

of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY:

H. Con. Res. 539. Concurrent resolution providing that certain violations of human rights by the Government of Poland shall be brought to the attention of the General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 540. Concurrent resolution providing that certain violations of human rights by the Government of Poland shall be brought to the attention of the General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H. Con. Res. 541. Concurrent resolution providing that certain violations of human rights by the Government of Poland shall be brought to the attention of the General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 542. Concurrent resolution providing that certain violations of human rights by the Government of Poland shall be brought to the attention of the General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 543. Concurrent resolution providing that certain violations of human rights by the Government of Poland shall be brought to the attention of the General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H. Con. Res. 544. Concurrent resolution providing that certain violations of human rights by the Government of Poland shall be brought to the attention of the General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 545. Concurrent resolution providing that certain violations of human rights of the Government of Poland shall be brought to the attention of the General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. Con. Res. 546. Concurrent resolution regarding the right of self-defense of the parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance in forestalling intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 547. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H. Con. Res. 548. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H. Con. Res. 549. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 550. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. Con. Res. 551. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. Con. Res. 552. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. Con. Res. 553. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL:

H. Con. Res. 554. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress in protecting the freedom of the countries of the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 13145. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Warren J. Green, of Fort Monroe, Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 13146. A bill for the relief of Doyle A. Ballou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 13147. A bill to provide relief for Allied Chemical Corp., Bates Chemical Co., Inc., H. Kohnstamm & Co., Inc., W. J. Stange Co., Sterwin Chemicals, Inc., and Warner-Jenkinson Manufacturing Co., for the losses sustained by reason of the decertification of batches of F.D. & C. red No. 1 by an order of the Food and Drug Administration dated November 26, 1960; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 13148. A bill for the relief of Hannelore Haller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 13149. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Picardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 13150. A bill for the relief of G. J. Gultreau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 13151. A bill for the relief of Elena DeSantis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 13152. A bill for the relief of Izhak Sokolski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 13153. A bill for the relief of Dewey Sumonja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1962

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

Our Father, God, who bringeth forth righteousness as the light, and judgment as the noonday, our souls wait upon Thee; our expectation is from Thee.

In this challenging hour in which our lot is cast, when appalling human need makes this a time for greatness, save us from the devices and the duplicity of cowardly compromises, as enticing evil

lies in wait to silence our consciences. Deliver us, we pray, from the inclinations of our own hearts to self-deceit.

Grant that our hearts may be shrines of devotion, our homes nurseries of virtue, our personalities centers of contagious good will, and our Nation a flaming beacon of hope, whose beams shall battle the darkness of the world.

We ask it in reverence of the Name above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 13, 1962, was dispensed with.

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 the bill (S. 4) to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 3064. An act to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources;

H.R. 298. An act to provide for the recovery from tortiously liable third persons of the cost of hospital and medical care and treatment furnished by the United States;

H.R. 9728. An act to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act;

H.R. 10160. An act for the relief of Mrs. A. R. Lendian;

H.R. 12459. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Coast Guard; and

S.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished services of Sam Rayburn, former Speaker of the House of Representatives.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On requests of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the

consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

U.S. ASSAY OFFICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul J. Maguire, of New York, to be assayer of the U.S. assay office at New York, N.Y.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE ARMY, THE NAVY, AND THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk, in the Army and in the Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET, 1963, FOR PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION (S. DOC. NO. 129)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1963 involving an increase in the amount of \$900 million for public works acceleration, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the petitions of Edward Muza, of the State of California, praying for a redress of grievances, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF GAFFNEY, S.C.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the textile industry, which is the largest employer in South Carolina, is experiencing great difficulty as a result of increased competition from foreign imports. This competition has caused many mills to close in various areas of the country. Many of the mills in South Carolina are being forced to curtail operations and run only 4 days a week.

This is a matter of great concern to all the people of South Carolina. This concern is being expressed by the people in various ways, and the local civic organizations are very active in urging remedial action to offset the impact of foreign imports. Several of the local chambers of commerce have adopted resolutions with regard to the present state of our domestic textile industry. I have received a number of resolutions, all of which express similar concern as to this problem. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks one such resolution which was adopted by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Gaffney, S.C., on September 11, 1962, and is similar to a resolution which was adopted on the same date by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Anderson, S.C.

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

Whereas the textile industry by far is the largest employer in Cherokee County; the State of South Carolina; the entire Southeast, and one of the largest employers in the United States; and

Whereas the textile industry is one of the largest users of many raw materials, and the largest single customer of the American farmer, plus the purchaser of millions of dollars' worth of industrial items, such as machinery and other materials each year; and

Whereas the textile industry is of prime importance to the Nation's economic and military security, and the Chamber of Commerce of Gaffney, S.C., hereby notes with interest and approval the attention that has been given the textile industry's extremely serious problem regarding the excessive importation of textiles from low-wage foreign nations, by President John F. Kennedy and also by numerous Members of Congress; and

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of Gaffney, S.C., is deeply appreciative of steps that have been taken to correct this situation that threatens the job security of millions of Americans plus the Nation's own security; and

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of Gaffney, S.C., has noted with alarm that despite the arrangements that have been entered into with a number of foreign nations to control textile imports into this country that excessive imports have flowed into the American market during the past several months; and

Whereas the record on the industry's case before the Office of Emergency Planning closed on October 15, 1961, and as of September 11, 1962, no decision has been announced by the OEP as to the essentiality of the industry to national defense despite the urgency of the situation; and

Whereas after considerable delay the Tariff Commission rejected the Agriculture Department's recommendation for import fee of 8½ cents per pound on the cotton content of textile imports to offset the difference between the cost of raw cotton to foreign mills to that which American mills are required to pay by law; and

Whereas the unfairness of the two-price cotton system which forces American mills to pay 8½ cents per pound more for American grown cotton than paid by foreign competitors places the industry in an unrealistic competitive position and obviously must be corrected; Therefore be it

Resolved by the board of directors, That the Chamber of Commerce of Gaffney, S.C., respectfully and urgently requests President Kennedy to exert all force necessary to expedite handling of the unresolved portions of his seven-point textile program.

Adopted September 11, 1962.

O. M. MULLINAX,
President.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

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

H.R. 11019. An act to provide that the Uniform Limited Partnership Act shall apply in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 2050); and

H.R. 12675. An act to provide for the formation of partnerships in the District of Columbia and to make uniform the law with respect thereto (Rept. No. 2051).

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

H.R. 5831. An act to amend section 11 of the act of April 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 197, ch. 207; D.C. Code, 1951 ed., sec. 11-776), being an act to "consolidate the police court of the District of Columbia and the municipal court of the District of Columbia, to create the municipal court for the District of Columbia, to create the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; in order to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2052).

By Mr. BIBLE (for Mr. BEALL), from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 3358. A bill to permit investment of funds of insurance companies organized within the District of Columbia in obligations of the Inter-American Development Bank (Rept. No. 2053).

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

H.R. 8738. An act to amend sections 1 and 5b of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 2058).

By Mr. BIBLE (for Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts), from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H.R. 9954. An act to amend the act of June 6, 1924, chapter 270 (43 Stat. 463), relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, as amended by the

National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 781; 40 U.S.C. 71) (Rept. No. 2055): H.R. 12689. An act to repeal section 557 and to amend section 559 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (Rept. No. 2056); and

H.R. 12727. An act to amend the act of February 28, 1901, to insure that policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia will receive medical care for all injuries and diseases (Rept. No. 2057).

By Mr. BIBLE (for Mr. MORSE), from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 3596. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended (Rept. No. 2054).

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

AUTHORITY FOR THE PRESIDENT TO ORDER UNITS AND MEMBERS IN THE READY RESERVE TO ACTIVE DUTY

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 92); which was referred to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly:

Whereas President James Monroe, announcing the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, declared to the Congress that we should consider any attempt on the part of European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Whereas in the Rio Treaty of 1947 the parties agreed that "an armed attack by any State against an American State shall be considered as an attack against all the American States, and, consequently, each one of the said contracting parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations,"

Whereas the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este in January 1962 unanimously declared—

"The present Government of Cuba has identified itself with the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, has established a political, economic, and social system based on that doctrine, and accepts military assistance from extra-continental Communist powers, including even the threat of military intervention in America on the part of the Soviet Union";

Whereas since 1958 the international Communist movement has increasingly extended into Cuba its political, economic, and military sphere of influence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States is supported in his determination and possesses all necessary authority (a) to prevent, by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Castro regime from exporting its aggressive purposes to any part of this hemisphere by force or the threat of force; (b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported offensive military base capable of endangering the United States naval base at Guantánamo, free passage to the Panama Canal, United States missile and space preparations, or the security of this Nation and its citizens; and (c) to work with other free citizens of this hemisphere and with freedom-loving Cuban refugees to support the legitimate aspirations of the people of Cuba for a return to self-determination.

RESOLUTION

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE CONSERVATION OF FISHERY RESOURCES

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. SALTSTAD, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 392) to express the sense of the Senate on the International Conference on the Conservation of Fishery Resources, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FORESTRY RESOURCES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 11, 1962, the name of Mr. LONG of Missouri was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3710) to establish in the Department of Agriculture an office to be known as the Office of Assistant Secretary for Forestry Resources, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators) on September 11, 1962.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 14, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 3064. An act to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; and

S.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished services of Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

A LONG WINTER IN BERLIN

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD my newsletter dated for release on September 17, 1962. It is entitled "A Long Winter in Berlin," and contains a statement of my views on the cold war problem over Berlin.

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

A LONG WINTER IN BERLIN (By Senator STROM THURMOND)

The American people can expect a long, cold winter of international tensions over Berlin, unless the United States moves to seize the initiative very soon in the cold war. Mr. Khrushchev has been threatening to force Western forces out of West Berlin. He has committed himself anew to this dangerous task of "removing this bone in my throat" with his recent rocket-rattling statement of September 11. In this threat over action against Cuba, Mr. Khrushchev said with regard to his position of ousting the West from Berlin that "this task must be accomplished and it will be accomplished."

Some have interpreted his statement about putting off a Berlin crisis until after the November elections as being an indication that he is backing down. Every indication, however, points to a showdown over Berlin this winter. For instance, the East Germans are strengthening fortifications along their border with West Germany and along the autobahn to West Berlin. Missiles have been installed along the air corridors to West Berlin, and electronic equipment to jam radar and other airplane controls have been reportedly set up across the wall at the end of each one of West Berlin's Tempelhof Airport runways. If Mr. Khrushchev can cross up air landings at Tempelhof, this means the United States would have to make a decision, when the Soviets sign their treaty with East Germany, whether to recognize the East German puppet regime by dealing with their officials on access rights, or whether to crash through to Berlin by use of ground forces in accordance with our present access rights.

Even Drew Pearson, who seems to be close to Mr. Khrushchev, recently stated in a news column that the man who he says wants to be a friend to the United States, if we will give him his way, will win in Berlin in the next few months, because he has the "whipland." This prediction coming from one who is constantly reassuring the American public what nice and reasonable fellows Messrs. Khrushchev and Tito are should not be taken lightly.

Another indication of Mr. Khrushchev's cockiness over Berlin lies in his remarks to Mr. Robert Frost that the United States is too liberal to fight to protect itself. Being a shrewd analyst and strategist, Mr. Khrushchev has studied each Soviet aggressive move and each U.S. reaction, and he has found most U.S. reactions to be too late, or to constitute a complete backdown. He has ample reason to feel that since we permitted erection of his wall in Berlin, establishment of a Communist garrison state in Cuba despite our Monroe Doctrine, and made an accommodation with him in Laos, that we will do little more in a showdown this winter over Berlin.

The stakes in Berlin are very high. If we accede to Soviet demands there—and we were prepared to do so in part last year until the West Germans leaked our plans to the press—then we stand to lose West Germany. If this occurs, NATO would be disbanded, and Western Europe would be ripe for neutralization and subsequent communization.

The United States must seize the initiative in Berlin while Mr. Khrushchev has given us the moratorium to settle our election problems. We could start by making some demands of our own. First, we could demand that the people in East Germany be given free elections, as they were originally promised. Next, we could demand that the wall be removed. Next, we could demand that Korea, Vietnam and Germany be reunited through free elections. Next, we could demand that the Soviets get out of Cuba, in accord with the Monroe Doctrine. If Mr. Khrushchev refused, then why couldn't we rattle a few rockets in his face to force him to at least trade with us on a quid pro quo basis, rather than permitting all the trading to be against our interests. I do not advocate any deals with the Communists because they have proved they will honor their commitments only so long as they are in their own interests. But since our State Department insists on negotiations, we ought to have some demands of our own to make.

If we act with determination, and proceed without delay in making demands and taking actions on Cuba, we can create a crisis that will put Mr. Khrushchev on the griddle while Berlin simmers on the back burner.

After all, he knows which side has superior military power. Why not convince him we have the will to use that power.

ROBERT FROST'S VISIT TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on September 10, 1962, I called to the attention of the Senate a United Press International news story reporting on the impressions of the distinguished poet, Mr. Robert Frost, after his recent visit with Mr. Khrushchev. My remarks and the UPI news story can be found on pages 18975-18976 of the September 10 issue of the RECORD.

In my remarks I made the statement that I felt Mr. Frost had eloquently spilled the beans on our no-win foreign policy and also on the direction in which our domestic policy planners have decided to lead our country in reaching an accommodation with the forces of international communism. I made the comment that our entire policy, both foreign and domestic, is based on the idea that we can move toward socialism in this country and that Mr. Khrushchev will evolve toward our system. This is, in essence, what Mr. Frost stated after his conference with Mr. Khrushchev. He also stated that Mr. Khrushchev told him that "he feared for us because of our lot of liberals. He thought that we are too liberal to fight. He thinks we will sit on one hand and then the other."

Today I was pleased to read in the Washington Post, of all newspapers, a very interesting and excellent column on Mr. Frost's comments. They were written by the distinguished news columnist and humorist, Mr. George Dixon. In this case, however, Mr. Dixon did not seem to be joking about Mr. Frost's remarks. He also makes the point that he feels that Mr. Frost spilled the beans. He says:

I know that Frost, before he left for Russia, was briefed extensively by the President's two foreign policy planners. The poet had a long session with Walt Rostow, Chairman of the Policy Planning Council, at the State Department, and an even longer one with McGeorge Bundy, the President's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, at the White House.

I've got a feeling the octogenarian may have been so filled he spilled.

Frost said he sees the U.S.S.R. easing off toward democracy, and the United States easing off toward socialism. I think the administration's projected foreign policy is planned on the probability of the two powers merging ideologically toward the center.

Mr. President, I feel that Mr. Dixon's column is so interesting and revealing that it should be printed in the RECORD for all the Members of this body to read. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have his column printed in the RECORD.

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

AS THE POET SAYS (By George Dixon)

I'm beginning to wonder if 88-year-old Poet Robert Frost, on his 10-day visit to the Soviet Union, didn't give away our overall

foreign policy as projected into the future by the Kennedy administration.

I know that Frost, before he left for Russia, was briefed extensively by the President's two foreign policy planners. The poet had a long session with Walt Rostow, Chairman of the Policy Planning Council, at the State Department, and an even longer one with McGeorge Bundy, the President's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, at the White House.

I've got a feeling the octogenarian may have been so filled he spilled.

Frost said he sees the U.S.S.R. easing off toward democracy, and the United States easing off toward socialism. I think the administration's projected foreign policy is planned on the probability of the two powers merging ideologically toward the center.

The reason I have to say "I think" is that the evidence on which a positive statement could be based has been suppressed. The State Department and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have entered into a compact to bury the Rostow document.

The Rostow document is the 400-odd-page white paper put together by the State Department's planner to cover our foreign policy, present and projected. Rostow was questioned on it exhaustively in closed session by the Senate's foreign policyholders. Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT said the transcript of the planner's cross-examination would be edited for security.

We leaped to the assumption that this meant the censored version would be released to us. It was a leap into nothing. Enough time has elapsed for it to have been edited, censored, and set to music, with special arrangement for life and piccolo, but there's no sign of it—and the word is out that there's not going to be.

Frost is hard of hearing, but I'm pretty sure he got an earful of it before starting Moscow-ward. The poet met with Nikita S. Khrushchev at the Premier's vacation retreat near the Black Sea resort of Gagra. This alone should have stimulated him because poets have been straining for ages to find a word that rhymes with Niagara. Frost could write a sonnet about his encounter with Khrushchev beginning:

He roared there at Gagra
As loud as Niagara.

Be that as it may, I'm convinced Frost was repeating from Rostow and Bundy when he told Khrushchev:

"There might be something that we have that you want, and there might be something you have that we want. We could trade and settle it just like a horse trade."

My feeling is that the good, gray poet also was reiterating words that had been briefed into his falling ears when he told Khrushchev:

"The future of the world for the next 100 years or so lies between the United States and Russia."

I have had the feeling for a long time that the way to keep posted on our foreign policy is to listen less attentively to the evasions of the State Departmenters and more closely to our globegirdling jazz musicians, night club comics, and poets.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is there further morning business?

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

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the un-

finished business be laid before the Senate and be made the pending business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3615) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment.

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

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

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT BY SEPTEMBER 30?

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader some questions, which concern me very deeply, about the possibilities of adjournment.

