesson we learn today in St. George is a lesson repeated a hundred times across this country, dating back to the beginnings of our strength as a nation.

That spirit, which caused so many families to leave their comparatively comfortable homes for an uncertain journey of 37 days to Dixie Valley, is not dead today. The will to sacrifice and share our abundance with the less fortunate of the earth that motivated our pioneers is now the highest goal of our Nation and the key to our survival.

It took 37 days for those pioneers to reach St. George, and for many years 30 days was considered fast time for the journey between Salt Lake and St. George. Yet, today, I reach this area from Washington in 4 hours by jet, and a Russian astronaut circles the globe in little more than 80 minutes.

But the courage of a people is not measured by time. Courage is in the heart. Liberty is in the heart, not in the books and the laws of a nation. My conviction is that our twin heritage of courage and love of liberty still inspires Americans as the embodiment of all of our highest ideals and aspirations.

Is it any wonder, then, that we can draw a conviction that the searing cancer of communism with its degradation of body and soul will never enter here. Is it any wonder, when we study St. George history, that we believe in the generosity of our country toward other countries of the world and our willingness to share with others and to help others fight against the ravages of hunger and disease and despotic dictators always eager to place their chains around the free human spirit.

In this great valley and in valleys throughout our land lie the strength and the hope of America; from these valleys come our unending resolution to preserve and extend dignity and freedom for ourselves and our children and for mankind.

Here we shall continue to apply a message of the prophet of old for the benefit of our posterity, "that the wilderness and the solitary place may be glad for them and that the desert may rejoice and blossom as the rose."

Thank you.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

On request of Mr. Moss, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety of the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the August 28 issue of the Wall Street Journal appears an excellent article entitled "The Unemployment Statistics," written by Ewan Clague. Mr. Clague points out some of the defects that exist in our unemployment statistics, and points out very well that we must have greater detail and greater knowledge of what these statistics mean before we can use them for the purposes for which they are intended; namely, to enable us to formulate sound public policy decisions.

Also in the same issue of the Wall Street Journal is a lead editorial entitled "The Purpose of Statistics," which comments in some detail on Mr. Clague's article, and points out why statistics on unemployment are rather meaningless in view of the definitions which are used in connection with unemployment figures.

I ask unanimous consent that both the editorial and the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE PURPOSE OF STATISTICS

A man either has a job or he does not. If he has a job he is employed. If he does not, he is unemployed.

If you merely want to compare the number of people who are working with the

number who are not, this presents a logical and adequate definition with a minimum of fuzzy edges.

With such a definition, you can then use standard sampling techniques which will give you a picture of the employment situation in the whole population within a reasonable margin of error. This, as you can see from the article by Commissioner Clague on this page, is the basic approach of his Bureau to measuring the Nation's unemployment rate.

But you will also notice that the Bureau of Labor Statistics does make one major modification in the simple definition of unemployment. Unless a person is looking for a job he is not counted as unemployed.

Now in a purely statistical sense this is rather illogical. A housewife who is not producing income is unemployed in the economic sense however happy she is with her estate—certainly as much so as the housewife in the same estate who wants to work. Nonetheless, the Bureau makes the distinction for a very good reason.

As Mr. Clague explains, "the measurements which have been devised were determined by the public purpose to be served"—that is, to give us some useful and relevant information about the economic state of the country. It would be statistically accurate to count happy housewives—as well as children and old people—as unemployed, but it would be patently ridiculous. Such a figure would not serve the public purpose intended; for that purpose it would misinform.

This leads directly to the questions that have been raised by many people concerning the unemployment statistics. They have nothing to do with whether Mr. Clague is a good statistician. They ask whether the statistics, however accurate, are relevant to the public purpose to be served.

The teenager at our house is unemployed; no question about it. The economy did not provide a job that met the specifications, which included acceptable hours, proximity to home, and relationship to training. As Mr. Clague argues, if a job had been found, employment would have risen by one; so if there is no job for a jobseeker, why shouldn't unemployment be increased by one?

Still, the fact is that this unit of unemployment is not of the same order as the unit of unemployment created by an unemployed steelworker who must support not only himself but a wife and family, although mathematically a unit is a unit.

The unemployed steelworker, especially when his numbers are multiplied, is an economic fact to trouble all thoughtful people. The unemployed teenager may trouble father, but to equate this unit in any statistical measure with the steelworker is ridiculous. It can actually serve the public purpose ill by misleading everybody as to the true state of our economic condition.

The same difficulty is encountered in other areas. We have, for example, more than 12 million people who are retired and draw social security. Some of them also work; some would like to work but haven't found the kind of job that meets their particular circumstances. In the same way as the teenager, they are statistical units to be counted.

Now we all think of unemployment as a bad thing, which in the case of the steelworker it is. Yet actually one of our public purposes is to create a society in which some people don't work. A depressed or backward society is one in which teenagers, housewives, and old people must work to survive. By counting as unemployed those who are impelled to work not out of need but for some other reason—and who can afford to be selective in taking a job—we not only distort our view of economic troubles but we actually obscure one of the very good things about our society.

Mr. Clague himself realizes this, for he has lately begun segregating teenager and retired unemployment. But they are still included in the total figure, so that when somebody says our unemployment rate is 7 percent, or whatever, the irrelevant is lumped with the relevant, the good with the bad.

What, then, do we really want to measure? Certainly not just the number of people who "don't have jobs," nor even those without jobs who might like to have one if the job suits them. The relevant question is how many people whose livelihood depends upon having jobs are unable to find them. This is the statistic that measures a part of our economic health in a meaningful way.

It begs the question to argue this statistic can't be found because the Bureau can't judge whether the unemployed person is needy. The Bureau doesn't have to know whether that unemployed steelworker is needy in the sense of being without money to buy groceries. His earnings are the support of himself and others and this is what makes his unemployment a meaningful fact.

But this is precisely the statistic for which you will have to burrow deep to find amid the present array of numbers. We are still presented with an unemployment index as if it meant what it plainly doesn't, because the Bureau persists in counting as the same thing things that aren't the same thing at all.

If this isn't the cause of all the misunderstanding about the present unemployment statistics it certainly abets it. And therefore, it seems to us, however accurate they are, Mr. Clague's statistics do not yet best serve the public purpose.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS—COMMISSIONER CLAGUE VIEWS THE METHODS OF MEASUREMENT

(By Ewan Clague)

The problem of unemployment has received more public attention in 1961 than at any time since the depression of the 1930's. The current overall rate of unemployment—about 7 percent of the total civilian labor force—has led some people to raise questions concerning these statistics.

Who is counted as unemployed? What are we trying to measure? And why are we measuring it? The general answer to these questions is that the measurements which have been devised were determined by the public purposes to be served.

The Employment Act of 1946 declared the maintenance of high employment to be the established policy of the Government. Under this act, the Federal Government was given responsibility for creating and maintaining conditions under which "there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work." If there had been no nationwide system of employment and unemployment statistics in existence at that time, it would have been necessary to create one.

As it is, the household survey, the employer reports of employment and hours of work, and the unemployment insurance records constitute the tools upon which any administration in Washington must rely in analyzing the current economic situation, in determining Government policies to deal with recessions, and in planning for the maintenance of economic growth and stability. I want to discuss the concepts we now use, the misunderstandings which exist and the adequacy of the household survey data to meet public needs.

Who are the employed? This is not as simple a concept as many people think.

Some groups are easy to classify. In July, 1961, there were about 57 million paid workers for a private employer or Government. However, there are individual business proprietors, farmers, self-employed professionals, and others who work on their own—over 9 million altogether. These are more troublesome. Our test is that their work must be for the purpose of bringing in some income; do-it-yourself projects at home do not count.

Then there are some real borderline areas in employment. One is unpaid family labor, a wife helping her husband in his grocery store, or a farm boy working in the field with his father. We count these as employed if they work 15 hours or more during the week in a family enterprise. During the summer there are usually more than 2 million such workers classified as employed. On the other hand, we exclude from the labor force the housewife who works in the home.

Still another borderline area is the worker with a job who is not at work during the week of reference—ill, on vacation, taking part in a strike, etc. Such persons are classified as employed because they have jobs; no new jobs are required for them.

There is one group of workers with jobs, who were formerly classified as employed, but who in 1957 were shifted to the unemployed. These are workers who have been laid off by their employers, but with a notification to return to work within a period of 30 days or less; also, new job seekers who have a commitment to a job beginning within 30 days. Since these workers often continued to be out of work for three or four more weeks, and since the promised jobs did not always materialize, it was decided that they more logically belong among the unemployed. When the shift was made in 1957, about 250,000 workers were transferred from the employed to the unemployed.

In each of the above groups are part-time workers. Some of these work only a few hours a day or a few days a week, but want no more work.

There are other part-timers who want more work than they have. In recent months there have been about 3 million such workers. They have jobs, so we put them on the employment side of the ledger.

Some critics argue that the time lost by these workers should be converted to unemployment on the basis of assuming one unemployed person for every 37.5 hours lost. However, there are several million workers holding two or more jobs at the same time, and other millions working substantial overtime on one job. If we compute the shortage, we must also compute the excess.

In summary, the employed work force is a varied and heterogeneous group.

Who are the unemployed? Our definition is clear enough in general terms—a person who has done no work during the survey week, but is looking for work.

Also included are persons waiting to be called back from a layoff, or to a new job; those whose search has been interrupted by temporary illness; and persons in stranded communities or occupations who have been discouraged in their search for work because of the unavailability of jobs. Note that this definition does not limit the unemployed to those who are disemployed—that is, who have been laid off from jobs.

The most clearly defined type of unemployed is the year-round, full-time worker who has held a job in the past and who is looking for one at present. This would most likely be a male worker, perhaps a head of a family, between 20 and 65 years of age; but it could include a single woman, a married woman, or a teenager.