First, I am very much encouraged by the report we received yesterday from the President's press conference, and elsewhere, that it seems that Congress is likely to pass much of the administration's legislative program. I think that is wonderful; and certainly the Senator from Montana deserves a great deal of credit for it. Of course that is our first duty; and we should remain in session as long as is required in order to pass these important measures, no matter how long that may be.

At the same time, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana whether there is some possibility that the session can be ended by the end of this month, because it seems to me that for many reasons it would be most helpful, not only to many Senators, but also to the country, in terms of a meaningful campaign, to have Congress adjourn by the end of the month.

I call attention to the fact that since the first of September there have been a number of absentees; and I think it a tragedy that on some of the crucial measures the Senate has had to vote with 25 or 30 Senators absent. I am sure the Senator from Montana shares that view.

I feel that if announcement were made that we might not adjourn until October 6, some of the committee chairmen might time their agendas in such a way that it would be unlikely that the session would end before that date.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], I would say, first, that no one wishes to have the session end any more

quickly than I do. Members are becoming rather tired, and I should like to see an early end to this session.

However, we have some important legislation to consider. Some of it is in conference, and I hope some will be forthcoming next week.

If Senators will cooperate, I think there is a good prospect that we can complete our work before the end of the month. But it is not up to the leadership to decide that; it is up to the Senate collectively to decide whether it wishes to "get on the ball" and attend to this proposed legislation and dispose of it one way or the other.

What the Senator from Wisconsin has said about the absentees is all too true. For the past several months I have been keeping a day-by-day check, and I have been a little disturbed at the absenteeism in the Senate; and because of that absenteeism it has been practically impossible to hold meetings on Saturdays, in view of the fact that it seems that we cannot get a quorum together then. However, there are reasons for this, which the Senator from Wisconsin knows as well as I do.

I hope that from now on we can work together and coordinate our activities, to the end that we may be able to conclude the session as soon as possible.

I can say to the Senator from Wisconsin that so far as I am concerned, I am ready to have Congress adjourn as soon as the President's legislative program is attended to and disposed of one way or the other; and if the Senate will cooperate, I think there is more than a reasonably good chance that we can complete our work by the end of this month. If not, the session will very likely continue into the first week of October. But I hope that will not be necessary.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think perhaps some consideration should be given—although I realize that it would be very taxing—even to holding night committee sessions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No—

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to state why. It is because if we do not complete this work by the end of the month, it is my strong feeling that it will be very difficult to maintain a quorum thereafter. Senators must campaign.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. They owe that to their constituents; and no Senator—no matter how experienced or how skilled a legislator he may be, or no matter what his seniority—can do any good here if he is not reelected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is not my intention to have all-night sessions held.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No, that is not at all what I am talking about.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is the intention of the joint leadership to have the Senate convene every day at 10 a.m., and, if need be, to remain in session until a reasonably late hour in the evening.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Montana misunderstood my suggestion. My point is that perhaps one or two of the crucial committees might consider holding meetings in the evenings—let us say, perhaps from 7 p.m. to 9:30 or 10

p.m., or something of that sort—so that the necessary legislation could thus be moved forward and gotten underway, because I understand that the bottleneck is not on the floor of the Senate, but is in the committees which have not been able to act upon proposed legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I express the hope that most of the committees have completed the larger share of the legislation before them for this year. So far as the Finance Committee is concerned, its members have been saddled with an extremely heavy burden this year. They have done very well, all things considered. They have a right to meet at any time the Senate is in session. I am not at all displeased or disturbed by their meeting during the sessions of the Senate, because I think all things considered, they have done extremely well. But I should think the other committees would be just about ready to wind up their committee meetings and that the Senate should continue to stay in session until all the legislation has been disposed of.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Appropriations Committee on the foreign aid bill, for instance?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand the committee has been holding hearings and that just as soon as the House is through with the foreign aid appropriation bill, we will be ready for it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I point out that on September 4 there were from 29 to 35 absentees. On September 10 there were 32 and 33 absentees, respectively, on two rollcalls. Senators who were absent had to be absent. They had to campaign. They had to explain their record to the people of their States. This is an important duty. I know the distinguished majority leader has had great burdens. He has done an excellent job under difficult circumstances.

The only reason I rise to speak of this is the great importance of using every emergency measure possible to try to terminate the session by the end of the month, because if we can, it will mean we can have meaningful coverage. If we cannot we are likely to have a bare quorum present. It will mean that every State will not be represented on the important measures before us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has raised these questions. I have answered them to the best of my ability. I think it is quite possible that we can finish by the end of the month, but it is going to be up to the Senate, individually and collectively, to work together to that end. It is the intention of the joint leadership to meet at an early hour from now on, 10 o'clock in the morning, and remain in session late into the evening, and, if possible, get some work done, because, speaking personally, no Senator wants to get out of here any faster than I do.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Wisconsin paid tribute to the majority leader. In my opinion, if it had not been

for the pacifying influence of MIKE MANSFIELD, the work on the Senate floor would have been in a state beyond redemption. His method of handling affairs has made possible the progress that has been made.

With reference to night sessions, I think there is a goodness and badness in them. Efficiency and proper consideration can be sacrificed by the compulsion that comes from late night sessions, and they ought to be avoided as much as possible.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We will do the best we can, but we have to attend to our business, and we shall.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to reiterate with great emphasis the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Ohio in appreciation of the very fine and effective work of our majority leader, at all times, as far as that is concerned, but particularly in this session, when he has had to carry an unusual burden and an unusually heavy load of legislation, as well as vexations because of circumstances that developed.

I am one of many—and I hope this applies to the entire Nation—who have had a growing appreciation of his very fine and very effective work. It has reflected true statesmanship at its very best and in its highest quality. I do not mean to flatter the Senator.

Mr. President, this seems to be open season for suggestions as to how the majority leader can conclude the session, and, if I may make one, if we could be shorter in our speeches, and not have so many of them, and eliminate just a little of the repetition and the filing of so many amendments, when it is known, beyond all doubt, what the result will be, I believe the floor leader would have a better chance. I am not referring to any particular Senator, but I know the majority leader has been burdened greatly in this session with a great deal of work that, with all due deference, it seems to the Senator from Mississippi, was committee work, which was brought to the floor of the Senate but which should have been taken up in committee.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3615) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I do not believe the motion has been made by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] as indicated. He stated he intended to move that the pending business, the mass transportation bill, be referred to the Commerce Committee.

We have had discussions since we recessed last evening. I recognize that this bill does, in some degree, have interstate commerce implications. For example, one section of the bill gives advance authorization for interstate compacts in connection with mass transportation agreements.

There are a very few areas of the country in which mass transportation plans could be involved with travel between States, though this is still essentially an urban development problem.

While I do not believe that every bill that is reported from a committee when there is a partial jurisdiction in other committees should be referred to the latter, we have discussed this question. This is pioneering legislation, in a sense. We thought that perhaps the Commerce Committee may desire a review of this bill.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I suggest that the bill be referred to the Commerce Committee by unanimous consent, with instructions that it be reported back by 12 o'clock a week from next Monday.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That would give the Commerce Committee a full week for consideration of a major piece of legislation. It seems a reasonable suggestion to me, and I would not object to that request.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a motion?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill, S. 3615, be referred to the Commerce Committee with instructions that it be reported back to the Senate by 12 o'clock on Monday, September 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Does the Senator from New Jersey yield for that purpose?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I have yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and the bill is referred to the Commerce Committee as requested.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1988 and the following measures on the calendar, in sequence, through Calendar No. 1998.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first measure will be stated for the information of the Senate.

ACCEPTING INVITATION TO COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION, LAGOS, NIGERIA

The resolution (S. Res. 379) accepting an invitation to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth

Parliamentary Association to be held in Lagos, Nigeria, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Vice President is authorized to appoint four Members of the Senate as a delegation to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to be held in Lagos, Nigeria, at the invitation of the Nigerian branch of the association, and to designate the chairman of said delegation.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the delegation, including staff members designated by the chairman to assist said delegation, shall not exceed \$10,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT STUDY ENTITLED "PROBLEMS AND TRENDS IN ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP"

The resolution (S. Res. 381) to print as Senate document the study entitled "Problems and Trends in Atlantic Partnership" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a staff study entitled "Problems and Trends in Atlantic Partnership—Some Comments on the Institutions," prepared at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that six thousand additional copies of such document be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CARL E. NEWMAN

The resolution (S. Res. 384) to pay a gratuity to Carl E. Newman, Norma V. Newman Sewell, and Yvonne C. Newman Cole, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Carl E. Newman, son, and Norma V. Newman Sewell and Yvonne C. Newman Cole, daughters of Alex Newman, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to two months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

NAOMI C. MITCHELL

The resolution (S. Res. 385) to pay a gratuity to Naomi C. Mitchell was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Naomi C. Mitchell, widow of Gilbert H. Mitchell, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ANNIE LEE CARRELL

The resolution (S. Res. 386) to pay a gratuity to Annie Lee Carrell was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to

Annie Lee Carrell, widow of Harvey E. Carrell, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

CLARA T. DOUGLAS

The resolution (S. Res. 387) to pay a gratuity to Clara T. Douglas was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Clara T. Douglas, widow of Walter J. Douglas, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES ENTITLED "STATE OF THE ECONOMY AND POLICIES FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT"

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) authorizing the printing for the use of the Joint Economic Committee of additional copies of its hearing entitled "State of the Economy and Policies for Full Employment" was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee five thousand additional copies of its hearings of the Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, entitled "State of the Economy and Policies for Full Employment."

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE HANDLING OF POOLED COTTON ALLOTMENTS OF BILLIE SOL ESTES

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 91) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on Department of Agriculture handling of pooled cotton allotments of Billie Sol Estes was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations two thousand additional copies of all parts of the hearing held by its Permanent Investigating Subcommittee during the current session on Department of Agriculture handling of pooled cotton allotments of Billie Sol Estes.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PARTS 1 AND 2 OF "STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES," 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 508) authorizing the printing of additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of "Structure and Organization of the Communist Party of the United States," 87th Congress, 1st session, was considered and agreed to.

TOCKS ISLAND NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, PA. AND N.J.

The bill (S. 3530) to authorize establishment of the Tocks Island National Recreation Area in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY"

The resolution (S. Res. 382) to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "Housing for the Elderly" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee on Aging eight thousand additional copies of its committee print of the Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, entitled "Housing for the Elderly".

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12870) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of September 12, 1962.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to, and I ask the Presiding Officer to lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Was this a unanimous report?

Mr. STENNIS. It was a unanimous report. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] will be in the Chamber in a few minutes.

Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to; and I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate the action of the House on certain amendments of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action

on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 12870, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
September 12, 1962.

Resolved, That the House agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12870) entitled "An Act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$181,272,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$193,355,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "\$847,810,500".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted, insert the following:

"During the current fiscal year, not to exceed a total of \$712,427,500 shall be available for obligation against the Department of Defense family housing management account for the purpose of section 501(b) of Public Law 87-554, approved July 27, 1962, as follows:

"For the Army: Construction, \$46,625,000; operation and maintenance, \$135,115,000; debt payments, \$49,863,000.

"For the Navy and Marine Corps: Construction, \$92,542,000; operation and maintenance—Navy, \$58,360,000; Marine Corps, \$7,700,000; debt payments—Navy, \$25,744,000; Marine Corps, \$4,691,000.

"For the Air Force: Construction, \$100,771,000; operation and maintenance, \$98,986,000; debt payments, \$89,574,000.

"For defense agencies: Operation and maintenance, \$2,456,500. The foregoing amounts available for obligation for operation and maintenance may be increased as determined by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided*, That such increased amounts are transferred from applicable operation and maintenance appropriations for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the total obligations against the account are authorized to be increased accordingly."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, and 5.

In that connection I wish to state that this is a unanimous report of the Senate and House conferees, with reference to this appropriation bill. The Senator from Massachusetts will be in the Chamber in a few minutes and will have some remarks to make concerning the conference report.

In the meantime, I shall make some remarks.

Mr. President, on Friday last I submitted for the approval of the Senate the appropriation bill for military construction. Today, we submit the report on the conference with the House, to which a unanimous conference report is being filed.

The conferees have agreed to recommend the sum of \$1,319,114,500 for the fiscal year 1963. This is a reduction of \$275,615,000 below the Budget and the Department of Defense requests, and it represents a further paring down from the amounts voted by the respective legislative chambers when we went to conference. This is a reduction of 20.9 percent from the Budget request. At that time, the Senate had voted \$1,349,611,000, and the House \$20,130,000 more or \$1,369,741,000.

The amounts allowed for each of the services are as follows:

Army	\$181,272,000
Navy	193,355,000
Air Force	847,810,500
Defense agencies	35,677,000
Loran stations, defense	20,000,000
Army Reserve	8,000,000
Naval Reserve	7,000,000
Air Force Reserve	5,000,000
Army National Guard	7,000,000
Air Guard	14,000,000

Total..... 1,319,114,500

Of this total amount, in round figures, \$525 million is for missile base construction and about \$40 million for space construction. That brings the total figure for the actual construction programs of the military services, outside of the missile bases, to less than \$1 billion, a sum comparable to that provided the past year.

I offer for the Senate's favorable consideration this conference report in the full confidence of which I assured the Senate on Friday last, that the true and substantial requirements of the services are fully satisfied by the recommendations presented. The bone and muscle of the requirements for military construction have survived the reductions as to which this body was advised in detail on September 7. As the case appeared to require, we reduced some requests, deferred some, and eliminated others.

A category which we explored in depth last week was family housing. The Senate recommendation that the budget requests be reduced from 14,475 units to 7,500 units for a saving of \$119 million has been fully agreed to.

I hope that I will be pardoned if I advert again to the reasons for our action therein, lest it be thought that our action was not preceded by the very fullest consideration. And I hope that I can further suggest that it is in the area of family housing that the responsible committees of both Houses have made extremely valuable contributions in the public interest. An outstanding example of this service is the fact that this year, after many years of effort, we have finally come to a program of family housing entirely of the appropriated variety. As all the studies unflinchingly have shown, great savings will be realized with the elimination of burdening interest costs over a long period of years in privately financed housing; further, a better house will be obtained for the original dollar investment.

Mr. President, I think this illustrates what happens when the subject matter of any program gets beyond the committee of either House which is trained,

and the staff of which is trained, to look after that phase of the program. Some years ago military housing got out of the control of the Armed Services Committees of the two Houses. It was taken over by other committees. It shuffled all around through the executive department and on Capitol Hill, throughout the years there were extravagant programs and one unworkable program after another, at a tremendous extra cost to the taxpayers, who finally have to shoulder the load.

It took 3 or 4 years of constant and diligent effort on the part of several committees to finally get this subject matter headed back to the proper committees and to place it on a much sounder financing basis which, after all, is the straight appropriated fund basis, with direct responsibility for Members of Congress who vote for the bills and who handle the bills.

In this way we get more and better returns for the dollar in the housing program. We get a better house, a better plan, and a sounder structure.

I think this is not a perfect plan, but it has finally been brought in line and the program is on this basis.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The plan now agreed upon between the two Houses with relation to housing for the military services is a great step in advance, not only in putting houses where they are most needed but also in keeping down the cost of the program.

I congratulate the chairman, who had so much to do with initiating that idea.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator, but no one contributed more to the solution of this tangled problem upon which we have been working than did the Senator from Massachusetts.

It is important that I reiterate here that, although we reduced the requests for new units, we did so while providing for the renovation of 2,884 substandard units, honoring the request in its entirety for that purpose. And we did so in the knowledge that 303,500 family housing units have already been constructed through various programs.

A major factor in our conclusion that the requests for family housing were far too great was of our dissatisfaction with the critiques and the rationale of the Department of Defense as to "adequate" and "inadequate" housing. We could not accept the principle established that if the military person in question had to travel more than 45 minutes from the residence available for rent to his place of occupation that this residence was "inadequate" and that, therefore, public funds had to be spent in order to provide him quarters. Such a test is not realistic, as many, many hundreds of thousands of people in daily American life have to spend more than 45 minutes en route to their work. We rejected also the proposition that available housing was "inadequate" as termed by the Department of Defense if the rental cost per month was more than 120 percent of the monthly quarters allowance.

I emphasize, too, that our action did not require the deduction of one single dime from the monthly allowance of any military person to pay rental for housing. Every single one of those accounts, of course, would be left intact. This year Congress increased that allowance by 18 percent. What we contemplate is a sound, Government-owned family housing plan.

Before I leave the subject, I want to disabuse any impression that the committees have substituted any scientific or wholly satisfactory criteria of their own. This is an area in which the legislative and executive branches intend to work in the days to come for a better solution. It is evident, though, that more consideration must be given to the taxpayer and the use of available houses which are offered for reasonable rentals. Some military personnel may have to pay more than their housing allowance, but, also, many pay less than their monthly housing allowance. On this last point, the Department of Defense can make a survey and present to the Congress how many military personnel pay less for rent than their allowances.

And there are provisions for placing the management of housing in one office in the Department of Defense. Pertinent inquiries as to the important characteristics of the bill were developed last Friday and I would hope that my statement today, together with the previous floor discussions, provide a satisfactory basis for your informed consideration.