Some people think that teenagers should be left out of the unemployed. In the month of June 1961, there were 2.5 million youngsters under age 20 who came out of school looking for work. Some were looking for permanent jobs; others were interested only

in temporary summer jobs. Altogether, about 1.6 million found jobs and the remaining 0.9 million were still looking for work by the middle of the month. The sharp June rise in the total unemployment figure for the Nation as a whole was fully explained by this group.

These teenagers, especially those who have never worked before, do raise a conceptual problem. In one European country no person is considered as unemployed unless he or she has previously held a job. However, I believe that our method is the sounder one. We count as employed those who got jobs. Why leave out those who didn't?

In my judgment these figures supply a useful picture of the labor market. We always tabulate these teenagers separately in every month of the year, so that those using the unemployment statistics as a guide can allow for this group. Also, we seasonally adjust the unemployment rates, so that this summer bulge can be discounted in economic analysis.

What should we do with elderly persons drawing pensions? There are at present almost 12½ million men and women drawing social security benefits. Under the law, such persons are permitted to earn up to $1,200 per year without loss of benefits. Many of these are counted among the 3 million men and women over age 65 who are employed, almost 900,000 of them in part-time jobs. At present our figures show that the number in this age group seeking work is about 150,000, but this amounts to less than 3 percent of the total unemployed. However, we publish the figures for this group every month, so that they can be subtracted from the total unemployment figures.

Questions are frequently raised about the method of counting women, particularly married women. Should they be counted as unemployed if they are only secondary wage earners or are looking for only part-time work?

But married women make up about one-fifth of all the unemployed persons in this country, and more than half of all employed women. Almost three-fifths of our increase in employment during the decade of the fifties was accounted for by married women. We can no longer think of them as a secondary or unimportant part of our labor supply.

According to our latest study, the vast majority of unemployed married women—over 80 percent—are looking for full-time jobs (we do not now collect these figures every month, but may do so in the future). Thus, of the approximately 900,000 married women who were unemployed in March 1961, only about 150,000 were looking for part-time jobs. Omission of this group would have little effect on the count of unemployed and probably no effect on the trend.

In summary, we know that with these broad concepts we include many different kinds of persons with many different degrees of job attachments or jobseeking aspirations. Long and loud arguments have gone on for years about this proper classification of certain borderline groups, but the general structure has proved to be useful.

We recognize also that these concepts alone do not meet every need for information about how our working force is being utilized or how well the economy is functioning in providing the right kinds of employment opportunities to the right people. But they do provide a measure of the number of people who have at least some form of employment, and a measure of the number of jobseekers who have not been able to locate what is to them a suitable job as of a given period of time.

The unemployment rate: The doubts of some people concerning our concepts and definitions arise from their serious concern about the effect on public opinion of the unemployment rate, which is the ratio of the unemployed to the labor force (employed plus unemployed).

We publish two rates for total unemployment: One, the actual for the month; two, the seasonally adjusted, which eliminates the wide seasonal variations. In July 1961 they were almost the same—7 and 6.9—but they can differ quite widely.

We in the Department of Labor have continually insisted that analysis of the unemployment problem should not be confined to the overall rates. We regularly publish separate figures and rates for men, for women, for teenagers, by age groups, by marital status, etc. It is also possible to shift some groups and to calculate rates on different combinations of employed and unemployed.

Unemployment policies: But all these classifications and reclassifications, valuable as they are, do not quite get to the heart of the controversy. A key issue has been raised by people who question whether persons who don't really need a job should be counted among the unemployed.

In statistical terms, this is not a practical suggestion. Statistical surveys cannot supply answers to the question of need. It would take a social work investigation of the family to determine that.

Even in concept this is not the way to state the issue. Need has no necessary connection with unemployment, or with employment. There are many millions of persons holding jobs in this country who don't really need them. And surely there must be hundreds of thousands of unemployed who could get along without a job. But in a free economy jobs are not allocated on a basis of need. Even in referring the unemployed to jobs, the Employment Service puts its primary emphasis on qualifications and ability.

But people who raise the question of need in connection with unemployment are thinking primarily of the social and economic policies for dealing with unemployment. An unemployed worker seeking a job constitutes a labor market fact; but what the Nation should do about it if he doesn't find a job is an entirely different matter.

While statistical surveys cannot measure such factors as individual or family need, some additional and more detailed classifications might be helpful as guides to public policy. For example, Congress has provided funds to the Bureau of Employment Security to make intensive surveys of the workers drawing temporary extended unemployment compensation. These studies will throw light upon that particular group of long-term unemployed.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics is planning some studies next winter on the characteristics of the unemployed to obtain more information "in depth" concerning the degree of attachment of various classes of workers in the labor force. In my judgment one of the limitations in our statistics is our lack of knowledge of the patterns of labor market participation by the unemployed over a period of years. How many of the unemployed are only lightly or temporarily in the labor market as compared with those who have been full-time, year-round workers for many years?

What is needed in connection with the unemployment problem is not to reject the statistics we now have but to provide for more detail and more meaningful breakdowns, so that the data would be more useful for public policy decisions.

KHRUSHCHEV'S POSITION ON GERMANY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in today's edition of the Washington Evening Star newspaper appears a text of the statement by Premier Khrushchev explaining his position on Germany.

Mr. Khrushchev says that the general problem is one of peaceful settlement with Germany. But from that point on he does not talk about Germany, but rather about two Germanys, or two German states, this contrary to the United Nations Charter principle of self-determination of the peoples of a country. He tries to evade this point by saying that the existence of two German states is a fact, whether we like it or not. Thus he misses the point that the German people do not like it, and only by the unilateral action of the Soviets in signing a separate peace treaty with East Germany could such a "fact" artificially be created. Nowhere in his statement is the suggestion that the people of both East and West Germany should be given the opportunity to determine, by free elections, whether or not one or two German states shall exist. Of course he does not dare do this because he knows that the exodus of thousands of East Berliners manifests the desire for freedom which is being suppressed under the puppet East German state, so called.

The Premier seeks to draw analogy between our signing a separate peace treaty with Japan and his proposal to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany. The difference, of course, is that there is a single Japan and not two states of Japan. In conformity with the above-cited principle of the United Nations Charter, the people of the entire country of Japan have been given their right of self-determination.

Mr. Khrushchev makes a strong point that freedom of West Berlin's communications must be guaranteed. In the first place, he says nothing about guaranteeing the freedom of East Berlin's communications, and on the basis of the present situation it appears that the only guarantee there would be is to shut off the freedom of the East Berliners. In the second place, his guarantee must be read in the light of the convenient change he has unilaterally sought to make in the guarantees with respect to Germany by the occupation forces and in his obvious contempt for the principle of the Charter of the United Nations respecting the freedom of self-determination of the people of each country. In this light, his so-called guarantee means nothing.

Finally, Mr. President, Premier Khrushchev says that the Soviets have firmly decided not to postpone any further signing of a German peace treaty, and that failure of the Western Powers to sign a treaty with both East Germany and West Germany will result in the Soviets signing a separate treaty with East Germany. This is his ultimatum: a separate peace treaty with East Germany, or a treaty signed by the Soviets and the Western Powers with both East Germany and West Germany establishing a free city status for West Berlin—not for both East and West Berlin, just for West Berlin. Mr. President, if Mr. Khrushchev is so interested in a free city of West Berlin, why is he not concerned about a free

city of East and West Berlin? And if he is concerned about free cities, why not a free Germany itself? Everyone knows the answer. He is interested only in suppressing the freedom of the people of East Berlin and East Germany; and he plans to continue to work against the self-determination of the German people in complete violation of the United Nations Charter, to which his government is a signator.

The answer is clear, Mr. President. The United States does not bargain away or negotiate away the principles of the United Nations Charter.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Mr. Khrushchev and an accompanying article entitled "Columnist Reports Khrushchev's Pledge" be inserted in the RECORD.

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

[From the Evening Star, Aug. 28, 1961]

KHRUSHCHEV EXPLAINS POSITION ON GERMANY

NEW YORK, August 27.—Following is the text of Soviet Premier Khrushchev's views on the German question, as given Bell Syndicate Columnist Drew Pearson following a recent interview in the Soviet Union:

"As I understand it, what you call the Berlin crisis is different between Socialist countries and countries of the West regarding the fate of West Berlin after the conclusion of the German peace treaty. I should like first of all to stress that this question is but a part of the general problem of peaceful settlement with Germany.

"The clamor raised by certain quarters in the West which promotes whipping up of international tensions and military psychosis clearly has the aim of making it difficult to sign a German peace treaty. A start should therefore be made by taking up the major issue—that of a German peace treaty.

"This is all the more important since the proposal of the Soviet Union and a number of the countries which fought against Hitlerite Germany to conclude a peace treaty with two presently existing German States which are legal heirs of former Germany has provoked completely erroneous reaction on the part of Western Powers.

"SEES HOSTILE POSITION

"An especially hostile position in this matter is taken up by the Government of West Germany. In this it is supported by the Governments of United States, France, and Britain. According to the Adenauer government, they are rejecting reasonable proposals to sign a peace treaty with the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, though such treaty in no way affects the interests of the Western Powers.

"Certainly if a united Germany existed, such a peace treaty would be signed with it. But at present no such united Germany exists. On the soil of the former Hitlerite reich, two German states with diametrically opposed economic and political systems have come into being and have taken their own roads of development.

"I do not want to delve into history on this question and give an account of why this happened, though we Soviet people do have something to say on this score. It was United States, Britain, and France who split Germany as far back as 1947 when they carried out a series of economic and political measures to transform their occupation zones first into bizonia, then into trizonia, and finally into the Federal Republic (West) Germany.

"Placed before the fact of appearance in the western part of Germany of a separate state, which, by the way, immediately started to acquire a belligerent revanchard character, the population of East Germany in their turn created another German state, German Democratic Republic, which bore a peace-loving and democratic character.

"TWO GERMAN STATES

"Thus, whether we like it or not, there actually exists in central Europe two German states, and it is from this fact that we should proceed. I can but add that the government of the (East) German Democratic Republic has repeatedly sought to persuade the government of the Federal Republic of (West) Germany to come to the conference table and devise ways leading to the reunification of the German nation. Not one of those attempts has met with success. The government of the Federal Republic (West) Germany has flatly refused to consider any proposals by the German Democratic Republic concerning the creation of a united German state.

"What prompts this position of the West German government? This can be given but one explanation: In rejecting peaceful unification of the German nation, the government of West Germany is contemplating the forcible seizure of (East) German Democratic Republic. Only a blind man can fail to see that the attempt to swallow that republic will not remain unpunished. Indeed it is not alone. It has its own true allies who will not leave it in time of trouble.

"It is also known that West Germany, too, has her allies with whom it is linked through an aggressive NATO pact. Under these conditions attack by West Germany against the German Democratic Republic would not be local conflict but would be the start of thermonuclear war without parallel in history, in which all states belonging to two opposing camps would take part.

"OPPOSES DELAY

"How then, are we to act in this situation? Are we to wait until Germany reunites—which as you see can take place only by means of terrible war—or are we to sign a treaty with two actually existing states without further delay?

"We believe there should be no further delay.

"Signing of a peace treaty which would write finis to a Second World War and legitimize orders of two German states will tie the hands of revenge seekers and discourage them from indulging in gambles. And only contrary, further delay would be interpreted by revanchard quarters of West Germany as encouragement to aggression, to unleashing war.

"It is proceeding from this that we decided to put an end to procrastinations in the question of a German peace treaty. And if the Government of the Federal Republic of (West) Germany continues to refuse to sign such a treaty, it will be signed with the (East) German Democratic Republic which has already voiced its agreement. The treaty will legitimize borders defined by the Potsdam Agreement, and the (East) German Democratic Republic will exercise full sovereignty on its territory, free from burden of vestiges of World War II.

"FATE OF WEST BERLIN

"Now with regard to the fate of West Berlin, as I already said, the question of West Berlin is part of the general question of signing a German peace treaty. Following the signing of a peace treaty with the (East) German Democratic Republic, West Berlin will receive the status of a free city and will be complete master of its destiny. Its people will live under such social and political system as they themselves want to have. We propose to include a clause in the treaty to the effect that no one shall have the right to interfere in the affairs of West Berlin or impose their order upon its people.

"It would seem that this would completely suit the Western Powers, which have repeatedly declared that the population of West Berlin must have complete freedom and independence in choice of their way of life. Nevertheless, the leaders of the Western Powers are vigorously opposing our proposals and in so doing are whipping up unparalleled clamor around the Berlin issue akin to military hysteria.

"What then are they displeased over? They are displeased over the fact that the signing of a German peace treaty and granting of free city status to West Berlin automatically puts an end to occupation status on whose basis their troops are stationed in that city.

"Contrary to plan and firm statements of the Governments of the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic regarding their readiness to provide West Berlin with any kind of guarantee, the statesmen of the West, notably Adenauer and Brandt, keep alleging that we want to "seize" West Berlin. It is not in vain that people say that the lie walks on short legs.

"SUGGESTS PLEDGE

"I should like to know what the Western Powers would reply to the following concrete proposal: Let the United States, Britain, France, and the Soviet Union jointly give a solemn pledge to respect and protect the freedom, independence, and rights of the free city of West Berlin.

"I believe you will agree with this. We, too, agree. Then where are grounds for inflaming passions and whipping up military psychosis around the so-called Berlin question?

"The question remains of freedom of access to West Berlin. As you know, it is around this question that adversaries of signing a German peace treaty are raising particular clamor. It is all the more important to give complete clarity to this question.

"We have said, and we repeat, that no one is encroaching on freedom of access to West Berlin. On the contrary, in proposing a conclusion of a German peace treaty we emphasize that freedom of West Berlin's communications must be guaranteed. The West Berlin Government, as any sovereign government, must have the right to maintain diplomatic, economic, and cultural ties with any country of any continent.

"CITES DIFFERENCES

"Then where do our differences lie? They lie in the following:

"We want to do away completely with the vestiges of World War II while Western countries—United States, Britain, and France—are clinging in every way possible to those vestiges, seeking thereby to assure their troops access to West Berlin on the basis of occupation rights which stem from the regime of Hitlerite Germany's surrender.

"But one thing does not conform to the other. Ask any lawyer and he will tell you that if a peace treaty is signed then a state of war is terminated. However, if a state of war is terminated, then how can an occupation regime be preserved in West Berlin? This is impossible.

"The sovereign countries of the world—and the German Democratic Republic is of their number—are guided by a universally accepted rule: If their routes of communication with other countries run through the territory of third states, then, naturally, agreement of those third states is always required in order to use those communications, no matter how they may run—on ground, in the air or across water. This holds good in regard to any country, regardless of what social system it may belong to.

"As an argument against dealing with (East) Germany, some Western personalities protest that they cannot deal with that government since the United States and other Western Powers fought against Germany. This argument is completely un-

founded. Indeed we too fought and are known to have borne the brunt of war against Germany, including that part of it which today makes up the Federal Republic of (West) Germany. Nonetheless, we maintain relations with and whenever necessary deal with the Government of the Federal Republic of (West) Germany.

"GIVES EXAMPLE

"Let me give you one example which I have already mentioned in one of my speeches. We are now operating a direct railroad service between Moscow and Paris. These trains pass through the territory of the Federal Republic of (West) Germany. Before signing an agreement with France, we naturally approached the Government of West Germany with a request that it allow transit of trains through its territory, and it was only after agreement was received and appropriate agreements signed that this train service started to operate.

"Thousands of such examples could be adduced. The same rules should also be applied in regard to access to West Berlin after a peace treaty is signed. Respect for sovereignty must be observed with regard to all countries, (East) Germany included.

"This rule represents the law of laws, and if we start to flout it there will be no stability in the world, there will be no peaceful coexistence of states, and in general there may well be no peace.

"And if certain state and political leaders say: Let the Soviet Union and other countries sign a peace treaty while leaving the Western Powers that right of access to West Berlin which stems from occupation status, they are wishing for the impossible. When a peace treaty is signed it is quite natural that rights of conquering powers which stem from surrender of conquered country come to an end.

"Two German states with which a peace treaty will be signed will from then on be completely sovereign. And regardless of whether or not other countries like the regime existing in one or the other of them, they shall have to maintain relations with them in conformity with the generally accepted standards of international law.

"RECALLS JAPANESE TREATY

"It might be opportune in this connection to recall what transpired at the time of the signing of the peace treaty with Japan. The Soviet Army routed the main nucleus of Japanese troops, the Kwantung army in Manchuria. After the surrender of Japan, the Soviet Union together with the United States and other allies, devised measures to control postwar development of Japan. Soviet representatives took the most active part in the work of the Allied council in Tokyo. When, however, the question arose of concluding peace, the United States signed a separate treaty, disregarding the Soviet Union. They unilaterally liquidated the Allied council for Japan and started to oust Soviet representatives from Tokyo. And though we had rights and commitments which stemmed from the fact of Japan's surrender, our allies disregarded them.

"Why are the United States and their allies now trying to describe as illegal our intention to sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic in the event that Western Powers refuse to join us in a peace treaty with two German States? What suits the United States they declare to be legitimate, but what does not suit the United States they call illegal. Is this logical?

"Thus it is quite evident that the Western Powers are artificially whipping up a dispute around the Berlin question by injecting a spirit of war hysteria in order to aggravate international tensions still further and create a pretext to unleash war against the Soviet Union and the Socialist camp as a whole. Arguments that they are allegedly fighting to preserve freedom and independence of population of West Berlin are false through and through, since no one is menacing that freedom and independence.

"SUMS UP POSITION

"We are saying: 'Let us sign a peace treaty, let us establish free city status for West Berlin, let us provide it with all necessary guarantees.' We are, moreover, ready ourselves to participate in the exercise of those guarantees. We are also ready to agree to these guarantees being reinforced by the presence in West Berlin of token troops of the United States, Britain, France, and the Soviet Union. These should be smaller numbers, literally token troops, because no large numbers of armed forces will be necessary there in order to guarantee free city status. In that case, agreement could be reached with the Government of the German Democratic Republic regarding freedom of communication for those military contingents.

"That in effect sums up our position on the German question. That is what we are calling for.

"I should like again and again to emphasize that we are striving for elimination of vestiges of World War II. We want the atmosphere in Europe and, therefore, throughout the world to become purer so that all nations of the world should breathe fresh air, so that all countries shall live as good neighbors, so that they shall build peaceful relations with one another, so that human relations shall live without fear of war.

"It is for this reason that the Soviet Government and governments of other Socialist countries which took part in the war against Hitlerite Germany have firmly decided not to postpone any further signing of a German peace treaty. We will regret it if Western Powers should not wish to join us in signing a peace treaty. But in that event we will be compelled to sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic alone.

"You ask when it would be desirable to hold negotiations. The answer is that solution of the question permits no delay. We are, therefore, ready at any moment to meet with the leaders of the Western Powers on this matter if they have a sincere desire to achieve realistic settlement of the German problem on a mutually acceptable basis.

"To this I should add that they no less than we—and perhaps even more so—should be interested in having this problem peacefully solved, and if leaders of Western Powers, notably President Kennedy, want such settlement, we have declared long ago that we are always ready to come to the round-table for peaceful negotiations."

COLUMNIST REPORTS KHRUSHCHEV'S PLEDGE

NEW YORK, August 28.—Columnist Drew Pearson said today Soviet Premier Khrushchev told him the Soviet Union would guarantee Berlin's status as a "free city" after signing a separate peace treaty with Communist East Germany.

Reporting on an interview Mr. Khrushchev granted in the Black Sea resort of Sochi, Mr. Pearson said the Soviet leader declared:

"We are also ready to agree to those guarantees being reinforced by the presence in West Berlin of token troops of the United States, Britain, and France, and the Soviet Union."