The House of Representatives Subcommittee on Appropriations, which handled the bill, has done outstanding work not only with reference to the housing problem, but over the years, in all the other major phases and features of the bill. They are outstanding in the hearings they conduct and the work they do upon this important measure.

I have a few additional factual points to present, but I know that the Senator from Massachusetts is engaged in an important conference on another appropriation bill. I should like to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Mississippi. The general military construction bill has been worked out very advantageously for all of the services. The amount appropriated is larger than the amount appropriated last year, but it is much smaller, as the Senator has pointed out, than the recommendations of the Budget Director. I believe that all the principal needs of the military for this year are covered. The great problem confronting the committee was in relation to research. The question of what facilities should be put in and how fast they should go in was before us. I think we have reached a very reasonable compromise between the positions of the House and the Senate on that point.

We have improved the research facilities of the military to a great degree.

I have a few brief remarks in summary. I believe that the report of the chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has covered the subject.

But I should like to supplement his figures and his judgments with my own. I am in hearty accord with him.

At the risk of repeating some of the remarks of our able subcommittee chairman I wish to comment briefly on this conference report. Let me say at the outset that I have never worked in a conference committee where I felt all of the members were more diligent in seeking out the facts on which to determine the proper course of action in providing the vast sums needed for military construction. Also let me say that all the conferees were dedicated to effecting economies and the conference report reflects this determination. The Army program was the smallest of the three services and it sustained the greatest percentage cut, yet it received \$181,272,000, which was \$23,338,000 over its fiscal year 1962 appropriation. The Navy received \$193,355,000, which was \$1,077,000 over its appropriation for the past year. The largest share was received by the Air Force which amounted to \$847,810,000, which was \$349,464,000 over its appropriation for last year.

There are two separate items which should be discussed to explain the conference action in each. First, as to the problem of family housing for the military people here in the United States and around the world. We were not satisfied with the criteria which had been established upon which housing should be allowed. Because of this dissatisfaction we felt that the housing starts should be reduced by approximately one-half. We do not attempt to say where these should be located as far as need is concerned, but commonsense points to the need of remote areas where other housing is not available or adequate and also where our military men are on short alert and must live close to their bases.

Next we come to the difficult problem of facilities for research and development. Obviously we could not vote all of the money sought by the services. Let me say that some of the decisions hung in the balance until the very last moment and additional proof had to be secured from the departments before a final judgment could be made. The conferees in the exercise of their most careful consideration had to decide that some projects should go forward and some should be held up for another year so that better justifications could be submitted as to need.

That, I believe, with the housing provision, were the two important considerations with which we had to deal.

In all I felt that an excellent job has been done. This bill represents a most healthy trend in appropriations. It is \$215,615,000 under the budget estimates, and still is \$367,423,750 over last year's appropriation. Thus we are adequately caring for expanding military programs to meet the U.S. defense needs. We went into this conference with the Senate bill \$19,240,000 under the House bill and the conferees reduced this sum by an additional \$31,386,500. These are very real savings and yet we are providing in an adequate way for all of our most important needs. A wise old man once said in regard to Government bond issues—if you do not understand them

vote "no." There were some of the items before us where the proof was not strong enough so we were forced to vote no this year. I, for one, feel that we have followed the wisest and only course of action, and we have presented a well-considered, thoroughly tested appropriation for the action of the Congress.

Mr. President, I thank the chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] for permitting me to make those few remarks at this time. As he knows, I am now engaged in another conference with the conferees on the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for making his remarks on the bill. This is another instance of the very valuable service that the Senator from Massachusetts renders to the Senate on the many committee assignments that he so ably holds and fills.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator for those remarks, and reciprocate them in full.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, continuing my remarks, I refer to further details of the new housing program and the management thereof, which is reflected in the figures spelled out in the final version of the military construction bill.

Last year, due to certain inadequacies and the way the program was administered, the Armed Services Committee of both the House and Senate saw fit not to renew the authority for the Capehart housing. Instead, it was decided to go to a direct appropriation method of family housing.

The Department of Defense, at the insistence of the Congress, in the past year has completely revised its approach to the management and building of family housing within the three services.

The plan submitted by the Department of Defense was not the one adopted this year by the Congress with reference to the financing of family housing. The Department of Defense presented a plan under which there would be a pooling of money, and a revolving fund. Houses could be built out of a revolving fund rather than from a direct appropriation. That is another plan and suggestion that, through the Armed Services Committees of the two Houses, I think the Congress very properly rejected, and, instead, insisted on going to

the direct method of making appropriations, which is the only way that really keeps the program within the direct, yearly control of Congress.

Managementwise, the Department has taken a number of steps to insure better administration of the family housing program for the services. A separate housing management staff has been established in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and in each of the three Departments. These offices are taking steps to establish modern accounting, planning, and control techniques.

For the fiscal year 1963, the services proposed the construction of 14,475 family housing units and the improvement of 2,884 substandard units to public quarters standards, requesting a total of \$289,810,000.

The conference committee has not approved the Senate formula for housing in its entirety. The program agreed upon amounts to 7,500 units, costing a total of \$143,742,000. The funds and units are distributed as follows: Department of the Army, \$29,865,000 for 1,600 units; Department of the Navy, \$43,880,000 for 2,195 units; Department of the Air Force, \$69,997,000 for 3,760 units. The units for each of the services include both housing for the continental United States and overseas.

No specific projects are deleted from the housing program, but funds have been made available only for the 7,500 units mentioned above. The Department of Defense and the services are charged with the responsibility of selecting where the housing units will be constructed on the basis of priority and need within the services.

I point this out in the RECORD because Senators may receive many inquiries about what was done with reference to housing units which had been requested in their respective States. Individual Senators and Members of the House ought not to be charged with the responsibility of getting the housing after it has been requested by the Department of Defense. That adds to the confusion, and it adds to the multiplication of so-called issues which are not pertinent or relevant. These decisions should not be made on that basis. We were willing to allow 7,500 units of housing to be built this year, but we did not disturb the list except to reduce the

money. That leaves the Department of Defense and the services charged with the responsibility of selecting where the housing units shall be constructed, on the basis of priority and need within the services. That is a legislative direction and mandate, as far as it can be carried out in language of this kind. They are charged with the responsibility of establishing the priority list in keeping with the needs of the services.

Under the section, "Department of Defense Family Housing Management Account," the conference committee adopted language placing a limitation upon the amounts of money which can be spent by the services for the construction, operation and maintenance, and debt payments for family housing within each specific service. There is some flexibility, however, given to the Secretary of Defense for the transfer of operation and maintenance appropriations.

Mr. President, I feel that the committee on conference has worked out a very fair and equitable bill. Further, it is my opinion that the bill furnishes for the Department of Defense and the services all the funds necessary to carry out the construction program required for our national defense commitments; and further, that the total reduction of \$275,615,000 from the amount requested by the Department of Defense and the Budget Bureau does not cut into, nor in any way weaken the bone and muscle of our military program.

I believe this bill establishes the fact that there can be some economy and that there can be some reductions with reference to military expenditures. The Senator from Mississippi believes that we have reached a critical place in our total budget of what our economy can stand, when more effective attention must be given to these military programs. We must never deny any sum that is essential. At the same time we must be certain that it is essential, and that only the essential amount of the request is allowed.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point certain tables which show the estimates and allowances with reference to the program.

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

Appropriations for military construction, fiscal year 1963, showing 1962 appropriations, 1963 estimates, and congressional action

Item	Appropriations, 1962	Budget estimates (revised), 1963	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Increase (+) or decrease (-), conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimates, 1963	House bill	Senate bill
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Defense.....	\$27,000,000							
Military construction, Army.....	157,934,000	\$234,421,500	\$197,477,500	\$193,634,000	\$181,272,000	-\$53,149,500	-\$16,208,500	-\$12,362,000
Military construction, Navy.....	152,278,000	306,982,000	214,349,500	196,423,000	193,365,000	-113,507,000	-20,994,500	-3,068,000
Military construction, Air Force.....	498,346,000	944,446,000	883,722,000	860,782,000	847,810,500	-96,635,500	-15,911,500	-12,971,500
Military construction, Defense agencies.....		46,000,000	33,192,000	38,662,000	35,677,000	-10,323,000	+2,485,000	-2,985,000
Loran station, Defense.....	10,000,000	22,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000			
Military construction, Army Reserve.....	14,381,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000			
Military construction, Naval Reserve.....	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000			
Military construction, Air Force Reserve.....	4,608,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000			
Military construction, Army National Guard.....	21,868,750	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000			
Military construction, Air Guard.....	18,275,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000			
Total.....	951,690,750	1,594,729,500	1,369,741,000	1,350,501,000	1,319,114,500	-275,615,000	-50,626,500	-31,386,500

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi to agree to the House amendments to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, and 5.

The motion was agreed to.

THE U-2 INCIDENT IN RED CHINA— THE PRESIDENT'S PRESS CONFERENCE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during the course of the President's press conference yesterday evening, he referred to the U-2 incident occurring over Red China. I do not know whether the President was indulging in politics, or whether he was merely stating a fact. However, he is reported as having said that the plane that was recently shot down by the Red Chinese had been sold to the Nationalist Chinese in July 1960, during the Eisenhower administration.

I do not know why he should mention that point, except to mention a historic fact. If politics was involved, I see no reason for it. In that case I would remind the President that his administration has given F-100 fighter planes to Yugoslavia, which certainly is not a friend of ours. The U-2 is not a weapon-carrying airplane, whereas the F-100 is a lethal weapon.

Therefore, if politics is to be involved in the sale of a normal airplane, I think we should also consider the fact that in the President's own administration deadly weapons have been given to a country which is certainly not our friend and that, in addition, we have trained pilots from that country to use such weapons.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I heard the President's broadcast last night. I believe the President used the date 1960, but did not make reference to the Eisenhower administration. The name "Eisenhower" was not used in the press conference.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I did not hear the broadcast. I merely read an article referring to it in this morning's paper. The article states that the sale was arranged in 1960, "that is, during the Eisenhower administration." The headline reads: "Kennedy Pins U-2 Sales On Eisenhower Regime."

I hope the Senator from Michigan is correct. Knowing the newspaper, I am inclined to think that it was the newspaper which made the statement, and not the President.

Mr. McNAMARA. I believe the Senator will find that the Eisenhower regime was not referred to in the press conference. I know the Senator from Arizona wants to be correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I certainly do. I do not think politics should be involved in a situation like this. If it was the fault of the newspaper, I expect it to print a retraction of the story tomorrow.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hickey in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON CUBA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last night the President began his press conference with a statement on Cuba. It is a sober statement which makes clear his complete command of the realities of that situation. It is a statement replete with firmness and wisdom and responsibility. He has the courage to say we will act as our needs may require. He has the courage equally to say that we will not act in an irresponsible fashion out of an irrational fear, or an excess of brashness, or merely out of an understandable but vague desire to "do something."

Mr. President, the Senate might well note the President's words on Cuba. They provide an excellent framework for the consideration of a resolution which will be helpful to him in this situation. I am confident that beyond considerations of partisanship, the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, who will consider such a resolution during the next few days, will have as their fundamental impulse a desire to close ranks in support of the President. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement previously referred to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Following is the transcript of President Kennedy's news conference yesterday in Washington, as recorded by the New York Times:

I have a preliminary statement.

There has been a great deal of talk on the situation in Cuba in recent days, both in the Communist camp and in our own, and I would like to take this opportunity to set the matter in perspective.

In the first place it is Mr. Castro and his supporters who are in trouble. In the last year his regime has been increasingly isolated from this hemisphere. His name no longer inspires the same fear or following in other Latin American countries.

He has been condemned by the OAS (Organization of American States), excluded from the Inter-American Defense Board and kept out of the Free Trade Association. By his own monumental economic mismanagement, supplemented by our refusal to trade with him, his economy has crumbled and his pledges for economic progress have been discarded.

Along with his pledges for political freedom his industries are stagnating, his harvests are declining, his own followers are beginning to see that their revolution has been betrayed. So it is not surprising that in a frantic effort to bolster his regime he should try to arouse the Cuban people by charges of an imminent American invasion and commit himself still further to a Soviet takeover in the hope of preventing his own collapse.

REPEATS CONCLUSION

Ever since communism moved into Cuba in 1958, Soviet technical and military personnel have moved steadily on to the island in increasing numbers at the invitation of the Cuban Government.

Now that movement has been increased. It is under our most careful surveillance.

But I will repeat the conclusion that I reported last week: That these new shipments do not constitute a serious threat to any other part of this hemisphere.

If the United States ever should find it necessary to take military action against communism in Cuba, all of Castro's Communist-supplied weapons and technicians will not change the result or significantly extend the time required to achieve that result.

However, unilateral military intervention on the part of the United States cannot currently be either required or justified, and it is regrettable that loose talk about such action in this country might serve to give a thin color of legitimacy to the Communist pretense that such a threat exists.

But let me make this clear once again. If at any time the Communist buildup in Cuba were to endanger or interfere with our security in any way, including our base at Guantanamo, our passage to the Panama Canal, our missile and space activities in Cape Canaveral, or the lives of American citizens in this country, or if Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this hemisphere or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union, then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies.

We shall be alert to and fully capable of dealing swiftly with any such development. As President and Commander in Chief, I have fully authority now to take such action. And I have asked the Congress to authorize me to call up Reserve forces should this, or any other crisis, make it necessary.

In the meantime, we intend to do everything within our power to prevent such a threat from coming into existence.

Our friends in Latin America must realize the consequences such developments hold out for their own peace and freedom, and we shall be making further proposals to them.

Our friends in NATO must realize the implications of their ships engaging in the Cuban trade. We shall continue to work with Cuban refugee leaders who are dedicated as we are to that nation's future return to freedom.

We shall continue to keep the American people and the Congress fully informed. We shall increase our surveillance of the whole Caribbean area. We shall neither initiate nor permit aggression in this hemisphere.

With this in mind, while I recognize that rash talk is cheap, particularly on the part of those who do not have the responsibility, I would hope that the future record will show that the only people talking about a war or an invasion at this time are the Communist spokesmen in Moscow and Havana, and that the American people, defending as we do so much of the free world, will in this nuclear age, as they have in the past, keep both their nerve and their head.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hickey in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PROPOSED FREEDOM ACADEMY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, at the present time a bill to establish a new Government agency to be called the Freedom Academy lies before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. In the press there has been a great deal of comment to the effect that efforts may be made to have this bill, S. 822, passed before the adjournment of the present session of this Congress.

So far as I am concerned, the Nation would be better off if the proposed legislation had a quiet demise in the committee to which it has been assigned. If there is one thing we do not need it is another governmental agency to rove the field of foreign policy.

The purpose of the proposed Freedom Academy is to prescribe doctrines by which the United States and friendly nations are to conduct the cold war. It is proposed that a school similar to our service academies be created to develop a scientific method of combating communism and to train Government personnel, private citizens, and foreign students in this science. Of course, all of that would be done at considerable expense to our taxpayers. The proposed Academy is supposed to be an answer to similar Soviet schools training commissars to serve as political advisers to Soviet military, air, and naval units and foreign Communists in the techniques of subversion; and it is alleged that the proposed Freedom Academy would find answers to the many-faceted problems of the cold war.

Mr. President, do we really desire to ape Communist Russia and to have political commissars attached to units of our Armed Forces? Americans are intelligent; they are not unintelligent cattle to be herded and regimented.

This is an outrageous proposal—to create a so-called Freedom Academy, and to spend millions of the taxpayers' dollars on such a project.

In our struggle with international communism—and it is a serious struggle, indeed, Mr. President—we must employ not only our military strength, but also all of our political, psychological, and economic resources as well. However, the issue is whether the so-called Freedom Academy is necessary or desirable in that connection. Someone conceived the name "Freedom Academy"; and, Mr. President, the fact is that the only attraction of this proposal lies in its name. If bad legislation is proposed, but if it is given an attractive name such as "Freedom Academy," in some minds the proposal becomes a meritorious one. However, Mr. President, this measure is not a meritorious proposal. The struggle with the international Communist conspiracy involves infinitely complex problems. We live in a grim period of international anarchy. The menace posed by the aggressive and ruthless dictators of the Soviet Union and Red China is the most serious our Nation has faced in its history. As leader of the free world we must retain our armed might and strengthen our retaliatory capability in order to assure that the Communist dictators will never dare to

embark on a war of conquest. However, it seems to me to be only wishful thinking to believe that a new governmental agency, without operational responsibility, would be able to cope with the grave and complex problems involved in this effort.

I suggest that we would be seriously deluding ourselves if we were to believe that the strategy for waging the fight against communism could be formulated into an operational science. Too many imponderables, too many unknown factors, and too many human elements are involved.

Intensive research into the nature and technique of the Communist conspiracy is necessary. Our intelligence personnel do make and, of course, should continue that policy of complete surveillance and inquiry into the operations of Communist Russia and Red China. They have been, I am certain, and will continue to be, alert and to keep abreast of these activities and try to figure the operations and contemplated moves of our potential enemies.

Existing Government agencies have accomplished much in this area, and will continue to do so. Those who carry out current programs run up against the practical problems of fighting communism. The proposed Freedom Academy would have relatively little practical contact with these problems. There is no sense in duplicating these efforts by establishing another agency to spend taxpayers' money. Furthermore, to assign this vital function to the proposed Freedom Academy would be like using a jeep to do a bulldozer's job.