Mr. Khrushchev has made this offer before. The Soviet news agency Tass reported on June 11 Mr. Khrushchev advanced it in proposing to President Kennedy during their Vienna meeting that an immediate peace conference be convened to draw up an all-German peace treaty.

In subsequent speeches, and in his interview with Mr. Pearson, Mr. Khrushchev attached a condition the West always has rejected in the past. A free, demilitarized Berlin, he said, would have to negotiate with Communist East Germany for use of land, sea, and air lines of communication with West Germany—110 miles from Berlin.

The United States has insisted access routes to Berlin, and the West's free use of them, are guaranteed in World War II agreements that the Soviet Union signed. U.S. officials further insist the East German regime is not a legitimate government and, therefore, without legal rights to negotiate on the access routes.

"We have said, and we repeat," the Soviet leader told Mr. Pearson, "that no one is encroaching on freedom of access to West Berlin. On the contrary, in proposing a conclusion of a German peace treaty we emphasize that freedom of West Berlin's communications must be guaranteed.

"The West Berlin Government, as any sovereign government, must have the right to maintain diplomatic, economic, and cultural ties with any country of any continent."

State Department officials in Washington who had read the text said they saw nothing basically new in Mr. Khrushchev's remarks and declined comment on them. The White House also refused comment.

Mr. Khrushchev set forth his views on the German question in an English-language summary he had drawn up after talking with Mr. Pearson several hours.

THE OPINION OF MANKIND WITH RESPECT TO BERLIN

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there is an excellent lead editorial in the August 24 issue of the Christian Science Monitor entitled, "The Opinion of Mankind," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the editorial well points out that it is well to evaluate the "opinion" of countries in light of the freedom of the people in those countries and the degree of information and responsibility present.

This leads one naturally to the opinion of the so-called neutral nations, and particularly their opinion over the Berlin crisis. India has been considered a neutral nation because of the so-called neutral attitude of Mr. Nehru. The other day, Mr. Nehru manifested how unneutral he really is when he suggested that the right of access to West Berlin on the part of the West has been "diluted" by events since the end of World War II. This merely compounded his unneutral attitude of ignoring the action of the Soviets in closing the border between East and West Berlin. In today's Washington Evening Star newspaper appears an editorial entitled "Looking the Other Way" and a timely article by Crosby S. Noyes, entitled "How Neutral Would Neutrals Be?" both of which develop very clearly the so-called "neutralism" of Mr. Nehru, and I ask unanimous consent that these be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Evening Star, Aug. 28, 1961]

LOOKING THE OTHER WAY

India's Prime Minister Nehru seems to believe that the West's occupation rights in

Berlin are legally sustainable, but that the right of access to West Berlin has been "diluted." Just what this means is less than clear, especially in view of his belated "clarification" to the effect that the West has valid access rights after all.

It is not our purpose, however, to quarrel with Mr. Nehru's comments on this point. He is entitled to his opinion, and if he doubts that the West has a right of access to Berlin there is nothing to stop him from saying so.

What does surprise us is his seeming indifference to what actually has happened in Berlin. By sealing the border, the East German puppet government, acting at the direction of its masters in Moscow, has converted East Germany into a vast concentration camp. An unknown but certainly large number of East Germans who would have fled to the West in search of freedom are now effectively sealed up behind barbed wire and brick walls. For years, Mr. Nehru has been an advocate of liberty and a harsh critic of Western "imperialism" in any form. But in a long speech to the upper house of the Indian Parliament he found no occasion to utter a single complaint against this ruthless Communist suppression of the East Germans. Not even by so much as one word did he condemn this most brutal form of imperialism. Instead, he was willing to look the other way—and to content himself with a dissertation on the West's legal right of access to Berlin.

Had the United States done such a thing, had we resorted to force to lock up a whole people, the anguished protests from the "neutrals" would have been heard around the world. And Mr. Nehru's voice, we are sure, would have been among the most censorious. But when the Russians, acting through their stooges, do it, no protesting voice is raised. Why do we spend so much time wringing our hands and worrying about what these "neutrals" may think of us or say about us?

HOW NEUTRAL WOULD NEUTRALS BE?

PARIS.—It is hard to think of anything sillier than the idea which seems to be gaining ground in some parts that the neutral nations of the world may have an important role to play in resolving the current crisis in Berlin.

This seems, in fact, to have been a major preoccupation of some Western leaders since the crisis began. The neutrals, it was said, could play a restraining role on Russia in Berlin. The legal justifications of the Western position there would impress them. Their reactions are considered important in the question of whether or not to engage Russia in early negotiations. Above all, the outcome of the neutralist conference which opens this week in Belgrade is being watched with nervous concern.

There are, of course, those who have an unshakable faith in the collective wisdom of neutral nations to solve almost every problem raised by the cold war. There are those who hold quite seriously to the proposition that the United States has no interest in the world more vital than the good opinion of uncommitted peoples. Nothing may be done which risks offending the least of them. In every case when the interests of great powers clash some are quite willing to submit the issue to mediation, if not arbitration, by neutrals in the United Nations and elsewhere.

Up to this point the great powers have been willing to go quite far in this direction. The Russians, as well as the Western powers, have been eagerly lining up neutralist support over the problem of Berlin. They have actively encouraged its inscription on the agenda of the coming Belgrade conference. And they have invited a number of prominent neutralist leaders, including Ghana's Kwame Nkumah and India's Jawaharlal Nehru to Moscow during this critical period.

REDS MORE REALISTIC

On the question of neutralist influence, however, the Russians are a good deal more realistic than some westerners. Lionization in Moscow of successions of Asian and African leaders has never had the remotest effect on the formation of Russian policy. The awarding of Lenin Peace Prizes has never entered into the calculation of basic Russian interests.

On the contrary, the Russians inflate the importance of neutral nations in the expectation that neutralist influence will work to their own advantage. They know—and most neutralist leaders know it too—that Russia is risking nothing in this process since Russia, as Premier Khrushchev freely admits, cares not two hoots what anyone may think or say about its own vital interests. On the other hand, they hope—and events encourage the hope—that Western policy in Berlin or elsewhere can be practically paralyzed by its subordination to the collective will of the uncommitted peoples of the world.

Prime Minister Nehru's recent analysis of the situation in Berlin is an illuminating case in point. His subsequent retraction and clarifications have not changed the central point of Mr. Nehru's original speech to the Indian Parliament: So far as he is concerned, the allies in Berlin haven't much of a legal leg to stand on. Whereas, he says, "the Soviet and East German authorities could very well argue that they have the right to regulate and control the movement from East Berlin to the West Berlin area."

SILENT JUSTIFICATION

The legal argument was all that interested Mr. Nehru. Whether the Communist action in Berlin was justified or not was "another matter"—a matter on which Mr. Nehru as a good neutralist would never venture an opinion. When a good neutralist condemns a political action on moral or humanitarian grounds it is almost invariably the West which is condemned. Such arguments applied to the Eastern bloc are recognized as a pure waste of breath.

When it comes to neutralist opinion on Berlin, however, there are other factors which the West can ignore only at its own peril. Few neutralist leaders feel in any way directly concerned with the cold war struggle in Western Europe. The overwhelming importance of Berlin in this struggle is for them a matter of little interest except as it may affect events in their own areas.

In the Berlin crisis these neutralist leaders see primarily the danger of a showdown between the United States and Russia which may involve them in a general war. Their obvious interest is to prevent this showdown at all cost. And the obvious way to do it is to bring about the capitulation of one or the other of the two parties.

Since as a matter of experience and logic they can expect to have little leverage on the Russian policy, the neutralist effort very predictably from now on will be to undermine and weaken the Western position in Berlin. To the extent that this effort is allowed to influence Western policy the going is sure to get rougher as time goes on. Those who look to the neutralists as arbiters in the Berlin dispute are due for the saddest of awakenings.

[Exhibit I]

THE OPINION OF MANKIND

How much should world opinion weigh in any nation's policy? This question is pressing upon statesmen as never before. Even the Kremlin has to consider it. Mr. Khrushchev has not even dared let his own people learn the truth about Hungary or Berlin. Washington hears some Americans declaring it should be careful not to affront world opinion and others declaring too much attention is paid to what other folks think.

No one should underestimate the force of opinion in this day. As never before in history popular opinion is effective in the conduct of nations. And the technical advances in communication promise to make opinion even more powerful. It must be counted even as a military factor.

Those who have faith in democracy can rejoice that opinion is so widely powerful today. But is it to be effective only where free peoples have a decent respect to the opinions of mankind, as the Declaration of Independence put it? Must it work always to the advantage of the very dictators who suppress it insofar as possible? Can free men prevent this and remain true to their own values?

Somehow they must. Every day we encounter unfair applications of what Senator FULBRIGHT has called "the double standard in diplomacy." Moscow, which has capped a succession of colonial grabs by locking the Berlin door to its East German prison, has the effrontery to attack France in the United Nations over Bizerte. And it expects by doing so to win popular approval in much of Africa and Asia which have a voice today simply because Western nations heeded desires for independence.

The same situation appears in many arms control discussions. No one can be sure today that the Soviet Union is not carrying on atomic tests. For 3 years at the risk of being militarily outdistanced Britain and the United States have abstained even from fallout-free underground tests. Is world opinion putting pressure on Moscow to agree to inspection? Not very visibly. Much more evident are the pacifist and unilateral disarmament campaigns, centering illogically on the West's most effective war deterrent—the Polaris submarines.

In dealing with such opinion Western statesmen face not merely a double standard but much irrationality and irresponsibility. Many folk who are not Communists are using freedom to help Communists destroy freedom. More attention is given to arms than to the evil purpose which might use them.

There is irrationality too in giving equal weight to all votes in the U.N. Assembly. Some represent tiny nations, others states where no good means of ascertaining opinion exists, others where no adequate information is obtainable, others where no free opinion can be expressed.

In constitutional democracies there is a basic reliance on the ultimate wisdom of the people. But this assumes freedom and a modicum of information and responsibility. Statesmen must dare to stand against hysteria and remain true to their own conscientious judgment.

So must nations. A "decent respect to the opinions of mankind" must be combined with Polonius' famous advice to Laertes: "To thine own self be true * * * thou canst not then be false to any man."

THE BERLIN CRISIS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, with respect to the Berlin situation, in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald appears a discerning article by Mr. Joseph Alsop on the subject of "Liberation Versus Containment." A reading of this article should convince anyone that the policy of containment of Communist world aggression is still very sound, not only from the standpoint of

resisting further advances against freedom but also as a means of actually promoting the cause of freedom. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

LIBERATION VERSUS CONTAINMENT

(By Joseph Alsop)

The idea is beginning to be spread abroad that the Western allies have suffered a heavy reverse because they have failed to prevent Nikita S. Khrushchev from shutting the gate of this disordered East German jail.

There is a large element of common or garden hypocrisy in this talk. Anyone who seeks to interfere with Khrushchev's management of his dependent jails must be ready to go to war for the purpose. No one was ready to go to war when the East Germans rose in 1953, or when the Hungarians rose in 1956—which were really good opportunities.

No one is really ready to go to war today, in order to keep open the East German jail gate. But in addition to hypocrisy, this talk about a "bad defeat" at Berlin betrays serious confusion about the real meaning of the Berlin crisis.

Nine years ago, when the balance of military power was so much more favorable to the West, it was possible for honest and prudent men to advocate a "liberation policy"—even though the advocacy of that policy in 1952 turned out to be rather less than honest, when the test came in 1953. In the context of an active liberation policy, Berlin had great importance as a "showcase," an escape route, a base for propaganda, and a center of eastward penetration.

But in the present context, after a deep, unfavorable change in the military power balance, Berlin has quite another kind of importance. The free city no longer has so much meaning as a lever of liberation, since the liberation policy was long ago publicly abandoned by those who first proposed it. But the free city is more than ever important as the decisive symbol, the final, crucial proof, of the West's readiness to hold the line against Soviet aggression.

The historical accidents which have given this role to Berlin do not enormously matter. What matters is the kind of catastrophe that will certainly ensue, if the Western Allies fail to discharge their solemn obligations to defend Berlin's freedom. Berlin's freedom is not threatened by the closing of the jail gates; but it is most obviously threatened by the Soviet and East German drive to gain control of Berlin's access routes. Right there, is the heart of the crisis.

If the access routes are not defended, and if Berlin's freedom is not maintained, the sequel will be a kind of worldwide political earthquake. Every American and Western position, all around the globe will be more or less fatally undermined. That is what Khrushchev wants to gain from the Berlin crisis, and that is why the Western leaders have decided to risk war for Berlin's freedom, although not to keep the jail gate open.

Furthermore, this exceedingly grave decision is by no means purely defensive. Evidence is constantly accumulating that Khrushchev badly needs the kind of earth-shaking success he is seeking at Berlin, in order to guarantee the stability and growth of the Soviet Empire.

Those who do not believe the evidence that the Soviet Union itself has now achieved stability, are very wishful indeed. But it is equally mistaken to ignore the evidence that there is bad trouble outside Russia, in the Soviet Empire.

The latest item takes the form of reliable reports of an agarian crisis, combined with fairly serious local uprisings, in Communist North Vietnam. Communist China is passing through a period of unimaginable internal agony; and Peiping is also challenging Moscow's role as the Communist vatican. The situation in East Germany is so precarious that closing the jail gate was an urgent necessity. The position in Poland is far from easy. And so it goes.

All of these essentially imperial problems harassing Khrushchev are deep seated and intractable. None can be easily solved, and some of these problems quite possibly cannot be solved at all, as long as Khrushchev's freedom is limited by the political equilibrium which now exists in the world. He cannot, for instance, consider a dangerous military involvement to call the Chinese to order, while the balance between East and West remains what it is today.

If the world equilibrium is upset at Berlin, of course, Khrushchev will begin to have a free hand. But if his grab for Berlin is repulsed in the end, he will be worse off than before. In short, there is even more to say in favor of the old containment policy than there was to say when it was first proposed, and then violently and quite unfairly denounced.

Mr. MILLER. Also, Mr. President, in today's Washington Post and Times Herald are two articles bearing on the Berlin situation which are significant. The first, by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, points out the alarming situation regarding our forces in West Berlin. One can only conclude from reading this article that there is not to be any deterrence of the Soviets over Berlin because of Mr. Khrushchev's fear of engaging us in a conventional war. The second article, by Mr. George E. Sokolsky, relates to export licenses to Communist-bloc nations. I pointed out the other day that there had been a greatly stepped-up number of shipments authorized to bloc nations since President Kennedy's speech on Berlin. Mr. Sokolsky makes a strong argument in favor of doing away with the secrecy that surrounds these licenses. I ask unanimous consent that both articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 28, 1961]

OUR EXPOSED POSITION—S O S TO WHITE HOUSE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

BERLIN.—Here in West Berlin at the most crucial, critical, perilous, and uncertain outpost along the whole periphery of Communist power—the crisis spot of the Western World—I have to report a grim anomaly.

I put it carefully and without exaggeration when I state that this vital, isolated U.S. garrison of only 6,500 men in Berlin is inadequately equipped with modern arms and modern armor.

This is not the frantic gripe of a general who, no matter what he has, is forever demanding more.

Nor is it the impatient plea of a military man who, suffering from what Gen. George C. Marshall used to call "localitis," feels that Washington is lightly ignoring his urgent needs.

Maj. Gen. Albert Watson 2d, the U.S. commandant in Berlin, knows that his immediate superior, Lt. Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, commander of the U.S. forces in Europe, and their backup at the Pentagon, are quite aware of the exposed position of the Berlin garrison and of the necessity that his troops have the best, the latest, the most effective weapons. But they aren't here in adequate supply.

I wish to emphasize that neither Gen. Watson nor his aides initiated a single complaint. It took prolonged questioning to bring out that better arms and better armor from the arsenal of American production would be welcomed with relief.

From everything which I could learn from every source, I am convinced that Gen. Watson even underestimates, at least in conversation, his requirements.

What is true is that with a $45 billion defense budget the Pentagon is not equipping the tiny Berlin garrison at it could.

What is true is that with a gross national product of $500 billion the United States is not allocating to its small but all-important Berlin garrison what it should.

I am not suggesting that there are not many diverse demands upon American defense production. I am not suggesting that Washington officialdom is unaware of the special character of the Berlin outpost facing 400,000 Soviet troops, in every direction.

I am suggesting that the wheels of military and civilian bureaucracy sometimes turn inordinately slowly and that if President Kennedy orders an investigation at the highest level, he will not be satisfied with the findings.

Obviously these matters would not and should not normally occupy the attention of the White House. But once the President has taken personal command of handling the Berlin crisis, which is certainly not over, he might well wish to get the facts at his own direction. If a decision is taken at the Presidential level, something would happen.

From the information one can gather at this end, something needs to happen.

When you figure that the Red army in East Germany could throw vastly superior manpower and firepower against the Allied forces of 12,500 men in this surrounded city, you will realize that West Berlin is a veritable death trap.

Only token Allied forces are here. They could be run over and completely destroyed in a day, a week, or a fortnight, depending on what the Soviets chose to do.

This fact is calmly accepted by the U.S. troops. They know they are expendable. But they know, too, that they are here for a vital military mission—to make it clear to the Soviet Union that an attack on West Berlin is an attack on the United States and to do one or two other things, to force the enemy to pause before all-out war became inevitable or to enable the United States to have time to take the next step.

This fact is also calmly recognized by the wives and families of the officers and men stationed here. They are army wives and they know that theirs is a risk which cannot be avoided.

Morale could not be higher than it is today at this U.S. garrison. The men who reinforced the garrison last week were eager to come.

These men deserve to have in their hands more of the best—not just the next best—arms and armor in tanks, artillery, ammunition, and armored personnel carriers which the Nation is producing.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 28, 1961]

EXPORT LICENSES

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Business is business but the security of our Nation is more important. At the present time, the United States has an embargo on exports to Soviet Russia, Red China, Cuba

and other Communist countries. This embargo is in the national interest. Congress has passed the Export Control Act with a view to protecting the national interest.

The Secretary of Commerce is charged with the execution of this act and under it he issues licenses confidentially unless it is, in his judgment, in the national interest to make such information public.

There are some who believe that all data concerning these licenses, including the name of the person or firm that applies for and receives the license should be made public. The Secretary of Commerce, Luther H. Hodges, disagrees with this point of view. He holds:

"By identifying individual business firms, along with other pertinent data, vital information reflecting the trade and commercial position of each company would be revealed. This in turn could and likely would in many instances lead to disruption of the normal competitive relationships between the many business firms in the export business, and could very well result in reducing the Nation's export business at a time when it should be expanded. In addition, I feel that publication of trade information as to individual firms would particularly be of potential damage to the smaller companies in the export business which are in the process of developing their oversea markets and gaining a toehold in a highly competitive business activity."

It seems to me that this is a specious argument. The American people are entitled to know what American firms are trading with the enemy and why. There may be a sound reason for such trade but we should know about it.

The publication of such information would not only startle people generally but would shock the stockholders of such companies who would suddenly discover that the enterprise which they own is engaged in trading with the enemy.

Secretary Hodges also says:

"A point of more substance and I think of greater significance is that—from the national interest—the vital information is not what particular company has been licensed to export, but what decision has been made by the Government to authorize what commodity to be exported to what country. In terms of the public interest and what should be of public concern it is far more important to know what commodity or item the Government has approved for export to what particular country than it is to know the name of the individual business firm that has applied for and received an export license."

The issue here, it seems to me, is not what is more or less important. It is rather that everything is important. The American people are entitled to know everything that goes on in this country and whatever affects them. The Berlin situation is a demonstration of the stupidity of secrecy and of the objection to criticism and debate.