The State Department has been given the primary role in marshaling our non-military resources in the cold war. Its Foreign Service Institute is developing a considerable program on anti-Communist techniques, of which an important part was implemented on June 11. Plans are also underway to expand significantly the Foreign Service Institute and broaden its training responsibilities to meet the needs of the changing times. During the last 5 years, 2,750 students from many governmental agencies attended seminars conducted by the Institute on Communist methods and organization.

In addition, educational opportunities are available at any one of the excellent Russian research or international studies centers throughout the country. A few years ago Soviet and Chinese Communist specialization was available at only three or four universities. Now 25 colleges and universities offer such specialization. Incidentally, many foreign students are educated on our views regarding communism, directly and indirectly, through student exchange programs. Also, such programs as the Peace Corps contribute to international understanding of Communist subversion.

Furthermore, the Justice Department operates a number of anti-Communist schools whose courses include instruction on Communist theory and policy. The Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, the U.S. Information Agency, and security agencies in various other Government departments

analyze problems of communism and teach civilian and military personnel about them in the same way that officials of the Freedom Academy, so-called, would, were we to be foolish enough to enact that legislative proposal into law.

Proponents of the Freedom Academy insist that it would bring this widespread activity together and coordinate it, thereby making it more effective. The facts are that if the State, Defense, and Justice Departments gave up their anti-Communist programs to the Freedom Academy, they would be crippled in many of their other related operations. If the Departments retained these functions, it is obvious that the Freedom Academy would be duplicating them; and adding one more voice to a chorus will not make it more harmonious. As current programs stand, diversity is useful because of the variety of methods employed in the cold war struggle. There is much coordination and communication between the agencies involved in this work.

Mr. President, it is extremely doubtful that governments of many countries or public opinion abroad would support the idea of enrolling foreigners—nationals of those countries—in this Academy for work to be done in their home countries. Such things are by their very nature done secretly, if at all. The Russians do not advertise the fact that foreign Communists in the Soviet Union are being taught Communist techniques of organization and subversion. Soviet propaganda would herald the Freedom Academy as a "cold war institute," a training course for espionage, and would give a completely incorrect connotation to the world of our concept of "freedom."

Officials of both our State Department and Department of Justice oppose this bill and urge its defeat. In my judgment it is entirely lacking in merit. I know of no governmental department that favors it. Its supporters have estimated that by the third year of operation it would cost taxpayers at least \$35 million a year.

Some have said, "Only \$35 million." I was born and reared in the country in Ohio, and to me \$35 million a year is a stupendous amount of money. At any rate, this is undoubtedly a gross underestimate. We all know of the operation of Parkinson's law and how Government agencies somehow always have a way of costing taxpayers a great deal more money than was anticipated at the time of their establishment.

The Freedom Academy, so called, has all the hallmarks of becoming another multimillion-dollar bureaucratic boondoggle, were it to be enacted into law. Far from being an aid in the cold war struggle, it would result only in duplication of effort and a waste of taxpayers' money. It is my fervent hope that our colleagues in the foreign relations committee will take no action on this bill during this session or any other session of Congress. Let it continue to lie in a state of innocuous desuetude.

Finally, Mr. President, it is a fact that the U.S. Government maintains and has maintained over the years four freedom academies which are the greatest

institutions of their kind anywhere in the world. I refer to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, the U.S. Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs, and the U.S. Coast Guard Academy at New London. It would seem to me unthinkable that we should give consideration to giving in to the proponents of this so-called Freedom Academy, and I am speaking out against such an outrageously foolish proposal.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE FILING OF A COMMITTEE REPORT DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be permitted to file a report during the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. ON MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the business for today has been completed, the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock a.m. on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is hoped and anticipated that the trade bill will be ready for action on Monday, and that the report and hearings will be available, because both go together. I make this announcement so that Senators may be aware of the intention of the leadership.

THE PRESIDENT'S NEWS CONFERENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a transcript of the news conference held by President Kennedy yesterday, September 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The transcript of the news conference was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PRESIDENT'S NEWS CONFERENCE ON FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC MATTERS

Thank you.

I have a preliminary statement.

There has been a great deal of talk on the situation in Cuba in recent days, both in the Communist camp and in our own, and I would like to take this opportunity to set the matter in perspective.

In the first place it is Mr. Castro and his supporters who are in trouble. In the last year his regime has been increasingly isolated from this hemisphere. His name no longer inspires the same fear or following in other Latin-American countries.

He has been condemned by the OAS (Organization of American States) excluded from the Inter-American Defense Board and kept out of the Free Trade Association. By his own monumental economic mismanagement, supplemented by our refusal to trade with him, his economy has crumbled and his pledges for economic progress have been discarded.

Along with his pledges for political freedom his industries are stagnating, his harvests are declining, his own followers are beginning to see that their revolution has been betrayed. So it is not surprising that in a frantic effort to bolster his regime he should try to arouse the Cuban people by charges of an imminent American invasion and commit himself still further to a Soviet takeover in the hope of preventing his own collapse.

REPEATS CONCLUSION

Ever since communism moved into Cuba in 1958, Soviet technical and military personnel have moved steadily on to the island in increasing numbers at the invitation of the Cuban Government.

Now that movement has been increased. It is under our most careful surveillance.

But I will repeat the conclusion that I reported last week: That these new shipments do not constitute a serious threat to any other part of this hemisphere.

If the United States ever should find it necessary to take military action against communism in Cuba, all of Castro's Communist-supplied weapons and technicians will not change the result or significantly extend the time required to achieve that result.

However, unilateral military intervention on the part of the United States cannot currently be either required or justified, and it is regrettable that loose talk about such action in this country might serve to give a thin color of legitimacy to the Communist pretense that such a threat exists.

But let me make this clear once again. If at any time the Communist buildup in Cuba were to endanger or interfere with our security in any way, including our base at Guantanamo, our passage to the Panama Canal, our missile and space activities in Cape Canaveral, or the lives of American citizens in this country, or if Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this hemisphere or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union, then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies.

We shall be alert to and fully capable of dealing swiftly with any such development. As President and Commander in Chief, I have full authority now to take such action. And I have asked the Congress to authorize me to call up Reserve forces should this, or any other crisis, make it necessary.

In the meantime, we intend to do everything within our power to prevent such a threat from coming into existence.

Our friends in Latin America must realize the consequences such developments hold out for their own peace and freedom, and we shall be making further proposals to them.

Our friends in NATO must realize the implications of their ships engaging in the Cuban trade. We shall continue to work with Cuban refugee leaders who are dedicated as we are to that nation's future return to freedom.

We shall continue to keep the American people and the Congress fully informed. We shall increase our surveillance of the whole Caribbean area. We shall neither initiate nor permit aggression in this hemisphere.

With this in mind, while I recognize that rash talk is cheap, particularly on the part of those who do not have the responsibility, I would hope that the future record will show that the only people talking about a war or an invasion at this time are the Communist spokesmen in Moscow and Havana, and that the American people, defending as we do so much of the free world, will in this nuclear age, as they have in the past, keep both their nerve and their head.

OFFENSIVE THREAT IN CUBA

1

Question. Mr. President, coupling this statement with the one of last week, at what point do you determine that the buildup in Cuba has lost its defensive guise to become offensive? Would it take an overt act?

Answer. I think if you read last week's statement and the statement today—I've made it quite clear, particularly in last week's statement when we talked about the presence of offensive military missile capacity or development of military bases * * * would indicate a change in the nature of the threat.

OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE

2

Question. Mr. President, in this same line, do you—have you set for yourself any rule or set of conditions at which you will determine the existence of an offensive rather than a defensive force in Cuba? And in that same connection, in your reading of the Monroe Doctrine what do you—how do you define intervention? Will it require force to contravene the Monroe Doctrine or does the presence of a foreign power in any force, but not using that force, in this hemisphere amount to contravention of the doctrine?

Answer. Well, I have indicated that if Cuba should possess a capacity to carry out offensive actions against the United States, the United States would act. I've also indicated that the United States would not permit Cuba to export its power by force in the hemisphere.

The United States will make appropriate military judgments after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others, after carefully analyzing whatever new information comes in as to whether that point has been reached where an offensive threat does exist. And at that time the country, the Congress, will be so notified.

EXPORTS OF U-2 AIRCRAFT

3

Question. Mr. President. Mr. President, would you state, sir, whether or not the United States has given export licenses for the export of U-2 aircraft to other nations, other than Nationalist China? And, if so, what is our policy?

Answer. No, we have not. We have not. These export licenses were given in—as you know, in July 1960, and were sold to the Nationalist Chinese Government. We have

no plans to sell any further ones or to grant any export licenses.

BERLIN AND THE ELECTIONS

4

Question. Mr. President.

Answer. Yes.

Question. Would you comment on the Soviet announcement that they apparently will shelve discussion on Berlin until after our elections in November?

Answer. I thought that the leaders of both political parties in the Congress indicated very clearly that on this matter of Berlin there was not a political division within the United States, and that our position would not be—in Berlin, which carries over a long commitment stretching back for many years and several administrations—would not be affected by whatever the results may be in the November election.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

5

Question. Mr. President, could you tell us why the Alliance for Progress has not made more progress in the past year on Latin American problems, in your judgment?

Answer. Well, the Alliance for Progress is a tremendous effort which is to, by the united effort of the free countries of Latin America and the United States, to attempt to bring about an increase in the standard of living in the opportunities for the people of Latin America.

Latin America has been neglected for many, many years. I would hope that a good many Americans, who are particularly concerned about Cuba today, would also take a very careful look at the very low standard of living of much of Latin America, the bad housing, the unemployment, the bad health of so many of the people there.

We're engaged in a monumental task in attempting to increase the standard of living of the people of Latin America and we're—have available for that purpose a good many less—a good deal less money than we had available for the rebuilding of Lat—of Europe, which had a highly developed labor force, great technical skills and which required only an infusion to provide an increase over the prewar standard of living.

Here we do not have the technical skills. We do not have the planning staff. We have, in a sense, neglected Latin America, so that we are engaged in a tremendous operation with insufficient resources. And I think we are moving ahead since Punta del Este. But there's an awful lot of business left unfinished, and will be for some time. You cannot remake the face of Latin America overnight and provide better opportunity.

In addition, I'm very anxious that the countries of Western Europe, particularly the Common Market, will concern themselves with Latin America. Latin America depends on its export markets to Europe in order to maintain its economy.

Latin America has had a flight of capital in recent months which has been serious. In addition, the price of its primary products has also dropped in recent months. So that even the assistance we have given has not been enough to keep Latin America even, and particularly when its population increase amounts to almost 3 percent.

So we're faced with staggering problems in Latin America, and I hope that in our concentration on the particular problem which I discussed at the opening we will extend our view and realize that what's at stake here is the freedom of a good many countries which are in very dire straits today.

SALINGER PARTY

6

Question. Mr. President, what did you think, sir, of the rather harsh things that Republican Congressman JOEL BROTHILL, of nearby Virginia, had to say about you and your press secretary because Mr. (Pierre)

Salinger (White House press secretary) gave a party last night for his Democratic opponent?

Answer. Well, I can see why he'd be quite critical of that and—but I will say I've never read as much about a Congressman who's in the paper as I do about that Congressman and see less legislative results.

7

Question. Mr. President, Martin King has telegraphed you asking for Federal action against anti-Negro terrorism in the South and at least one Negro organization has threatened to picket you with the allegation that the Federal Government has not done enough. Could you tell us whether you have answered Dr. King and give us the thought that you gave him? And whether you can say that or not, can you give us a comment on the problem?

Answer. We're in contact with Dr. King and others who have communicated to us about it. I don't know any more outrageous action which I've seen occur in this country for a good many months or years than the burning of a church—two churches—because of the effort made by Negroes to be registered to vote.

The U.S. Constitution provides for freedom to vote, and this country must permit every man and woman to exercise their franchise. To shoot, as we saw in the case in Mississippi, two young people who were involved in an effort to register people, to burn churches as a reprisal with all of the provisions of the U.S. Constitution—at least the basic provision of the Constitution guaranteeing freedom of worship—I consider both cowardly as well as outrageous.

The United States now has a number of FBI agents in there and as soon as we are able to find out who did it we'll arrest them, and we'll bring them before a jury, and I think that—I'm sure they'll be appropriately dealt with.

But let me say that nothing, I think—and I'm sure this is the view of the people of the States—the right to vote is very basic. If we're going to neglect that right, then all of our talk about freedom is hollow, and therefore we shall give every protection that we can to anybody seeking to vote.

I hope everybody will register in this country. I hope they will vote. I commend those who are making the effort to register every citizen. They deserve the protection of the U.S. Government, the protection of the States, the protection of local communities, and we'll do everything we possibly can to make sure that that protection is assured.

And if it requires extra legislation, and extra force, we shall do that.

NORTHWESTERN RAIL STRIKE

8

Question. Sir, in connection with the Chicago & North Western Railway strike, how long do you believe such a major transportation tieup may be allowed to run on before the public interest requires Presidential intervention or congressional action?

Answer. Well, as you know, we exhausted the procedures of the Railway Labor Act in that case. The only provision which is available to us would be the Taft-Hartley, under a finding that the national interest and security was affected, so that we would have to make that legal judgment.

It's my understanding that representatives of both of these parties have been meeting with Mr. W. Willard Wirtz, Acting Secretary of Labor, during the last few days and that some progress has been made.

I think it's very important that the parties come to an agreement immediately, because there are a great—the interests of nine States are affected. A good many farm crops, which should be coming to harvest, which are in the field—and the public welfare suggests that these two important groups come to

a conclusion, I would hope, over the weekend.

Question. Mr. President.

Answer. I am hopeful of it, and as I say, the latest report I had today was progress had been made. So I am hopeful that both sides will make the sufficient concessions, if that is the word, to permit an agreement, because the public interest suggests an agreement is due.

CONTINUATION OF TESTING

9

Question. Mr. President, it was generally understood that the current test series would be over by now, and it now appears that the atmosphere tests may continue on until November. Can you tell us why this decision was made to continue tests?

Answer. Well, there are two reasons. One is that, as you know, because of the blowup in the pad at Johnston Island we were not able—and because of the earlier failures of the communications system in the missile—were not able to carry out these tests, which were the most—among the most important, if not the most important, of our series. So we are going to finish those.

In addition, as a result of the earlier tests of this Dominic series, there were certain things learned which we would like to prove out. So that we have agreed to a limited number of tests in concluding the Dominic series. And also, we have taken some steps to prevent a repetition of the incident which caused an increase in the number of electrons in the atmosphere, by lowering the altitude and the yield, so that lunar flights will not be further endangered.

EISENHOWER AND CUBA

10

Question. Mr. President, can you tell us whether you discussed the Cuban situation with General Eisenhower on Monday and, if you did, whether there was any agreement between you as party leaders that it should not be an issue in this fall's campaign?

Answer. We discussed all the problems and, of course, that was one of them, but I did not request any such agreement.

DETROIT AUTO SHOW

11

Question. Mr. President, in connection with your plans for next month, do you think you will find time to visit the National Automobile Show in Detroit?

Answer. I am hopeful that I will. Yes, I think I might.

CUBA AND POLITICS

12

Question. In the recent Soviet statement on Cuba, the Russians implied that perhaps the main reason the United States is so exercised about Cuba now is because of our election coming up. I'd like to ask you if you agree with this premise and, more pointedly, do you think that the Republicans are going to make political hay out of Cuba?

Answer. Well, I would not want to comment on the extent of the Soviet knowledge of our free elective process, nor would I suggest that the concern over Cuba is due to the election.

I think the concern is due to the fact that Cuba is close to the U.S. territory and that Cuba is obviously tying itself closer to the Communist bloc.

The arrival of these weapons and technicians has caused increasing alarm to not only the Members of Congress but also to the administration and to the American people.

I would think that it is part of our serious problems which we're engaged in, a tense concentration in many parts of the world in a dangerous time, and it's quite natural that this action would bring a good deal of concern.

I would not suggest that those who are concerned about it are motivated by political purposes.

WILL WAIT ON TAX MEASURE

13

Question. Mr. President.

Answer. Yes.

Question. In view of your intention to try to close some tax loopholes next year, do you find either the House or Senate versions acceptable this year?

Answer. Well, I want to wait until the conference, and, of course, the Senate version is much more acceptable than the House version, but even the House—the Senate version requires some careful analysis, and I'm sure—I think it would be more useful to wait until after the conference and then make a judgment as to whether we should go ahead with this bill or whether we should wait till the general reform of next year.

IMPLIED SOVIET THREAT

14

Question. Mr. President, the same Soviet statement that was mentioned earlier implied that the Soviet Union might intervene militarily on the side of Cuba in the event the United States was forced to take military action. Would this implied threat be a major factor in any decision you might be called upon to make?

Answer. The United States will take whatever action the situation, as I described it, would require. As far as the threat, the United States has been living with threats for a good many years and in a good many parts of the world. But the United States will not take any action that the situation does not require and will take whatever action the situation does require along the grounds which I indicated in my opening statement.

PEACEFUL USES OF SPACE

15

Question. Mr. President, in the area of peaceful uses of space, you said that we shall be first. But if we refrain from competing in the—with Russia for warlike space vehicles, as Mr. [Roswell L.] Gilpatric [Deputy Secretary of Defense] has said, doesn't this almost condemn us to a second-place finish in the military field?