It is true that Secretary Hodges can point to his predecessor, who set up the precedents which he is following. However, it is to be noted that we are today paying a very heavy bill contracted by these same predecessors who failed to protect American interests. They were among those who made it possible for Soviet Russia to build a new industry on the gifts from the United States, amounting to $11 billion during the war period, and how much more has yet to be calculated.

The time has come to let the cat out of the bag. Let us know everything about what has been done to the economy of the United States during the past three blighted decades. The more the people know the readier they will be to stand up in support of their Government at this critical moment.

BLOCKADE OF CUBA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, over a year ago I called for establishment of a blockade of Cuba by the United States, in concert with the Organization of American States, under which all shipments of war materiel either into or out of Cuba would be stopped. If this had been done, I doubt that Mr. Castro would be in power today. So it is with considerable interest that one finds in the August 21 issue of the Omaha (Nebr.) World Herald a lead editorial on the "Policy of Contraband," which points out that the members of the National Strategy Committee of the American Security Council have come up with substantially the same recommendation. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

POLICY OF CONTRABAND

"Our national power," said a group of prominent Americans, "should be applied peacefully and effectively by utilizing the centuries-old principle of declaration of contraband. It is recommended that the President apply this principle by declaring the entire Western Hemisphere to be a peace zone, with all Communist war materiel, including fuel, declared to be contraband."

Contraband goods are subject to seizure. If the principle outlined above were applied and diligently enforced, Soviet Russia could not arm and supply Castro's Cuba.

Who are the prominent Americans who suggest this course? They are members of the National Strategy Committee of the American Security Council. They include Adm. Arthur W. Radford and Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer. Another member in 1960, and an adviser until last July 1 when he became President Kennedy's military representative, was Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor.

The Council includes executives of such companies as General Electric, United States Steel, Sheaffer Pen, Quaker Oats, and Weyerhaeuser Timber. These and other responsible Americans believe that action other than handouts of foreign aid is needed to save Latin America from communism.

In support of tough hemispheric action, the strategy committee report makes a bow in the direction of the late Franklin Roosevelt, approving his swap of U.S. destroyers for British Caribbean bases and quoting his opinion that the swap was "an epochal and far-reaching act of preparation for continental defense in the face of grave danger. Preparation for defense is an inalienable prerogative of a sovereign state."

These military-citizen strategists regard their contraband plan as in a category similar to the destroyer deal.

If the strategy committee plan were applied, legitimate peaceful trade would continue, but Soviet bloc ships headed for Cuba would be stopped. If they contained contraband, they would be told to go home. If they headed for Cuba, they would be boarded, and the contraband would be dumped or brought to the United States. If the Soviets used armed escorts, "they would be risking war for the warlike purpose of forcing Iron Curtain arms and munitions into the peaceful Western Hemisphere."

A declaration of contraband would not involve blockade, or armed intervention, or invasion, says the committee, but it would be a reasonable answer to "the state of belligerency" created by Premier Khrushchev's announced aim of destroying non-Communist governments.

If the United States wants to apply a tough policy short of war which would demonstrate American determination to keep communism out of this hemisphere, the principle of contraband may fill the bill. It deserves public discussion and attention at the highest levels of government.

WAGE RATES AT MISSILE SITES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Wall Street, Journal of August 24 appears an article on the subject of unreasonable wages at some of our missile sites undergoing construction in Kansas. The article points out the abuses which were uncovered by the Commission headed by Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

MISSILE UNIT CALLS WAGES "UNREASONABLE" AT KANSAS SITES; RULING IS FIRST OF ITS KIND

WASHINGTON.—The Missile Sites Labor Commission issued its first decision branding wage rates "unreasonable" at a missile site construction project.

The "unreasonable" finding involved construction of Atlas missile-launching sites around Forbes Air Force Base at Topeka, Kans. The Commission conducted hearings at the base July 24 to examine wage agreements between Local 142 of the International Hod Carriers Union and the Topeka division of Associated General Contractors of America, a builders' organization.

Defense Secretary McNamara has been advised of the finding, the Commission said. Many Government contractors are paid on the basis of cost plus profit; the Department is empowered to disallow costs deemed unreasonable.

Complaints have been made that some contractors were agreeing with construction unions to pay exorbitant wages because, through cost-plus contracts, the wages would be paid by the Government instead of the contractor. To prevent this practice and to promote labor peace at missile and space sites, President Kennedy on May 26 created the 11-man Commission headed by Labor Secretary Goldberg.

A month ago the Commission announced a set of guidelines for wage agreements between contractors and unions at missile and space construction sites. In general, the guidelines provide that wage rates on these sites should not exceed rates for the same type of work on other projects in the area.

In its Forbes Air Force Base finding the Commission said normal wage rates for construction in counties surrounding Topeka were as much as 13 percent below rates in Topeka, but the union and the companies agreed that on Federal construction in these counties, the Topeka rate would be paid rather than the normal rate.

This agreement, the Commission found, is "discriminatory on its face" and "unreasonable." The Defense Department was advised that if any costs are disallowed, however, the action should apply to future payments rather than costs incurred before the ruling.

The Commission also examined contracts for construction at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California and found the wage rates "reasonable."

Through Labor Secretary Goldberg the Commission also announced guidelines for labor-management contracts covering industrial workers at missile-space sites. Missile-makers often bring plant workers to launching sites to help install the completed

missile. As in the Commission's st..tement on construction wages, the new policy asks that wage rates and fringe benefits for industrial workers on Government projects be consistent with wages for similar workers doing non-Government work.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2883—JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I intend to propose to H.R. 2883, and ask that it be printed and ordered to lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table, as requested.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, H.R. 2883, which was recently reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, provides for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment. In general, it would make a civil action against the United States the exclusive remedy in such cases and authorize removal to the Federal district court of any action commenced in a State court against the individual Government employee. In committee the bill was amended to provide that a proceeding commenced in a State court against a Government employee could not be removed to a district court of the United States without the consent of the plaintiff.

In my opinion the committee's amendment is unwise for several reasons:

First. The purpose of the bill is to make the United States wholly liable for any damages caused by its employees in the course of their duties and to protect the employee from any dual liability. This purpose would be frustrated if plaintiffs can continue to proceed against individual employees in State court proceedings.

Second. Under the committee amendment, employees would have to incur the expense of insurance to protect themselves against personal liability, which defeats another one of the stated reasons for the bill.

Third. Section 5 of the Suits in Admiralty Act—title 46, United States Code, section 745—is a direct precedent for the proposed bill. Under the provisions of this act, the plaintiff has no option—the remedy against the United States is exclusive and suits must be brought in the district courts. The committee amendment to H.R. 2883 would be inconsistent with this precedent and would establish different procedures for maritime and nonmaritime employees of the United States.

Fourth. Under the Federal Tort Claims Act, the Federal courts have original jurisdiction over all other claims against the United States. The committee amendment is also inconsistent with this scheme.

Perhaps the next point is the strongest practical argument to be made against the action taken by the committee and in favor of the amendment which I propose.

Fifth. The President last year vetoed H.R. 7577—an identical bill—because of the same amendment which the committee has recommended. Approval of the amendment may invite the same action this year. The matter has been long delayed and it is unreasonable to jeopardize the proposed legislation again this year.

My proposed amendment would avoid these objections and at the same time give full protection to the plaintiff's interests. Under my amendment, a State court suit could be removed to the Federal court only if the Attorney General certified that the Government employee was acting within the scope of his employment at the time of the incident out of which the suit arose. The bill already provides that should a district court determine that a case which has been removed is one in which a remedy is not available against the United States, the case shall be remanded to the State court. With these safeguards in the bill, it should be entirely satisfactory to the Government, its employees and potential plaintiffs.

EXHIBIT 1

On page 2, line 23, amend subsection (d) to read as follows:

"Upon a certification by the Attorney General that the defendant employee was acting within the scope of his employment at the time of the incident out of which the suit arose, any such civil action or proceeding commenced in a State court shall be removed without bond at any time before trial by the Attorney General to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place wherein it is pending and the proceedings deemed a tort action brought against the United States under the provisions of this title and all references thereto. Should a United States district court determine on a hearing on a motion to remand held before a trial on the merits that the case so removed is one in which a remedy by suit within the meaning of subsection (b) of this section is not available against the United States, the case shall be remanded to the State court."

LEGAL COUNSEL FOR INDIGENT DEFENDANTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, earlier in this session I joined with several of my distinguished colleagues in the Senate in introducing legislation which would provide for legal counsel for indigent defendants. Recently, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of which I am chairman, released a committee print dealing with this subject.

It has been a source of disappointment to me that legislation providing counsel for indigent defendants has not been enacted. Yesterday the Washington Post carried an article in which was quoted excerpts from a letter written by President Kennedy to Dean Paul R. Dean, of Georgetown University, in which he commended the legal intern program of the university's law center. The author of this article, Mr. Leslie H. Whitten, focused attention on the appalling situation which exists in Federal courts in the District of Columbia alone regarding counsel for indigent defendants.

I join the President in saluting Georgetown University's legal intern program. I feel that this program has helped to point up the need for the type of legislation which S. 655, S. 854, and S. 1484, would provide; I hope that such legislation will soon be enacted by the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

KENNEDY PRAISES LEGAL INTERN PLAN AT GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

(By Leslie H. Whitten)

President Kennedy has praised Georgetown University's legal intern program for its "admirable dedication and competence" in defending the city's poor in criminal cases.

Ironically, the praise comes when defense of paupers, so vigorous in the spring, has fallen into summer doldrums.

The President's commendation came in a letter to Dean Paul R. Dean of the university's law center. American Bar Association President Whitney N. Seymour also lauded the interns.

"The interns can justifiably take pride in the knowledge that they have made a valuable contribution to their country and their profession in pursuing the standard of excellence in this area," President Kennedy wrote.

But until fall the indigent defendant in criminal cases can count on more troubles than just the charges against him.

The core of the present problem is in municipal court, which is going full blast this summer with hundreds of criminal cases each week. District court is largely in recess.

The situation is no better than a year ago, before the legal aid agency and the legal intern program were initiated to help penniless suspects.

Then prisoners fresh from the cellblock received counsel from among the 40 or so lawyers who frequent the court. Most of them got good service, some did not. Judges, educators, and lawyers set about to correct the abuses.

The legal intern program, set up with a $57,000 gift, began work last November with nine young lawyers who combined classroom work with court service. One of them succeeded in freeing more than 22 paupers jailed because they could not pay fines.

The interns handled 325 municipal court cases in 6 months and freed 99 of their clients. Their year ended in August. The project will pick up this year with three fewer lawyers because of a drop in donations.

Early this year, legal aid agency lawyers came to municipal court, largely on unspent funds from a $75,000 congressional grant. They handled dozens of cases each day and screened defendants to see which actually were paupers.

But all five of the agency lawyers in municipal court left June 30 when the fiscal year closed out the available funds. Since then, the three permanent agency lawyers usually at district court—have appeared in the lower court from time to time.

Agency Director Charles B. Murray said he hopes to hire two new lawyers if the

Senate follows the House in passing a $100,000 grant for the program. One of these will be assigned to municipal court to help run a new volunteer system that begins October 1. Murray hopes 50 to 150 young lawyers will be available for him to draw on for indigent and near indigent defendants.

Murray said his present plans call for one or two of the permanent staff lawyers to handle cases in juvenile court, at coroner's inquests, before the U.S. Commissioner, and at Mental Health Commission hearings.

The other attorneys will work in district court. There a well-run plan has been in operation for years whereby private lawyers practicing in the court take the cases of indigent defendants without fees.

INDIANA SAND DUNES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators GRUENING, MCCARTHY, NEUBERGER, METCALF, and HUMPHREY, I introduce for appropriate reference an amendment in the nature of a substitute to S. 1797, my bill to provide for the preservation of the Indiana Dunes which I introduced on May 3 of this year.

In discussion of the bill it has been pointed out—

First, that the Midwest is without a large national park to serve it.

Second, that there are 7 million people in the area from Milwaukee to Michigan City.

Third, that population throughout the Midwest is rapidly expanding.

Fourth, that the dunes have unique scientific and historical value in addition to their recreational values.

Secretary Udall toured the dunes on July 23 with myself, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Senate Committee on the Interior; Conrad Wirth, Director of the National Park Service; Mayor Richard Daley, of Chicago; Mayor George Chacharis, of Gary; Mayor Edward Dowling, of Hammond; Mayor Walter Jeorse, of East Chicago; Mayor Mary Bercik, of Whiting; Mrs. Dorothy Buell, of the Save the Dunes Council; and others who are interested in saving the dunes.

As a result of the trip Secretary Udall has said—in a recorded TV and radio program with me now being broadcast throughout Illinois—that he concluded: First, there still remains a large enough area suitable to be preserved as a national park; and, second, that the dunes themselves are extraordinary and striking in quality, comparing favorably with areas in other parts of the country now being preserved as national parks.

The dunes trip and the background of the fight to save the dunes were discussed ably by William Peeples in the Louisville, Ky., Courier-Journal for July 26, 1961.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

THE DRAMA OF THE DUNES IS A CLIFFHANGER

(By William Peeples)

INDIANA DUNES STATE PARK.—Senator PAUL DOUGLAS made a quick change into his walking shorts at the superintendent's house and joined the other dignitaries before the cameras and reporters in the hot, crowded room.

Being from Chicago, the Senator has long memories of vacations in the dunes land of Indiana. Being a man of intelligence and uncommon forthrightness for a public officeholder, he spoke briefly and to the point. He will not flag, he said, in his fight to save what is left of the dunes from destruction. They are a priceless natural and recreational asset serving an area of 6 million people, he declared, and he will do all in his power to preserve them.

He meant it, too. For 3 years now he has fought the combined weight of the officialdom of Indiana and their scheme to build a deepwater harbor in the middle of the dunes primarily for the benefit of two steel companies.

Stewart Udall, the young Secretary of Interior, was more circumspect. He told the press he was simply here on a factfinding mission and had not reached any conclusions. Senator ALAN BIBLE, of Nevada, the chairman of the Senate subcommittee considering the Douglas bill to make a national park of the remaining dunes land, also was cautious.

Of course, all of the distinguished visitors swore eternal fealty to the general principle of conservation of our natural resources. Some of them just didn't want to get specific.

But those who did, did so passionately. Their instincts in each case were politically sound. Mayor Richard Daly, of Chicago, was all for saving the dunes, as were the mayors of East Chicago, Gary, Hammond, and Whiting. So was Representative RAY MADDEN, who serves the adjoining district containing Lake County.

EVERYBODY LOVES THE DUNES

Lake County would like to have the port for itself—and it can make a strong and logical case for having it—and it favors preserving the dunes for its citizens who like to use them for recreation.

To disabuse his constituents of the notion that his determination to save the dunes might have waned at one time, Congressman MADDEN assured all and sundry that he has always been a great protector of our natural resources, and the dunes in particular. This brought a cheer that was music to his ears.

CHARLES HALLECK, the straight man in Washington's EV and CHARLIE show, was conspicuous by his absence. MADDEN was quick to point this out for the enlightenment of his auditors. HALLECK is a Republican and minority leader of the House. MADDEN is a Democrat. HALLECK said later that he didn't show—although the disputed dunes area is in his district—because he wasn't invited. It's just as well.

Good old CHARLIE would have been an alien presence. He is one of the leading dunes wreckers, and they were hard to find here. "Save Our Dunes" placards were hoisted and waved by the hundreds as the caravan left the park for the inspection tour.

The jeeps and other four-wheel-drive vehicles carefully negotiated the sandy road through the dunes and suddenly, over a rise, the blue-green expanse of Lake Michigan appeared, bordered by a magnificent stretch of sandy beach.

The jeep carrying Senator DOUGLAS got too close to the water and sank nearly to hubcap level. The Senator tried to help pry it loose. Failing, he left the job to a tow vehicle, and started walking at a fast pace down the beach. The mayors of Chicago, East Chicago, Hammond, Gary, and Whiting manfully followed.

Secretary Udall, meanwhile, finished inspecting another part of the area, and joined the rest of the party at the beach. Then, Udall, Douglas, Bible, the mayors, and other important visitors, briskly walked inland and scaled some of the more imposing sand dunes. In their wake trailed photographers, reporters, dunes savers, and tourists. A boatload of placard-waving dunes preservers approached the shore so the visitors could read the signs.

We were square on the site that would be taken for the proposed harbor development. It is a spot of rare, wild beauty. The port project would take out about a mile of beachfront from the only remaining 4 miles of dunes beach left, beside the 2½ miles in the State park to the east. It also would destroy the dunes formations inland.

Over the years industrialization has swallowed the rest of the dunes land that once stretched for 25 miles between Gary and Michigan City.

The Indiana Dunes not only boast excellent beaches, sorely needed in this part of the country; they are a natural wonderland, filled with variegated and unique combinations of plantlife and wildlife as well.

The dunes wreckers dismiss it as a wilderness. They say it is not developed. What they mean is that it remains uncluttered, for the most part, by empty beer cans.

To destroy what is left would strike anyone unfamiliar with the vagaries of Indian politics as totally senseless.

The final irony may be that DOUGLAS, an Illinois Senator, will be the instrument through which the people of Indiana will save their greatest scenic asset.

Perhaps some day the whole story of the bipartisan effort to wreck the dunes will come out in full—the land speculation, the cozy relationships between certain business interests and public officials, the real motivation of the political leadership in its single-minded determination to build a harbor near the Burns Ditch site in the heart of the dunes land.

For in Indiana, it is definitely a bipartisan scheme. Senator HARTKE, a Democrat, is just as bent on destroying the dunes as CAPEHART, his Republican colleague. Democratic Governor Matthew Welsh has a record on this issue that is just as bad as that of his Republican predecessors, Handley and Craig—except that Craig's law firm played a direct role in the land speculation.

Certain facts are devastatingly clear.

Indiana officials have never really considered any other site. They have repeatedly brushed aside assertions that Indiana could have its port to the west, around Gary and East Chicago, away from the dunes and in an area already industrialized.

They have either paid no heed to—or denied without a shred of supporting evidence—warnings that a deepwater harbor near Burns Ditch would pollute the beaches all along the dunes, including the stretch in the State park.

They have persisted single-mindedly to push ways and means to build the harbor in the dunes with public money, preferably with about half of it coming from Washington.

There is no doubt that this would be a bonanza for the steel companies, Midwest, Bethlehem, and possibly Inland. Midwest, however, seems to be the prime industrial mover behind the port project. Midwest is a subsidiary of National, and National is George Humphrey, former Secretary of the Treasury under President Eisenhower, and an important figure in the Republican Party.

Frank McKinney, of Indianapolis, former national chairman of the Democratic Party, also looms as a big man behind the scenes. He has been acting as a lieutenant for the Murchisons of Texas, who in turn now control the New York Central Railroad through the Allegheny Corp. The railroad has a track running through part of the dunes area and has a financial stake in a port development there. McKinney, by the way, is also very close to Governor Welsh, and vice versa. And so it goes. Wheels spinning within wheels.

Midwest Steel has owned its dunes acreage since 1929 and recently built a steel rolling mill on it. Bethlehem and Inland also own dunes acreage. The dunes preservers, however, feel that both of the latter are willing to work out a solution that would save the dunes, but not Midwest.

SOME DAMAGE DONE ALREADY

The Midwest mill and the Northern Indiana Power Service Co.'s generating plant have already marred some of the dunes landscape. But their presence is no excuse for abandoning the rest of the dunes. What is left is still well worth preserving, although much of it won't be if the harbor development goes through.