Answer. No, Mr. Alexander. As I said last week, in the first place we're spending \$1,500 million a year on our military space program. What is key for the success of both the peaceful exploration of space, as well as the military mastery of space are large centers, effective control of the capsule, the ability to rendezvous and all the rest, usefulness, if the situation should require military usefulness, for our efforts—peaceful efforts in space.

There is no sense in the—and in addition, as you know, very recently, we determined to go ahead with the Titan III, which gives the U.S. Air Force a very strong weapon, if that should become necessary.

So that the work that NASA is doing on Saturn, the work the Air Force is doing on Titan, the work that's being done on the Apollo program, and Gemini and the others, all have a national security factor as well as a peaceful factor.

Yes, sir.

Question. Could you say a little more about what Mr. Gilpatric meant by allowing the Russians to go first with hydrogen weapons in space?

Answer. I'm not aware that we're intending the Russians to go first with hydrogen weapons—

Question. He said we wouldn't go until they did.

Answer. Well I think that the United States is attempting—and this administration, as you know, is making a very massive effort in space. As I've said, we are spending three times what we spent last year in

space, and more in this year's budget than the 8 previous years.

So that this is a tremendous effort—\$5,500 million. As well as the money that we're spending for the military use of space.

As I say, the size of the booster, the capsule and the control all would have, if the situation required it, a military use. We hope it does not. We hope that space will be used for peaceful purposes. That is the policy of the U.S. Government.

But we should be prepared if it does not. In addition, as I've said from the beginning, both the Soviet Union and the United States both have a capacity today to send a missile to each other's country with a nuclear warhead on it.

So that we must keep some perspective as to where the danger may lie. But the United States, in the effort it's making, both in the peaceful program and the military program, all of this will increase our security if the Soviet Union should attempt to use space for military purposes.

ROBERT FROST'S TRIP

16

Question. Robert Frost reported when he recently came back from a trip to Russia, and said he had a message from Premier Khrushchev to you. I think the American people would like to know what that message was and what the message he might have taken over from you to Premier Khrushchev. Would you tell us what that was?

Answer. No, I—he didn't take a message except—if the message of his own personality and poetry is what—to Russia and to Mr. Khrushchev—and his character. I've not received his message, though I'd hope to see him shortly and, if I do, I will if it's—I'm sure I'll be glad to communicate it to you and to the American people.

ROLE OF LATIN AMERICA

17

Question. Mr. President, you mentioned in your opening statement that proposals might be made to the Latin American countries. Could you give us some idea of your philosophy of what the Latin American countries' roles should be in this?

Answer. No. I think it would be more appropriate—as you know, Mr. Rusk intends to meet with them this month at the time that the General Assembly opens, and I think it would be more appropriate for they and he to meet and confer on the matter, and at that time we will have some suggestions.

SPACE COOPERATION

18

Question. Mr. President

Answer. Yes.

Question. Mr. President, have you received any response from the Soviet Union to indicate that they are in fact considering cooperative ventures with the United States in space other than those negotiated earlier in the satellite weather research by Doc—the late Dr. Harry Wesmer? If not, are you still hopeful that such cooperation is likely in the near future?

Answer. No. As you know, Dr. [Hugh L.] Dryden [Deputy N.A.S.A. Administrator] had some conversations at Geneva in regard to the matter and some progress was made, but it's limited, limited in its scope, and we would hope more could be done. More perhaps could be done if the atmosphere between the two countries should be improved which (interrupted).

POWER TO ACT ON CUBA

19

Question. Mr. President. Answer. Yes.

Question. In your—

Answer. Yes, go ahead. Question. You said in your opening statement that you now have full authority to act in the Cuban affair. In view of this, do you think there's any virtue in the Senate or the Congress

passing a resolution saying you have that authority?

Answer. No, I think it—no, I think it—I think the Members of Congress would, speaking as they do with a particular responsibility—I think would be useful, if they desire to do so, for them to express their view. And as I've seen the resolutions which have been discussed—a resolution which I think Senator MANSFIELD introduced and which Chairman [CARL] VINSON [of the House Armed Services Committee] introduced in the House—and I would think that—I'd be very glad to have those resolutions passed if that should be the desire of the Congress.

MOBILIZATION POWER

20

Question. Mr. President, would you tell us some of your thinking on your request for special reserve mobilization power? Now, the international situation has led you twice to request such legislation. You could call a million reservists if you declared a national emergency. Why don't you do that?

Answer. Well, I think there are several stages of a possible crisis. The call of a national emergency is, I would say, the near—the final step of a crisis, but there may be increased threats which would require us to call some reservists, particularly in the air, maybe at sea, possibly on the ground.

Last year, when we called the reservists, the two divisions, the Wisconsin and Texas divisions—we also laid plans for making two more divisions permanent, which came into effect this summer—August and September—so that those two divisions served a purpose of giving us this reserve during the period of the crisis at that time, and at the end of it we had two permanent divisions.

We have, as you know, of course, increased our Army strength from 11 to 16 divisions in the last year and a half.

Now if we need, of course—if we're in a national emergency where the United States is threatened with very serious military action, of course there'd be no hesitancy in declaring it.

But we might be in a situation where the declaration of a national emergency might not be the most appropriate step, and in that case, we might—we would use the power granted to us by the Congress.

AN INTERMEDIATE STEP

21

Question. Mr. President in that connection, your request for only 150,000 reservists would seem to not support the opinion expressed because it seems no stage at all.

Answer. Well, I think that—

Question. You said it strengthened the armed forces.

Answer. That's correct. Then we have 150,000 more that we could call. They could be in very critical areas. As I've said, the air and the sea are two. And, of course, there could be Guard divisions called if the United States were obliged to reinforce its forces any place. The ability to call up needed men would make an appreciable difference.

Now, as I say, we always have the final weapon, or nearly final weapon, of a national emergency and the power to call a million men. But the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense felt that this intermediate step could be very useful during the period when Congress is out of session.

Mr. Hurley.

22

Question. This question concerns the air-space dispute. As you know the autoworkers and the machinists union have accepted the Presidential board recommendations and recommendations, sir, which I believe you also have found acceptable as a basis for

settlement. The four leading aerospace manufacturers, especially Lockheed, have rejected the basic union shop recommendation. Now the unions feel they are being forced into a strike posture as a result of the companies' attitude. Could you tell us something of your opinion and your reaction to the situation and what the equities in this area * * *.

Answer. Well, in the first place, most major industrial companies or industries in the United States have accepted the union shop many years ago—the steel industry, the auto industry, the aluminum companies, other basic industries, the union shop is part of collective bargaining, and particularly under the terms suggested by Dr. Taylor, two-thirds vote people do not have to join the union unless—to get the job. After they've come to work, if it's an opinion of the majority, large majority of the members, then they would join the union. This is, as I say, been acceptable for many years to many companies which are even larger than the ones that are involved.

Now, the second point is that the total package, it seems to me, should be considered as a package. The economic proposals made are not excessive. They come well within the guidelines suggested by the Council of Economic Advisers. The unions are accepting a financial settlement which is not particularly generous in relation to certain other unions in recent years. They feel that the total package, however, is acceptable.

I would hope the company would accept it because if a strike comes in view of the fact that the recommendation of the factfinding board headed by Dr. Taylor, who also was given a comparable assignment by President Eisenhower in the steel strike case, which indicates—and his own high reputation and that of the panel—I would hope that the companies would accept it, because if there is a strike the responsibility would be very clear, I think, to the American people for the—for such an action.

Question. Mr. President.

Answer. I would hope there wouldn't be a strike, that business would go on, that the companies would accept the report.

23

Question. Mr. President, do you favor the election of every Democratic candidate for Congress, and how many seats do you feel you need in the Senate and the House to get a Congress that will put across your legislative programs?

Answer. Well, I would be glad to go through the names with you. I've said from the beginning that I would probably be supporting any Congressman who was interested in my support.

I think there are probably some Democrats who might not be particularly anxious for my support and who might—and therefore, my endorsement would not be required across the board.

Those Congressmen who are anxious—who are interested in my supporting them are usually people who hold the same general view of the necessity for this country making progress that I do.

Now, secondly, this Congress that is ending—I think that it is somewhat like Lazarus—it has revived, it's moving, and we are going to see the session end, in my opinion, with the passage of a good trade bill; with a tax bill which will come out of the conference; with, I hope, a higher education bill, and a good many other bills which 2 months ago seemed to be in the deep freeze.

So I think that we're making progress. What I think is important is—because these votes—and we'll get a farm bill. I hope—because these votes are so close because the program is opposed by the opposition party, almost across the board and because some

Democrats join—I would hope that we could hold the number of seats we have, and perhaps pick some up, even though I recognize that it's going to be a very intensely fought election.

KENNEDY VISIT TO TEXAS

24

Question. Mr. President.

Answer. Yes.

Question. Sir, when you went to Houston the other day, you didn't take along Congressman [BOB] CASEY, [Democrat, of Texas], whose district you went to. And you also didn't take along Senator YARBOROUGH of Texas. I wonder why you did this and I also wonder if you were motivated in leaving CASEY at home because he had opposed you on some issues.

Answer. Well, you say I didn't take Senator YARBOROUGH and he and I have been in close concert. So, of course, the reason was not perhaps as you have suggested, Miss [Sarah] McClendon [of the El Paso Times]. We didn't take any Congressman or Senator along to Florida, where we visited. We didn't take any Congressman or Senator along to Alabama because this was a program—

Question. One was already there, wasn't he?

Answer. Oh, yes, and we invited all the Congressmen and Senators who were in the districts to come with us on the trip. For example, Senator LONG from Missouri came with us through the McDonald plant. We would have been glad to have anyone come. But we took Senator—the ranking and the—we invited the members of the Space Committees of the House and Senate, the ranking Democrat and Republican.

We also brought Congressman THOMAS along, who is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to the space program. And that was the total invitations because this was a nonpolitical trip.

Question. Mr. President, thank you, Mr. President.

Answer. Thank you.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as usual, the President's answers to the questions of the news media personnel demonstrated his outstanding grasp of the problems and issues, both domestic and international, facing our Government. I thought the President's press conference of yesterday was his most outstanding performance in terms of meeting head on the penetrating questions which were posed to him by the able and competent reporters and commentators. The President deserves to be commended for his forthright and lucid statements concerning highly complicated and controversial questions. His statements are indicative of his firm and dedicated leadership as President and Commander in Chief.

I was particularly impressed with the President's statement concerning U.S. policy toward Cuba. I noticed this morning that the New York Times and the Washington Post & Times Herald commended the President. I suppose this will be characteristic throughout the land and that there will be many other commendatory remarks and editorials. I also commend the members of the press corps for the extremely timely and intelligent questions which they posed to the President. I believe this was one of the best question-and-answer sessions ever held by any President. For that reason I am especially desirous that the transcript of

the entire press conference be printed in full, in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I call attention again to the joint resolution which I introduced some months ago, Senate Journal Resolution 86, which provides that all Presidential news conferences be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a matter of permanent public record. It seems to me that this would serve a most useful purpose and that many of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, now and in years to come, would appreciate having full transcripts of Presidential press conferences available for their study and consideration. Regrettably, only a few of the daily newspapers throughout the country regularly print in full the text of the President's press conferences. As a result, the vast majority of the people of the country do not have an opportunity to read what the President was asked at the conferences and what his replies were in full.

Of course the radio and the television are most helpful and informative by means of their splendid coverage of the President's press conference. But, Mr. President, no other chief executive in the world so regularly faces representatives of the news media—representatives of the radio, the television, and the newspapers—and answers their questions so directly and so completely as does the President of the United States. If ever there was a demonstration of democracy in action, it is at these Presidential press conferences.

I hope the Committee on Rules and Administration, which has my resolution before it, will take action on it before this session of Congress adjourns. It is my belief that students of history and of the U.S. Government will, in the years to come, be most grateful to us if we arrange to have the President's press conferences made a part of the permanent RECORD for the Congress. Inasmuch as the President's press conferences relate to many of the legislative actions of the two bodies or the policies which he advocates to the Congress, certainly it will be most appropriate and fitting to have the full text of his responses to the press questions made a part of our permanent RECORD.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I would have reserved the right to object to the request of the distinguished acting minority leader to have the transcript of the President's recent press conference printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, by unanimous consent. But inasmuch as the question was not put, I could not object.

I merely wish to point out that one of the statements made by the President at the press conference was in regard to a Member of the House of Representatives, and the statement came rather close to violating the rule in regard to the maintenance of amity between the two Houses of Congress. It is not considered proper to place in the RECORD, either directly or by indirection, statements derogatory of a Member of either body. Because of the source of the statement, I shall not object; but I

point out that the rule is strained when such a statement is printed in the RECORD.

In justice to the President, I say that he was asked a partisan question, and he gave a partisan answer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But a rather restrained one, I may say.

Mr. MUNDT. I doubt the restraint. I suppose it is permissible for one to become somewhat exuberant in making a reply to such a question; but the reply was scarcely restrained.

That incident demonstrates the difficulty; namely, that one who occupies a political office sometimes is asked political questions, and obviously will give political answers to them.

It seems to me that if the Presidential press conferences are automatically to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there should be a rule to the effect that there would be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD only the portion of the Presidential press conferences dealing with public issues, but not the portions dealing with partisan matters. It seems to me that otherwise much partisan debate would be stimulated, following each Presidential press conference, if the full transcript of the conference were automatically to be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not think that would be injurious. Certainly there are differences between the parties. I respect the integrity and the legislative ability of the Senator from South Dakota; but he has his point of view, and I have mine, and at times this situation leads to disagreements between us. However, certainly it is wholesome to have debate on these issues, and certainly we can properly debate them from a partisan point of view. I do not think that is an evil or that it should be frowned upon. And at the same time we can debate the public issues of the day, and can submerge our partisan differences. But I am of the opinion that there are legitimate political differences.

One of the things I always admired about the late Senator Robert Taft was that he was a vigorous partisan. He was a great American and a great public servant; and these words were spoken about him during his lifetime, as well as now, when he is no longer with us. I think he and the late Alben Barkley were two shining examples of those who make the two-party system meaningful—with the result that when a person would say he was a Republican, the reply would be, "Oh, you support Senator Taft," and when someone else said he was a Democrat, the comment would be "Oh, you are one of the supporters of Senator Barkley"—illustrating a good, wholesome, honest difference of opinion.

I recognize the point the Senator from South Dakota has made, and I agree that the matter should be discussed before the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

I share the respect of the Senator from Minnesota for the two-party system and the importance of political debate; and

certainly there can be vigorous debate without having it become disagreeable or interfere with friendships.

However, I point out that in this instance the transcript discloses a little partisan "plug" for a Democrat who is running for election to the House of Representatives. I would not object to that; but when there then is vigorous criticism of a Republican Member of the House, although I shall not object to the request the Senator from Minnesota has made, at least I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the generosity of those on the Republican side who do not object to the request to have the transcript printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, those on the other side of the aisle are always magnanimous.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; and in this case magnanimous in the extreme.

I did not happen to hear the President's statements; but last night I read them, as published in the newspaper. I agree that it was a most interesting press conference.

However, I think the President made a misstatement when he was discussing the Chicago & North Western Railroad strike. The President said, as I understood, that the procedures under the Railway Labor Act have been fully carried out, and that the only recourse left him is the Taft-Hartley Act. However, I do not believe that under the Taft-Hartley Act the President has any specific authority to deal with a railway strike.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the use of one excludes the use of the other.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But I think the President was correct when he said that the full extent of the application of the Railway Labor Act has been utilized.

Mr. MUNDT. That part of the statement was correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And now the question is whether the participants will accept the report, or whether by negotiation they will make some modification of it.

Both the Senator from South Dakota and I are very much concerned about this matter, because the Chicago & North Western Railroad is a vital artery of transportation, particularly for the rural areas in our two States.

I repeat that I am hopeful, now that the dispute and strike seem to be right at the point of settlement.

I confided in the Senator that there were very good signs of settlement, and it is important.

Mr. MUNDT. It is important. I think that was an inadvertence on the part of the President, because I am sure he knows labor legislation better than I, since the President, when he was a Senator, served as chairman of an important subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. If I felt that there really were powers the President could invoke under the Taft-Hartley Act, I would be busy on the telephone or in the telegraph office asking him to exert

them; but I believe that the Railway Labor Act excludes provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which are applicable to other forms of transportation.

I recall our conversation yesterday. I was encouraged by the fact that he had been advised, I believe by the Secretary of Labor, that the differences were narrowing, that there was some prospect of early settlement. I had picked up the same kind of rumor from the Labor Department. If the strike is not settled over the weekend by negotiation, if there are any inherent powers under the Taft-Hartley Act of which the President knows, and of which I am not aware, I think they should be exerted by Monday morning.

If there are no steps which the President can take through the Taft-Hartley Act, as I am afraid there are not, I suggest that he send to the Senate a message recommending some kind of legislation to meet this type of emergency. Perhaps the bill introduced by my colleague the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BORAH] yesterday would accomplish the purpose, but I am sure Congress can enact some kind of emergency act which, through injunction or some other way, would compel the railroads to deliver perishable items to market before a colossal loss in the farm belt is suffered. I am sure it will receive prompt and early action, as was done with respect to authority for the President to call up the Reserves. We acted promptly yesterday to give him such authority. A real emergency in the farm area is involved in this case.