The people who are fighting to save the dunes are organized and purposeful. They have allies in the owners of expensive homes in the dunes area who have the wherewithal to carry on the fight.

Those who propose to wreck the dunes in the holy name of industry and jobs are being called more and more often on their distortions and outright misrepresentations.

It is not a question of whether Indiana should have a deepwater harbor but where. It is not only the people the dunes wreckers sarcastically call "bird watchers" who have a stake in saving the dunes. There are thousands upon thousands who want a decent, nearby place to vacation who also should be considered, and others who have the foresight to know that natural recreation areas and preserves are going to be a premium in this country in the years to come.

I suspect that Secretary Udall is one of these.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Other newspapers have commented on the Dunes Tour and have come out for the position of a compromise that will provide for both permanent heavy industry and a harbor in Indiana, and for preservation of the dunes. This is exactly my position. I am from an Indiana port in Lake County, not in the dunes. The dunes should be saved.

The Chicago Tribune in an editorial for July 25, 1961, summarizes this position well. I ask unanimous consent that the Tribune editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

THE INDIANA SHORE

The long-continued story of planning for the future use of the Indiana Dunes will apparently have yet another chapter, and perhaps an ending that differing interests can all consider reasonably happy. Not long ago it looked as if industrial development had won and conservation had lost. But the steel interests have lost some of their former zeal to expand the beachhead they now occupy at Burns Ditch. And a proconservation rally at Indiana Dunes State Park last Sunday was able to show some political muscle.

On this occasion, Senator Paul Douglas was joined by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, Representative Ray Madden, of Gary, and two members of the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee. The mayors of Gary, Hammond, East Chicago, and Whiting were hosts for the gathering, and Mayor Richard Daley, of Chicago, was a guest. It is something new for Indiana politicians to appear, beaming, at a save-the-dunes meeting.

"A compromise is probable," Secretary Udall told the crowd. Now under consideration is a plan to designate 1,000 acres of the disputed area for recreation and 3,000 acres more for conservation in a natural state. Commerce would be served by development of a large, deepwater bistate harbor behind a 15-mile causeway extending from South Chicago to Miller, east of Gary, as a supplement to the Calumet Harbor.

The long struggle between conservationists and industrialists for the dunes can probably have no better outcome than a well considered compromise. Certainly the industrial complex straddling the Illinois-Indiana border provides a more reasonable focal point for harbor development than does Burns Ditch, among still unravished dunes.

Indiana, the Midwest, and the Nation need both industry and conservation on the Indiana waterfront. We are all for a compromise that will provide permanent places on the Indiana shore for heavy industry, shipping—and the dunes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Army Corps of Engineers is finally holding another hearing on the proposed Burns Waterway Harbor, which, if carried through, would destroy the dunes. This hearing is to be held in Indianapolis on the morning of August 30. It took months of prodding to get the engineers to take such action. There has not been a hearing on this subject since November 1956. Hitherto there has been no opportunity for the Lake County, Ind., mayors to be heard. They will be heard in Indianapolis, and I hope that the Army Corps of Engineers will give proper attention to the arguments which will be presented.

In the new version of the dunes bill we have made some changes in accordance with the experience which the Department of Interior has had with other shoreline park proposals, and because of the imminent possibility of the wanton destruction of some of the best dunes land, even though the Burns Ditch Harbor is becoming much less of a possibility.

BOUNDARY CHANGES

Five boundary changes are particularly notable. In the original bill, about 8,000 acres in Porter County, Ind., of representative portions of the Indiana Dunes and other areas of scientific interest and of public recreational value were to be preserved as a national scientific landmark. Of the 8,000, about 4,000 were in four defined units bordering Lake Michigan, and another 4,000 acres were to be selected as supporting land from the area south of U.S. Highway 12 and north of U.S. Highway 20. In the new version of the bill, the boundaries of three of the units bordering the lake are changed and the area of supporting land south of Highway 12 is defined, for a net addition of about 1,000 acres to the lakeshore.

First. The western boundary of the area designated "unit 2"—east of the National Steel Co. property and west of the Northern Indiana Public Service Co. property—is moved about three-fourths of a mile west to add—including a fish-shaped area between the Chicago, South Shore & South Bend Railroad and the New York Central Railroad—about 400 acres of the best unspoiled dunes to the park. This extension takes in most of the site of the proposed Burns Ditch Harbor and puts the beach to a preferable use.

Second. In the area south of and surrounding Dune Acres and Porter Beach—designated "unit 1"—the Porter Beach area, formerly included within the proposed boundaries, is now excluded except for approximately 1,000 feet of lakefront at Johnson's Beach—adjoining the State park—and a passageway providing access to this beach approximately 600 feet wide along the western border of the State park. This change excludes from the park about 100 of the approximately 150 houses in the Porter Beach area formerly designated as "within the park."

Third. Also in unit 1, a small section to the east of Dune Acres, previously excluded from the park, is now included within the boundaries, and an area of equivalent size in the western part of Dune Acres is now excluded from the park. This exchange brings an outstanding "blowout" dune into the park. The area in the western part of Dune Acres which is excluded from the park is 200 feet south of the shoreline and involves about one-half dozen houses.

Fourth. In the area east of the State park—unit 4—the southern boundary of the unit is extended to the Chicago, South Shore & South Bend Railroad right-of-way, to bring an additional 200 acres into the lakeshore.

Fifth. The area of supporting lands, running south of the Chicago, South Shore & South Bend Railroad and from the Porter-Lake County line to a line extending south from the east end of the State park, is defined and designated as "unit 5."

RIGHTS OF PROPERTY OWNERS

The new version of the bill also substantially liberalized the alternatives available to owners of improved property in the proposed lakeshore units. Owners would have three alternatives: First, an owner may choose to retain ownership permanently, providing he abides by zoning regulations established by Porter County and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Second, an owner may choose to sell his property to the Department of the Interior for fair market value and retain the right of use and occupancy, transferable, for 25 years. Or third, an owner may sell his property outright to the Department of the Interior.

Another new section of the bill provides for the establishment of an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Advisory Commission. The Commission would advise the Secretary of the Interior about lakeshore matters. The Commission would be composed of seven members, appointed for 2-year terms by the Secretary of the Interior, two from recommendations made by Porter County, two from recommendations made by Lake County, two from recommendations made by the Governor of Indiana, and one designated by the Secretary.

Other new provisions in the bill provide for law enforcement within the lakeshore, in accord with National Park Service recommendations.

In conclusion, I believe we have cause to be hopeful. I am greatly pleased by the assurances given on the floor this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], who has done

such excellent work in this connection, and by the expression of interest by the Senator from Alaska.

I repeat that I am in favor of a deep water port in Indiana and for the development of heavy industry in Indiana, but this should be in the already industrialized area of Lake County. We should not permit the dunes, which are irreplaceable, to be destroyed.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in accordance with the order already entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 29, 1961, at 9 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 28, 1961:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

Albert Lee Stephens, Jr., of California, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of California, vice Benjamin Harrison, deceased.

Raymond E. Plummer, of Alaska, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Alaska, vice a new position.

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1961:

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.

OMAR BURLESON, U.S. Representative from the State of Texas.

MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, U.S. Representative from the State of Illinois.

Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York.

Arthur H. Dean, of New York.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 16th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1961:

Charles W. Yost, of New York.

Clifton R. Wharton, of California.

Philip M. Klutznick, of Illinois.

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York.

Mrs. Gladys A. Tillett, of North Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 28, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. WALTER.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

AUGUST 28, 1961.

I hereby designate the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Psalm 1: 1–2: *Blessed is the man whose delight is in the law of the Lord.*

O Thou Supreme Ruler of the Universe, inspire us with a heartfelt longing to lead mankind out of the bondage of hatred and ill will into the radiant light of that better and brighter day when all the capacities for a nobler life, with which man has been created and endowed, shall be brought to fulfillment and fruition.

Humbly and penitently we are praying that we may have a clearer vision and understanding of the utter futility and waste and insanity of war which is the brutal destruction of human life and property and we cannot give it any other reading or interpretation.

Grant that in all our labors for world peace we may make a more daring trial of the moral and spiritual values and teach us how we may courageously use and implement them in the building of a finer civilization.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 24, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3596. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to Purvis C. Vickers, Robert I. Vickers, and Joseph M. Vickers, a copartnership doing business as Vickers Bros.;

H.R. 6765 An act to authorize acceptance of an amendment to the articles of agreement of the International Finance Corporation permitting investment in capital stock; and

H.J. Res. 438. Joint resolution to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 so as to authorize and direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a study and investigation of the adequacy, for the protection of investors, of the rules of national securities exchanges and national securities associations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 258. An act to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to increase the rate of tax imposed on certain gross receipts, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942 to transfer certain parking fees and other moneys to the highway fund, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 4785. An act relating to withholding for State employee retirement, disability, and death benefit system purposes, on the compensation of certain civilian employees of the National Guard.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1124. An act to provide financial assistance to the States to improve educational opportunities for migrant agricultural employees and their children;

S. 1126. An act to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes;

S. 1130. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for family clinics for domestic agricultural migratory workers, and for other purposes;

S. 1729. An act to promote the foreign commerce of the United States, and for related purposes;

S. 2000. An act to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; and

S. 2325. An act to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States No. 62–5.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed the Senator from Utah, Mr. Moss, as an alternate delegate to the Interparliamentary Union, to be held in Brussels, September 14–22, 1961, in place of the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. PASTORE, excused.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1962

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 544) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1962, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a continuing resolution to provide funds for the various agencies of the Government; is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. Yes, it is an extension of the resolution which we adopted 2 months ago covering the months of July and August. The committee, it seems, was too optimistic. We were hopeful it would require no more than 2 months to finish up the appropriations work of the Congress, but we have not disposed of all the bills, so we are suggesting not to exceed another month—to September 30 at the outside—for the same purpose. It is essentially identical to the last resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Are we entitled to be pessimistic from here on out? What is the story?