Farmers of nine States have gone through the tortuous job of producing, and now they find their products deteriorating in front of their tear-filled eyes because the railroads will not, or cannot, haul them. They cannot get their products delivered to the mills or the markets.

The situation is very serious. I share with the Senator from Minnesota the hope that the strike will be settled over the weekend; but if it is not, we need leadership from the Department of Labor or the President to have it settled by Monday or Tuesday of next week, because after that it will be too late.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure the Senator that the matter about which he is so concerned is not only being given active consideration, but very hard work is being done on it. Again this morning I spoke to the Secretary of Labor about the situation. The President is fully cognizant of the fact that he was consulted about the problem. I am confident that this situation is under control and that there will be a settlement.

I have urged that, if the good offices of the Secretary of Labor are not sufficient for this particular task, the President himself ask the parties to complete their discussions and negotiations and come to a prompt settlement. I think they are preparing to reach a settlement. At least, that is my hope.

Mr. MUNDT. I share that wish and express the hope that the Senator's hope will be realized.

CERTAIN LANDS ADMINISTERED BY FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, Senate colleagues will recall that recently when the Senate had before it a bill appropriating funds for the Department of Agriculture, I took occasion, with reference to the provision in the House bill denying payment in certain instances to farmers for the drainage of so-called potholes needed in the breeding areas of migratory birds, to refer to the fact that we face a critical shortage of ducks.

In my opinion, it is the most critical shortage that any of us have known, and I have been concerned with the problem for 46 years. In 1916, as a member of the State Senate of Virginia, I helped to frame and write into law the first comprehensive game law that Virginia ever had. It created for the first time a game department. It provided for the first time for the employment of game wardens. It provided a license tax for hunting and fishing. It fixed seasons for hunting and fishing, with bag limits. For the first time it provided that hunting without permission on a farmer's land was a trespass. We aimed to protect the farmers at the same time we were trying to build up a supply of game.

I was a member of the National Game Association that annually met in New York, where we discussed means for protection of migratory birds, under a helpful migratory bird treaty with Canada, in which Mexico later joined.

I was elected to the House in 1932, and in 1934 I sponsored a resolution to create in the House a Select Committee on Wildlife Conservation, of which the then Speaker Rainey named me as chairman. I served in that capacity for the following 12 years, until I was elected to the Senate in 1946.

In 1934 I helped to prepare and secure the passage in the House of a bill that required the purchase of a duck stamp for the privilege of hunting migratory birds, including all species of ducks and geese. Under that bill, millions of dollars have been collected, not from the taxpayers of the Nation, but from the sportsmen of the Nation, who have bought the duck stamps, not only as a privilege for hunting ducks and geese, but as a cheerful contribution to a fund that would enable our Government to buy refuges so badly needed in the breeding areas, and likewise in the feeding areas along the flyways from the Canadian Provinces, from Alaska and from Labrador.

The original bill limited the Department of the Interior to 10 percent for administration. In some way the limitation was removed, and at one time as much as 60 percent of the entire revenue was being spent for what was called administration and other purposes. In other words, it was not going for the purpose for which the bill was passed; namely, refuges. But the fact remains that every dollar that has been spent for a refuge program in the United States has been contributed by the sportsmen who purchase the duck stamps. Not one cent has been paid out

of the Federal Treasury for this program. We have passed a law providing compensation for the draining of potholes necessary for refuges in the breeding areas.

We would provide that the counties in which refuges are located should receive the same compensation that we have provided for counties in which are located 173 million acres of national forests. Those counties receive 25 percent of the revenue from timber sold in lieu of taxes. The States in which refuges are located get 25 percent of any profit derived from the management of the land, such as from the sale of hay or any other product that is taken from the refuge.

Several hours ago when I heard that the leadership planned to call up S. 2138 for debate today I was much disturbed. I was gratified when I learned that the measure would not be brought up today. It is on the calendar and probably will be brought up at a later time.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. What bill is not to be brought up today? I misunderstood the number.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I said that I heard this morning that the leadership might call up the bill S. 2138 today, but I am now informed that it will not be brought up.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is the pending business, but it is doubtful whether the Senate will complete action on the bill today.

Mr. MUNDT. That was my understanding.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is the bill S. 2138 the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that it is not the pending business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my understanding that it was the pending business. If that is not the case, I now move that the bill S. 2138 be made the pending business, with the understanding that the Senator from Louisiana, who has a keen interest in the bill, will be heard on it. If he is not available today because of his work on the conference committee considering the independent offices bill, we shall not act on the measure.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if I can be assured that there will be no effort, with most Senators gone for the weekend, to rush the bill through, I am willing that unanimous consent be granted. Otherwise, I would be forced to ask for a quorum call to delay the matter, which I have no desire to do. Provided the bill is not rushed through today, I shall not object.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Virginia knows that there will be no rush act on the measure at all. His rights will be fully respected, as I told

him before, under the consideration which he has offered and extended, so that we may have the debate with respect to a subject which ought to be developed. I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be the bill S. 2138, Calendar No. 1881.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that a motion is pending before the Senate.

The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2138) to provide that a greater percentage of the increase from lands administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior be returned to the counties in which such lands are situated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That effective only during the time provided in section 2 of this Act, section 401 of the Act of June 15, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 378, 383; 16 U.S.C. 715a), relating to the participation by the counties in revenues from wildlife refuges, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 401. (a) The revenues from all collections received by the Secretary of the Interior, during each fiscal year in connection with the operation and management of those particular areas of the National Wildlife Refuge System that are solely or primarily administered by him through the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, which are obtained from the sale or other disposition of animals, timber, hay, grass, or other products of the soil, minerals, shell, sand, or gravel, from other privileges, or from leases for public accommodations or facilities incidental to but not in conflict with the basic purposes of particular areas of that System, shall be covered into the United States Treasury and be reserved in a separate fund for disposition as hereafter prescribed. Amounts in the fund shall remain available until expended and may be expended by the Secretary of the Interior without further appropriation in the manner hereafter prescribed. The National Wildlife Refuge System (hereafter referred to as the "System") comprises those areas and lands administered by the Secretary that are included in the following descriptive categories: wildlife refuges, wildlife ranges, game ranges, wildlife management areas, and waterfowl production areas.

"(b) The Secretary of the Interior may pay from the fund any necessary expenses incurred by him in connection with the revenue-producing measures set forth in subsection (a).

"(c) The Secretary of the Interior, at the end of each fiscal year, shall make the following payments out of the net receipts (after payment of necessary expenses) for such fiscal year to those counties in which the aforesaid areas of the System, as prescribed in subsection (a) hereof, are situated, which funds shall be expended solely for the benefit of the public schools and roads in such counties:

"(1) to each county in which reserved public lands in an area of the System are situated, an amount equal to 25 per centum of the net receipts collected by the Secretary from such reserved public lands in the particular area of the System: *Provided*, That when any such area is situated in more than one county the distributive share to each county from the aforesaid receipts shall be

proportional to its acreage of such reserve public lands therein; and

"(2) to each county in which lands in the System are situated that have been acquired in fee by the United States, three-fourths of 1 per centum of the cost of the lands, exclusive of improvements to such property subsequent to Federal acquisition, such cost to be adjusted to represent current values as determined by the Secretary. The aforesaid determination by the Secretary shall be accomplished in such manner as he shall consider to be equitable and in the public interest, and his determination hereunder shall be final and conclusive.

"The aforesaid payments to counties in the United States for any one year shall not exceed the amount of net receipts of the fund for that year and, in case the net receipts are insufficient for a particular year to pay the aggregate amount of the payments for that year to the counties, the payment to each county shall be reduced proportionately.

"(d) Any moneys remaining in the fund after all payments are made for any fiscal year may be used by the Secretary thereafter for management of the System including but not limited to the construction, improvement, repair, and alteration of buildings, roads, and other facilities, and for enforcement of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 703-711).

"(e) The disposition or sale of surplus animals, minerals, and other products, the grant of privileges, and the carrying out of any other activities that result in the collection of any revenues may be accomplished upon such terms, conditions, or regulations as the Secretary shall determine to be in the best interest of the United States or for the advancement of knowledge and the dissemination of information regarding the conservation of wildlife, including sale in the open market, exchange of animals of the same or other kinds, and gifts or loans to public or private institutions for exhibition or propagation."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall be effective only with respect to revenues received during the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and the succeeding nineteen fiscal years, and during the period such amendment is in effect the provisions of the paragraph entitled "Management of National Wildlife Refuges" in the General Appropriation Act, 1951, approved September 6, 1950 (64 Stat. 595, 693-694), shall not be effective.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am glad to have the opportunity to say something about the bill and, of course, to let Senators in favor of the bill explain their side of it, in order that Senators who are not present may, at some appropriate time, but not this week, be informed about what is involved. I wish to point out today that a vital principle is under consideration.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I point out that there is a difference between the revenue-producing quality of forest land and the 25 percent which accrues to the States from that source, and the revenue-producing quality of wet lands, which are not very suitable for farming, and which do not have any great revenue-producing ability. As a consequence, the formula which works so satisfactorily in forest areas falls miserably in the duck-raising areas. The distinguished Senator from Virginia and I are both interested in acquiring additional wet lands and in producing more ducks, because we face the melancholy prospect

of a duck season this year with a limit of two ducks. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. If one wishes not to see the species exterminated, he would be well advised not to kill any.

Mr. MUNDT. I really believe that a duck season with a limit of none is almost as good as a duck season with a limit of two, because a bag limit of two is not even a good meal for a bachelor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In Virginia a trip to the duck-hunting country is not unexpensive. One would not want to make that trip for two ducks, especially if he knows that the supply is probably the lowest in our recollection.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. I am not criticizing the Fish and Wildlife Service for fixing the limit at two ducks, although I doubt the wisdom of opening the season at all under the circumstances.

But the point I make is that what has happened dramatizes the fact that all of us are interested in acquiring more wet lands. The Senator from Virginia knows that the basic wetlands legislation properly provides that wet lands can be acquired only with the consent of the Governor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That has been so within the past 2 years. Before then we had the right of eminent domain.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. Because the right of eminent domain had failed to meet the situation, Congress in its wisdom put it within the power of the Governor to veto the proposed use of the land. We are trying to arrange the situation so that the Governors can adequately protect taxing bodies, such as the townships and counties, which have to maintain local government. That is the purpose of the proposed legislation which is before the Senate. In other words, if we wish to obtain duck lands, we must find some way in which to compensate adequately those who provide them.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia recognizes the point made by his distinguished colleague from South Dakota. It is true that a great many potholes do not produce revenue, as do the forests in the George Washington National Forest in Virginia, where the soil is fine, and the roots of the native oaks clutch Mother Earth.

Mr. MUNDT. In South Dakota also the soil is fine.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In South Dakota we have been paying up to \$18 an acre to drain potholes, and after they are drained the land goes into the soil bank at \$10 to \$12 an acre.

I think the State of the Senator from South Dakota has more soil banks than any State in the Union. Now, in addition, he wants us to pay the taxes on federally owned lands.

Mr. President, we are dealing now only with the land bought with sportsmen's money. But we are dealing with a principle that will involve billions of dollars that the Federal Government has put into acquiring Federal land. If the principle is correct, if we buy that with sportsmen's money, we must pay the county taxes on what we own there. Then we will meet the demand that has come year after year for taxes on all na-

tional forest land, because for years the counties have been demanding that we pay such taxes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. As the distinguished Senator knows, North Dakota is the No. 1 duck propagation State.

The Federal Government has taken out of use hundreds of thousands of acres in my State for the wetlands program to propagate ducks. That is fine. But the land does not produce any revenue that can be used to compensate the counties, townships, and school districts in lieu of taxes. We want the program to succeed, but we cannot let it go on as it is. The State of North Dakota will oppose it in any way which we can unless we can get some compensation in lieu of taxes. It is a serious problem for us. Ducks are important, but people are more important. Too, we must have tax money to run our State government and help educate our children.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is never a serious problem for a man who sells his property to the Government, not only for a fair price, but in recent years, far more than the land is worth. We have needed it so badly we have paid \$50 to \$75 an acre for land that would not sell for \$10 on the local market.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The point that the Senator from Virginia seems to make about the proposed legislation is that it would result in what he calls payments in lieu of taxes. The fact is that there is no change in principle at all.

The legislation which would be amended by this new formula would not change what had been done before in terms of principle. Other counties and States have been getting payments in lieu of taxes, in terms of revenues from the so-called wet lands. All this would do would be to equalize the formula. This would say, "After the land is sold to the Federal Government the local government cannot tax that land." The local township or county government would have no revenue, because the only way it could raise revenue is by a tax on the land.

This would merely provide a better sharing formula from the total revenues from all Government-owned wet lands. It would consider the total body of wet lands, and provide a more equal formula for the distribution of earnings from such wet lands back to the States.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. We must have that money in order to educate our schoolchildren.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is a very pleasing presentation. No one is more skillful than my distinguished friend from Minnesota in putting his best foot foremost. The Senator has made this proposal look very attractive, plain, and easy, and has made it seem that it could not possibly involve a demand for revenues by counties or by cities, in respect to valuable tax land taken for Government purposes and taken off the city or county tax rolls.

I will show Senators what this would amount to. The pending bill deals only with Government land bought for migratory bird refuges. The annual tax to be paid to the counties—there is no use in calling it anything else, because that is what it is—would be relatively small, though in many instances it would equal the revenues derived from a marsh area before it had been taken over by the Federal Government.

Incidentally, the marsh areas in Virginia are far better than some of those in the Midwest, because the marsh areas in Virginia never dry up, and those in the Midwest do dry up at times.

Those areas were assessed at about \$2 an acre. At a rate on land of 25 or 30 cents on \$100, the amount involved was a mere bagatelle to what this tax would amount to. I will show Senators what it would amount to.

The total area of migratory bird refuges is 20,036,230 acres, which were worth, on a 1961 appraisal, approximately \$78 million. That means, as of fiscal year 1961, that the proposed tax payment to counties would amount to \$585,086 per year, assuming that there was enough money from the refuge to pay it.

At the present time all over the 25 percent of the revenue from sale of products from wildlife refuges goes for improvement, and is spent for the purposes for which the sportsmen put up the money, to improve the duck spots.

Under the terms of the bill, the money could all be taken, except that they would be kind enough to say, "If the tax is more than all the money you have, we will not carry it forward into the next year. We will call it quits when we have taken all the money you have."

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. My distinguished friend from Virginia is a very articulate spokesman for any cause he embraces. I am sure he finds himself tossed on the horns of a dilemma. Normally he is one of our most attractive and persuasive advocates in favor of the maintenance of local government, the maintenance of our Federal system, and the preservation of the rights of the people in the county, local, and State governments. I have followed the Senator's leadership, and I have followed his efforts many times in that direction.

The Senator from Virginia also is a sportsman, and has rendered a wonderful service in the general area of conservation, protection, and preservation of wildlife.

Now we find ourselves with the two rails of the railroad merging, because they are in conflict, and we must find some way to resolve this conflict.

I am sure the Senator from Virginia is not seriously going to advocate that the smallest structure in all of our government, the little counties, should undertake the job of financing the preservation and conservation of waterfowl. We want that done. That is why we have the bill. The question is, who will pay for it?

As I said on July 9, when I appeared before the Commerce Committee and

testified, the whole connotation of the word "sportsman" and of the word "sportsmanship" should indicate the importance of dealing, if not generously, at least equitably with the little governments, dispossessed of their financial assets so essential to their existence.

As a sportsman I say to my dear friend, "Do you find anything wrong with that axiomatic truism?"

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. I think there is a vital difference between believing in local government and the rights of the individual compared to the power of the Federal Government, for the national welfare, to establish refuges for migratory birds without having to pay taxes to the locality on them, provided they have paid either what the owner asked to be paid or, if the property were condemned, what a court said was fair and proper compensation for property taken for the national welfare.

My friend must remember that a great Virginia jurist named John Marshall, in the case of *McCulloch* against Maryland, said that the power to tax was the power to destroy. He said then that if Maryland could tax a branch in Maryland of the Bank of the United States it could destroy the bank and it could destroy Federal property wherever it might be. That ruling stuck. It became the law of the land.

For 10 years the Ways and Means Committee, year after year, heard demands from those who wanted the Federal Government to pay taxes on federally owned land to the localities.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It consistently opposed all of those bills. I did not think that a community which first sought to get a Federal project—and a lot of them were overzealous in the getting of Federal projects—should then, once the community got the Federal project and got paid for it, turn around and say to the Federal Government, "Now we want some more pay for it. We want you to subsidize us to the tune of taxes we would have had if we had kept the property where it was."

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. Not for a speech. Mr. MUNDT. Not for a speech; only for a short commentary.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator.

On the payments in lieu of taxes, I point out for the RECORD that a bill in that regard was before the U.S. Senate twice, and in both instances the Senator from South Dakota came as close as he has ever come in his life, or as he ever expects to come, to waging a filibuster in order to defeat it. I am sorry that the Senator from Virginia was not in the Chamber that day, because I would have had valiant support. I agree entirely with the Senator's philosophy. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota can bear testimony to what I have said.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can show the Senator my wounds.

I was the target of the thrust of the Senator from South Dakota, and I am delighted that the Senator from Virginia was not present.

Mr. MUNDT. Good.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Had the Senator been present, the onslaught would have been beyond human endurance.

Mr. ROBERTSON. When General Banks came down the valley of Virginia with 70,000 troops he met Stonewall Jackson and was defeated at Cross Keys, at Port Republic, and everywhere else. When he got safely back across the Potomac he said, "It's murder to fight without reinforcements."

Now I am being "ganged up on."

Mr. MUNDT. I am looking for reinforcements, and the Senator is getting them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the Senator, in the spirit and heritage of Stonewall Jackson, that it takes two to make a fight with the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not flatter myself in that regard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not a matter of flattery. That is simply an objective judgment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Senators are trying to prove that I am wrong when I say that we should not adopt a program of paying taxes for federally owned property.

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

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator has had a complete and adequate retort to that argument, from the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who has pointed out that we have already established that pattern. Nothing new is involved. We would change the formula for payment from what we are already providing.

We recognize that some kind of payment must be given to the counties. We tried to accomplish the result in the form of the 25 percent of revenues.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The trouble is that the potholes do not produce revenues, and the localities want a tax paid in lieu of revenue.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator would come to Minnesota and South Dakota and North Dakota, he would find that it is not suggested that the Federal Government move in, with its power, to take the potholes and leave the farm. The whole productive area is destroyed. The tax base, which is used to support schools, for example, is destroyed. The additional trouble is that if the Government once flexes its muscles in this respect, it will use the same power with respect to schools, for example.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I recognize that there may be some local hardship. I wish we knew some fair way in which to handle the problem. It involves the big principle of paying taxes on federally owned land. We start with land bought not with Federal funds, but with sportsmen's money. Once the camel gets its nose under the tent flap, we know what will happen.

As we all know, our ducks are in a deplorable condition. I believe we have the smallest number since we took the land away from the Indians. The last census showed that there are 17 percent fewer ducks than there were last fall. Everyone knows how low the count was last fall. It was the smallest census since the last spring census was taken 11

years ago. I have been living with this problem for 40 years. I remember the time when ducks would cover the sky in a dark cloud. Now we see only a few in the early dawn.

This is not the time to take a total of approximately \$585,086 a year from the inadequate funds that we now have for our refuge program. However, the debate points up the necessity for the Senate being informed as to what is involved. In order to awaken the consciousness of the Senate and of the American people as to what is involved in our duck situation, I ask to have printed in the *RECORD* at this point an article entitled "The Passing of the Passenger Pigeon," printed in the *American Heritage* magazine of June 1961. It was written by Charlton Ogburn, Jr. Among other things the article points out the significant fact that when the pigeons were at maximum number and the ducks were at maximum number, and when there were no bag limits, and when a carload of canvasbacks would go out from Norfolk to markets every night, the number of ducks amounted to only 2 percent of the number of passenger pigeons. What has become of the pigeons? They were completely exterminated. I have seen only two of them that have been mounted, and they are at the Smithsonian Institution. They were said to have been killed in 1887 in this area, and they were the last two pigeons to have been in this area. The last one died in captivity in a zoo in Ohio some 60 years ago. They have been completely wiped out.

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

THE PASSING OF THE PASSENGER PIGEON
(By Charlton Ogburn, Jr.)

On September 1, 1914, a bird named Martha died in the Cincinnati Zoological Gardens. In covering the news of the day the *New York Times* devoted half a column to the change in the name of the Russian capital from St. Petersburg to Petrograd and equal space to a defeat of the *New York Yankees* by the *Detroit Tigers*. Most of the first three or four pages were, of course, filled by news of the Great War that had just begun: the Allied armies were falling back toward Paris before the initial German offensive; a "daring aeronaut" from Germany had dropped four bombs upon the French capital; and the American colony led by the American Ambassador was petitioning the U.S. Government to protest this inhuman innovation in the conduct of war. There was nothing about the death of Martha at the age of 29. And yet her demise was the final event in the history of a slaughter as massive in the annals of the animal kingdom as the slaughter then beginning in France was to be in human history. For Martha was the last of the passenger pigeons.

When the first European settlers arrived in the New World the passenger pigeon in all probability outnumbered any other species of bird in the world. At that time it was found throughout the forest that covered eastern North America, breeding in the north and wintering in the south. It lived in flocks at all seasons, and these flocks were of such magnitude that nowhere had anything resembling them been seen before.

It requires an effort, and is perhaps impossible, to visualize the passenger pigeon's numbers even from the circumstantial accounts that have come down to us. In the vast tract of hardwoods that extended

over Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan, some of the nesting sites were 3 miles wide and 30 long. From descriptions of the density of the nests, which sometimes numbered as many as 100 to a tree, it has been computed that one such zone of 90 square miles must have contained 57 million birds. The scenes presented by these nestings stupefied all who beheld them. James Fenimore Cooper, groping for words adequate to the spectacle, wrote that he was reduced to silence by "admiration of the works of the Creator." In any case, he added, speaking would have been futile since human voices were inaudible in the pandemonium of the pigeons.

Unlike the notes of most other pigeons and doves, which are soft and muted, the cries of the passenger pigeon were loud, shrill, and scolding. Presumably, like the human city dweller, it had to speak loud and often to gain a hearing above the din created by its fellows. Travelers approaching a nesting site would begin to hear the clamor at a distance of several miles and once upon the fringes of the flock had to bawl into one another's ears to be understood, while their horses were terrified by the noise. As the squabs grew to maturity, danger was added to bedlam: branches breaking under the weight of the birds might kill anyone upon whom they fell.

With the departure of the pigeons, a scene of weird devastation remained. Every plant was killed. Droppings to a depth of several inches covered the ground, which was further littered with limbs; for miles upon end the forest would appear to have been struck by a violent hurricane. In their winter roostings, the birds were packed even more densely. Describing one of these roosts in the South, an English traveler in 1819 declared that within a circumference of 4 to 6 miles the trees were bent and broken under the hosts of pigeons "piled upon them like swarming bees."

Yet even such scenes were hardly to be compared with those that met the gaze of the awe-struck early Americans when in the spring the flocks gathered in the South, and the tremendous movement northward began. It was from these mass migrations that the bird derived its somewhat peculiar name, "passenger," meaning a bird of passage.

It is legendary that the flocks of passenger pigeons darkened the sky. This seems to have been the literal truth. In addition to obscuring the sun, they were said to have created "a wind and rushing sound like that of the greatest cataracts." Alexander Wilson, the Scottish ornithologist who came to America in the early years of the past century at about the same time as the more famous Frenchman, John James Audubon, wrote of his first encounter with a migrating flock of passenger pigeons that he took the "sudden rushing roar, succeeded by instant darkness," for the winds of a tornado.

Later, Wilson had a chance to estimate the size of one of these flocks, a column he saw passing between Frankfort, Ky., and what was then the Territory of Indiana. "If," he wrote, "we suppose this column to have been 1 mile in breadth (and I believe it to have been much more) and that it moved at the rate of 1 mile in a minute, 4 hours, the time it continued passing, would make its whole length 240 miles. Again, supposing that each square yard of this moving body comprehended three pigeons, the square yards in the whole space, multiplied by three, would give 2,230,272,000 pigeons."

Even conceding Wilson's reputation as a careful observer, is it possible to credit this astronomical figure? Three pigeons to a square yard sounds like an exaggeration, but probably Wilson meant not only a square yard but a cubic yard, or more. Moreover, the passenger pigeon seems to have flown in very dense formation. There are many stories of the numbers that could be

brought down by flogging a long pole in a low-flying flock, while one man has recounted how, finding such a flock bearing down upon him, he had to fall upon his face to escape having his eyes put out by the rain of winged projectiles above his head.

Accepting the figure of three birds to a cubic yard, how much faith may we place in Wilson's estimate of the flock's speed? Many observers, including Audubon, who himself estimated the size of a flock he beheld at over 1 billion, spoke of the passenger pigeon as flying a mile a minute. The speed of birds in the past was often overestimated, but Audubon offers supporting evidence. He recorded that passenger pigeons killed in New York had been found to have crops filled with rice they could not have eaten north of South Carolina. At the bird's high rate of metabolism, he computed that the flight must have been made in 6 hours or less, which would not have been possible at a speed under 60 miles an hour.

Perhaps there are errors in these statistics. Nevertheless, the domesticated homing pigeon has been clocked at a speed of a mile a minute, and the passenger pigeon, with its wild vigor, its beautifully proportioned, tapering lines, and its exceptionally powerful wing muscles, was undoubtedly a faster bird. Enormous speed and endurance were, indeed, essential to the survival of its legions. The congregation of 50 million birds in a single nesting area over a period of 5 or 6 weeks would obviously deplete the food supply for scores of miles around. The passenger pigeons, having to feed not only themselves but their lusty young, did in fact clean huge areas of forest bare of berries and nuts, especially of acorns and beechnuts. While feeding, the flock rolled over the forest like a tremendous wheel, the last ranks always in process of flying over their fellows on the ground and settling at the head of the procession. Such was the strength of instinctive communal discipline that no pigeon, it was said, would rise and fly ahead of the flock until it found itself at the very tail. As the nesting season progressed, the birds would, of course, have to go farther and farther afield until at the end flocks were reportedly forced to make round trips of 200 miles or more—and to make them at a prodigious speed in order that the young might not want for food.

Wilson believed the flock he saw near Frankfort to have been much greater than his estimated total. If, as seems likely, this flock actually included upward of 2 billion, that would mean, on the basis of modern computations, that it contained about one-fiftieth of all the birds in the entire world. At the very least, according to a conservative estimate, the passenger pigeon flocks represented from 25 to 40 percent of the bird population of the United States. We may realize in some degree the abundance that America offered our ancestors if we reflect that all the ducks and geese surviving on the continent by 1947 (taking the figures of the Fish and Wildlife Service) would, if added to that one flock of passenger pigeons, have increased its numbers by only 2 percent.

Those who witnessed the maneuvers of these winged hosts were left breathless. Wilson observed that "the whole, with its glittery undulations, marked a space on the face of the heavens resembling the windings of a vast and majestic river. When this bend became very great, the birds, as if sensible of the unnecessary circuitous course they were taking, suddenly changed their direction so that what was in column before became an immense front, straightening all its indentures, until it swept the heavens in one vast and infinitely extended line." Audubon declared: "I cannot describe . . . the extreme beauty of their aerial evolutions." He added that in "almost solid masses they darted forward in undulating and angular lines, descended and

swept close over the earth with inconceivable velocity, mounted perpendicularly so as to resemble a vast column, and, when high, were seen wheeling and twisting within their continued lines, which then resembled the coils of a gigantic serpent."

Those who knew the passenger pigeon best spoke as feelingly of its superiority of form and bearing as of its numbers and impetuosity on the wing. One whose knowledge of pigeons is derived only from the ever-familiar domestic breed, a descendant of the Mediterranean rock dove, can have no idea of the passenger pigeon's reputed style. Photographs show it tapered at both ends, like a bobbin, with its long, pointed tail accounting for nearly half its length, which was between 16 and 17 inches. It measured about 2 feet between the tips of its similarly tapered and pointed wings. The mourning dove, which is still common over most of our country, presents a fair approximation of the passenger pigeon's outlines. It is, however, a much smaller and in every sense more pallid bird. The male passenger pigeon had a rich bluish-slate back and a wine-colored or reddish-fawn breast with sheens of golden bronze and purple bronze on the sides of its neck. The female was less vivid. Set in the characteristically mild physiognomy of a dove, its eyes, as described by Wilson, were brilliant, fiery orange.

The passenger pigeon had many appealing qualities. According to Audubon, the males, belligerent in defense of the nests, were exceptionally affectionate with their mates and shared equally in the care of the young. It is also said that the birds would adopt and feed nestlings whose parents had been killed. The characteristic sometimes known as a sixth sense was developed in an unusual way in the passenger pigeon. When a nesting area had been selected, flocks would stream to it from all quarters, directed there by a mechanism as unerring as it was uncanny. Wilson is authority for the statement that, more mysteriously still, when a migrating flock was jumped by a hawk, its evasive movement would be repeated by succeeding groups, as if each were following a trail plainly marked in the air.

The passenger pigeon had one other noteworthy characteristic. It was edible.

Before the settlement of America, it was customary for villages of Indians to camp on the outskirts of the nesting areas and feast upon the squabs for a month or more at a time. According to an early traveler, Indian villages of no more than 17 houses would be found to have on hand a hundred gallons or more of pigeon oil or fat, which was used as butter. An account of the hunting of pigeons written by a botanist in the 1740's contains the significant statement that the Indians would not allow the molestation of the parents while the young were dependent upon them, "pretending that it would be a great pity on their young, which would in that case have to starve to death."

The white man brought to the New World a different set of values and different weapons. As early as 1672, there appeared this ominous statement by a New England settler: "But of late they [the pigeons] are much diminished, the English taking them with nets."

Not only nets, but all conceivable methods of killing were employed both in the breeding colonies and winter roosts and by every village and farm through which the migrating flocks passed in spring and autumn. It is abundantly testified that the sprayed pellets from one blast of a fowling piece might bring down from 10 to 100 birds, so dense were the flocks. In netting, advantage was taken of the pigeon's craving for salt at the end of the breeding season. Salt or salted mud was spread upon the area over which the net was to be dropped, or, on the New England coast, nets were spread above the salt springs. In the latter case, as many

at 1,500 pigeons could be trapped at one time. It was customary for farms to keep captive a pigeon whose eyelids had been sewn up or whose eyes had been put out. These blinded birds served as decoys, their cries bringing the wild migrating flocks to alight where the nets had been set.

The whites joined the Indians in camping at the nesting sites. Not content with the slow process of dislodging the squabs with poles, however, the whites cut down the trees and took the dead away by the horse-load. Unsatisfied even by these returns, they resorted to a method of mass butchery that left no room for improvement. Approaching at night, the hunting parties would set fire to the grass and underbrush in a circle around a portion of the nesting colony. The pigeons, driven out of their heads by panic, would dash into the conflagration and be roasted alive. The next morning they would be gathered from heaps 2 feet deep.

While the pigeons flocked in an area, they were served on every table, in every town, on every farm, in every inn. They were eaten, as Wilson wrote, "until the very name became sickening," and more were salted away. Early records state that wild pigeons were a staple of the poor. Their importance to the economy of the young colonies must have been incalculable.

The slaughter appears to have proceeded over the years at an ever-accelerating pace. Yet Audubon, after describing one of the scenes of carnage, wrote that "persons unacquainted with these birds might naturally conclude that such dreadful havoc would soon put an end to the species. But I have satisfied myself, by long observation, that nothing but the gradual diminution of our forests can accomplish their decrease."

The destruction of our forests would have indeed reduced the flocks that in Audubon's lifetime frequently took 3 days to pass. It is also undeniable that in reading the stories of the prodigious hordes of these birds and of the damage they inflicted upon themselves when the limbs of trees torn loose under their weight would smash to death the birds on lower branches, one has a feeling of something unreal and impossible about these multitudes. It seems outside the scheme of nature for any species to achieve a position of such dominance, to teem in such billions that self-destruction is an inevitable consequence.

Even without the agency of the white man, it is possible that in time something would have occurred to scale the passenger pigeons' numbers down—the increase of natural enemies, the development of parasites, or epidemic disease. But obliteration was certainly not marked out for the species by any process of nature, or even rendered inevitable by the fate that befell the forests the pigeons inhabited. There would seem to be no reason why the passenger pigeon could not have survived in flocks of thousands in the woods that yet remain, and it might, like many other birds of the wilderness, have adapted itself to civilization if it had been given a chance.

Audubon did not foresee the rapid growth of our cities and the extension of the railroads that gave men access to the hinterland. It was these developments, and the attendant appearance of the professional pigeon trapper, that raised the tempo of the slaughter to its highest pitch. The climax came in the 1870's, when it was estimated that several thousand trappers were devoting their full time to the destruction of the pigeons, following them from one nesting to another—these in addition, of course, to the unnumbered thousands who simply killed pigeons whenever opportunity offered.

It was in this same period that the massacre of the bison took place. Between 1869, the year the Union Pacific's transcontinental line was completed, and 1883, the third year after the completion of another trans-

continental line by the Northern Pacific, the number of bison was reduced from an estimated 5 million to 740. The slaughter of the fur seal began at the same time and in the end left but 200,000 of the original herds of over 3 million.

In those days the market stalls of every city and town were piled high with game—and game then included not only bison, deer, elk, pigeons, grouse, turkeys, ducks, and geese, and other waterfowl, but also robins, meadowlarks, red-winged blackbirds, and other songbirds, some of which, like the bobolink, were shot by the tens and hundreds of thousands. Everything that flew or that walked on four feet was killed for the table, for its fur or feathers, or for fun.

Although the day was to come when over \$2,000 would be offered in vain for the discovery of a nest or colony, there were times in the past when passenger pigeons sold for a penny a bird or even 3 pence a dozen. One person remembers having been offered for a penny as many birds as he could carry away. When human appetites were glutted, the pigeons were fed to dogs and hogs.

With the growth of large cities, however, the profits of the trade were assured. Schooners were loaded in bulk with squabs for New York from a breeding colony in the Catskills; one record speaks of 15 tons of ice being required for packing. From 1866 to 1876, 10 million birds were shipped each nesting season from the great midwestern flocks, in addition to those consumed locally. Since these were brooding birds, fully half as many young were left to perish in the nests, while countless wounded birds were invariably left behind by the hunters to die a lingering death. The flocks sought new nesting grounds in vain; the pigeoneers hunted them everywhere.

The peak of the slaughter was reached in 1878 with the eradication of the mighty colony at Petoskey, just south of the Straits of Mackinac in Michigan. According to one account, five freight car loads of pigeons left from the town every day for 30 days.

From then on, the decline of the passenger pigeon was precipitous. It is accounted for not only by the slaughter of the adults and marketable squabs and the starvation of the smaller young but also by the total disruption of the breeding cycle of the species. Following the Petoskey massacre, the major remaining flocks appear to have sought refuge in Manitoba, where, however, their numbers diminished rapidly. The effect of late snowstorms upon their nesting may have been a factor in their disappearance there, which was complete by the 1890's.

The last large nesting was in Grand Traverse County, Mich., in 1881, and probably included a million birds. The nesting took place in a birch woods, and Chief Pokagon of the Michigan Indians described in the reminiscence he wrote how the dry bark of the trees was ignited, and the birds perished in the roaring, leaping flames. In addition to the larger number killed in this fashion, 20,000 were trapped and sent to Coney Island, where, weakened by confinement, they were released to be shot down in a trap-shooting contest.

This kind of sport was apparently too much for public opinion even in those days. Laws against molesting the birds at their nesting sites had been on the books in various States since 1862. These, however, were honored more often in the breach than in the observance.

The truth was that there were not many more left to kill. Yet still the profiteers of the pigeon trade shouted down the appeals for more forceful protective legislation made by a minority who were appalled and sickened by the fury of the slaughter.

The bison was saved on the brink of extinction through the preservation of cap-

tive herds. The passenger pigeon could likewise have been saved, for it bred readily in captivity, but only a few pairs were kept alive, and these proved insufficient to start a self-perpetuating flock. The legend of its inexhaustibility doomed it. No one upon seeing his last wild passenger pigeon dreamed that he would never see another. In every locality it was supposed that the pigeon had simply moved elsewhere.

The last scattered shipments of pigeons to the markets took place in 1893. They amounted to a few thousand birds. It was at the headwaters of the Au Sable River, in the north-central part of the Michigan Peninsula, 3 years later, that Pokagon, himself the last of the Potawatomi chiefs, found the last breeding colony—a few dozen pairs. In his account of the species, Pokagon included a sentence that may serve as its epitaph: "It was proverbial with our fathers that if the Great Spirit in His wisdom could have created a more elegant bird in plumage, form, and movement, he never did."

The distracted flocks that remained had broken up into small bands or scattered pairs well before the century's end. A few apparently survived for a number of years. The ornithologist, Edward Howe Forbush, noted several more or less authenticated records of wild carrier pigeons in the early years of the 20th century: 140-odd in Rogers, Ark., in 1902; 1 at Bar Harbor, Maine, in 1904; 1 on the Black River of Arkansas, in 1906; 1 at St. Vincent, Quebec, on September 23, 1907.

All of these, of course, were killed. Charlton Ogburn, Jr., who wrote "The Marauders," an account of World War II on the Burma front, is an ardent amateur ornithologist and author of many articles on birds. For further reading: "The Passenger Pigeon, Its Natural History and Extinction," by Arlie W. Schorger (University of Wisconsin Press, 1954).

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am very reluctant indeed to see Congress embark, first, upon the principle of paying taxes on Federal land and, second, on raiding to the extent of nearly a half million dollars a fund which is urgently needed to preserve an adequate supply of brood stock if we are to perpetuate one of the most wonderful game birds we have ever had.

SAN-MAN INN OF MANNING, INC.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1999, S. 2702.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2702) for the relief of San-Man Inn of Manning, Inc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 9914. This is a House-passed bill and is identical with S. 2702. The matter has been cleared with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 9914.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9914) for the relief of San-Man Inn of Manning, Inc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate, and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 2702 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CERTAIN LANDS ADMINISTERED BY FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2138) to provide that a greater percentage of the increase from lands administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior be returned to the counties in which such lands are situated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, so that there may be a clear understanding, in light of some questions that have been asked relating to the pending business, it is not intended that final action be taken on the pending bill today. The staffs of Senators, as well as others who may be interested, should be on notice.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. With respect to S. 2138, numerous questions have been raised by county officials in my State as to the effects of the bill. With the assurance of the distinguished acting majority leader that no action will be taken at the present time, I will defer inquiry into that question until Senators who are in charge of the bill are in the Chamber.

THOMAS G. MASARYK: FREEDOM FIGHTER; FOUNDER OF FREE CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a quarter of a century ago, one of the truly great 20th century liberal statesmen of the world, Thomas G. Masaryk, died. A spiritual product of the Czech reformation and of honest, true, faithful parents, he was a physical product of the hard work required of Czechs and Slovaks under the old Austro-Hungarian Empire. His mind was disciplined by earning his doctorate from the University of Vienna, and the man and the hour met when World War I gave him an op-

portunity to organize, lead, and achieve Czech independence.

Spurred on by Woodrow Wilson's 14 points, including the right of self-determination of peoples, Thomas G. Masaryk read the Czechoslovak Declaration of Independence in Washington, D.C., October 18, 1918, and 63 days later entered Prague and took the oath of office as President of the independent Czechoslovak Republic.

For 17 years he was President, until ill health forced his resignation. In that 17-year span, he brought Czechoslovakia from a conquered province whose people for hundreds of years had lived in serf-like thralldom, to a position as the foremost democracy of central Europe. The praise of his country was on every man's lips and her products were in the marketplaces in all the nations. Truly he had wrought a national miracle in less than two decades.

Thomas G. Masaryk's death came as the light of liberty was snuffed out in Czechoslovakia by Nazism's tanks and guns.

But his spirit is deathless. It lives now, even in the night of a new terror, and will live on until his country rallies to the magic and mystic of Masaryk in a new freedom.

When Thomas G. Masaryk died, freedom wept. When Thomas G. Masaryk died, hundreds of thousands of my fellow Texans who are of Czech extraction wept with the weeping millions around the world. When Thomas G. Masaryk died, the heart of democracy broke. It bleeds yet for him and his beloved country; for his love of liberty and Czechoslovakia's need for it.

His spirit lives on in the world. In my own State of Texas, various Slavonic organizations: benevolent, religious, cultural, musical, and athletic have been a force for freedom and for good and honest government. They have shown courage consistently. In the years following the Civil War, scores of thousands of Czechs migrated to Texas, settling on the rich blackland farming belt that runs north and south across Texas, averaging about 50 miles in width, just to the east of Dallas.

It is some of the finest farming land in a great agricultural State, and the descendants of these early Texans are leaders in the professional and business life of the State.

Yes, Masaryk's spirit lives on. Millions still live who saw him in person, and millions more read his call for freedom. His voice from history will raise resistance from field and factory.

Liberty is never securely chained; she can break any shackles, wreck any tyrant, call forth limitless allies. Thomas G. Masaryk's cry for liberty whispers through the mountains of Czechoslovakia now, on every breeze, in every wind. It pads in the new fallen snow; it runs with the current in the rivers; it grows green with the grass in the spring; it blossoms with the fruits and the flowers.

I believe I know whereof I speak. I was in Czechoslovakia with our advancing forces in the final days of World War II. I saw liberty come to Pilsen,

where the Czechs threw flowers and danced in the streets.

Surely other Thomas G. Masaryks will rise from those Czech mountainsides. With the faiths of freedom in their hearts and 500 years of resistance to tyranny in their veins, there will be a new freedom, a reborn democracy, another republic of the Czechs and the Slovaks.

The souls of Masaryks and martyrs watch Czechoslovakia. Their day of liberation will come.

Mr. President, let us have faith that it will come soon, very soon. It may seem far away, but be near at hand. When liberty awakens, tyrants flee. Let liberty awaken in that ancient land.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, great respect and admiration have been accorded, throughout the world, to one of the foremost world democrats and champion of human and national liberty and of the rights of man, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, the founder of the Czechoslovak Republic. While his name remains indelibly inscribed in the annals of history and in the hearts of free men everywhere, as well as in the hearts of the Czechoslovak people in particular—the people who are now suffering under the Communist yoke in a country which was, after the First World War, considered a model democracy, the Communist regime exerts all efforts so as to besmirch his memory and to erase it from the hearts of a people faithful to democracy.

Mr. President, today, September 14, 1962, marks the 25th anniversary of this great statesman's death. The Communist regime does not allow a dignified remembrance of the man who led his country to its liberty in 1918. It is fitting that proper words be spoken in remembrance of the 25th anniversary of the death of this Czechoslovak statesman who had been honored by the United States through the issuance of a commemorative stamp in the champion-of-liberty series.

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, from the time of his professorship at Charles University in Prague and his first participation in public life, was dedicated to the principles of humanitarian democracy, the rights and duties of the moral man in a society governed by democratic, representative institutions. He stressed the importance of the religious life and fought strenuously for man's spiritual well-being.

He advocated more education of the common people and opposed the special rights of the privileged social classes. He fought for the moral rebirth of the nation as well as for the full establishment of civil rights. He stood for humanitarianism and against autocracy. His is a name that still, after 25 long years, brings inspiration into the hearts of people seeking a better world in which to live.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMBARGO ON RUSSIAN USE OF FREE WORLD SHIPPING FOR MILITARY PURPOSES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Ralph E. Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, has made an important suggestion to cope with the continuing use by the Soviets of NATO and other free world ships to send military supplies and other equipment to Cuba. He has proposed that some of the world's shipowners forego a few extra dollars profit in the interest of the security of the free world. This would be done by a free world embargo on Soviet trade with Cuba. It would be an effective way of cutting down Soviet assistance to Cuba.

It is indeed a sad commentary on the policies of some of our NATO allies, whom we have promised to assist and defend, that no restriction whatever has been put on the chartering of Soviet ships to reinforce the Soviet military and economic position in Cuba. Shipowners of Norway, Britain, Canada, and other countries are known to have participated in this kind of deal. Some of these nations benefited substantially from Marshall plan aid; some are still benefiting. It is time that they—and by that I mean private citizens as well as governments—stand up and be counted in the present struggle against communism, which has already enslaved such a large area of Eastern Europe.

Mr. President, I think Mr. Casey's suggestion is an important one that deserves international consideration and support. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the New York Herald Tribune which describes this offer in greater detail.

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

FOR A FREE WORLD SHIPOWNERS' EMBARGO ON CUBA

(By Walter Hamshar)

A top U.S. shipping official yesterday called upon the free world's shipowners to declare a voluntary embargo on trade with Communist Cuba.

Ralph E. Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, which represents a majority of the Nation's privately owned ship companies, made the proposal in a letter to Sir Colin Anderson, chairman of the International Chamber of Shipping.

Mr. Casey also sought White House support for his suggestion. In a telegram to President Kennedy he said, "An indication of your support for this proposal would enhance greatly the possibility of voluntary yet effective embargo on the Cuban trade for the free nations of the world."

The International Chamber of Shipping, headquartered in London, is composed of 20 national shipowner groups including British, West German, Norwegian, Swedish, Japanese, and other major maritime nations of the free world. Mr. Casey's organization is a member.

Asking foreign shipowners to forego some of the profits they have been making out of chartering their ships to bring Russian supplies to Cuba, Mr. Casey noted that "ships under the American flag have ceased to trade with Cuba."

"This embargo has been considered necessary not only to our national security but to the continued existence of our democratic institutions," he said. "I cannot urge too strongly the widespread nature of these sentiments in this country."

Mr. Casey declined to identify the nationality of ships trading with Cuba, but it is known that British, Norwegian, Canadian, and other free world shipowners have been cashing in on profitable charters for carrying goods to the island.

Mr. Casey said that Sir Colin should find it hard to answer the embargo request with a no. "I will not be satisfied with a negative response," he said, adding that he had a "couple of ideas" to deal with it if it was made.

"I know that Russia does not have enough ships to carry the trade that has been flowing to Cuba," Mr. Casey commented.

In his letter he noted that Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union, had requested the International Transport Workers Federation to ask its member unions to refuse to sail ships headed for Cuba with supplies.

"This should not be necessary," he added. "It is not a labor problem; it is a matter of concern to all citizens of all free countries."

Mr. Curran's suggestion got its first rebuff yesterday. Gunvald Hauge, chairman of the Norwegian Seamen's Union, said in Oslo that his union "as a matter of course" could not join an international boycott of ships transporting Soviet goods and technicians.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT METHODS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, several weeks ago the Defense Department announced that despite a competitive procurement effort, it intended to ignore the results of the competition and award the contract for development of an inertial guidance system for the Titan III rocket to A-C Spark Plug Co. The firm developed the Titan II system, but had lost in the competition for the Titan III.

The competition for a new and more advanced guidance system for the Titan III was won by New York and California in cooperation, Space Technology Laboratories and American Bosch Arma of Garden City, Long Island. The Defense Department does not deny that the system they proposed is an excellent one, more advanced than the Titan II, more flexible, and more able to meet the varied missions for which the Titan III was designed. Yet the decision was made, for reasons which still require considerable investigation, in an effort to downgrade the program, to adopt a less good guidance system, and to ignore entirely the more advanced proposals submitted in the competitive proceedings.

On the basis of the preliminary Department of Defense announcement, what has now happened is that not only is American Bosch Arma deprived of the work which it fairly won after weeks and months of negotiation, and which would substantially advance our space technology, but A-C Spark Plug, which has been promised the work by default, as it were, is now making a deliberate effort to hire away the competent Arma

personnel who worked on the winning proposal. That is certainly adding insult to injury.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an advertisement by A-C Spark Plug, announcing that interviews will be held in Garden City, Long Island—the home of American Bosch Arma—for scientific and professional positions. It would appear that not only has A-C Spark Plug Co. pirated the work legitimately won by STL and Arma, but that now it is deliberately and flagrantly trying to pirate from Arma the qualified and competent personnel who initially made it possible for Arma to come up with a better proposal and a better price.

Mr. President, this is an example of the kind of industrial practice that is fostered by the arbitrary procurement methods of the Defense Department, and, in particular, by the complete disregard for competitive methods of procurement. One firm seems to get in on the inside track. First, it gets the contract; and then, without competition, it proceeds to pirate the personnel of other firms who have relied on fair competition and the merit of their own proposals. Mr. President, I have already called this matter to the attention of the Department of Defense; and at this time I am calling to its attention the most recent attempts to take away the personnel of American Bosch Arma, for precisely the methods of procurement which it supports are responsible for the increasing monopolization of defense work and the fact that each year a smaller and smaller number of firms get a larger and larger share of defense contracts.

I am happy to say that in this case, after all the difficulties we have had from time to time, New York and California stand shoulder to shoulder, because both of them are being beaten out of this employment, and I have no doubt that the same concern may be in California, trying to pirate workers away from firms established there.

THE YOUNGER GENERATION DEFIES COMMUNISM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, perhaps one of the most encouraging signs in our continuing cold war confrontation with communism is the basic failure of the Communists in many areas of the world to succeed in the brainwashing tactics they espouse, their failure to extinguish the spark of freedom and initiative in every human being.

Certainly one of the most obvious points to be observed since the Berlin wall was erected last summer is the continuing effort of East German youth to make their escape from communism. Even though these boys grew up under nazism, and then communism, and, in fact, have never really known what freedom is, they know enough to rebel against Ulbricht's tyranny, and they dare to face death, to get away from it. It is most regrettable that some of them—and they deserve our prayers—have met that fate.

This very valid and important point is most persuasively made in an editorial that appeared recently in the *Utica (N.Y.) Observer-Dispatch*. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial by Edward Shields, be printed in the *RECORD*, following my remarks.

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

BORN NAZIS, REARED AS REDS, THEY DIE FOR FREEDOM

(By Edward Shields)

BERLIN.—They were born in the flames of the dying Reich, and from their first day of school they were in the hands of Communist educators.

They were part of the generation to which Walter Ulbricht and the "revolutionary veterans" were to pass the Marxist-Leninist torch.

Where are they today, as they reach maturity?

Peter Fechter, 18, is buried in an East Berlin cemetery. He bled to death, crumpled against the Communist wall, while the "peoples police" who fired the machine-pistol bullets into his head and body refused to give him medical help.

Helmut Kubiet, 18, Peter's friend, is with relatives in West Berlin, still suffering from shock, but determined to leave Berlin for some point far from the wall. Helmut scrambled over it a split second before Peter was shot down.

Hans Dieter Wesa, 19, is in a newly filled grave in Eybach, in West Germany. He never saw Eybach. For a second he may have felt the free soil of West Berlin before Communist "Peoples Police" fired more than 30 bullets into his head and body as he jumped a wire border fence.

Richard Kueter, 16, is in prison in East Germany for a 10-year term and at least nine of his friends, aged 17 to 23, are also serving long terms. They were caught while stealing a truck in a desperate plan to crash it through the Berlin wall.

Joachim X. (his relatives are still in East Germany), 19, is in West Germany. He slipped away from the East German Communist youth ship *Voelkerfreundschaft* (peoples friendship) at the Red-sponsored World Youth Festival in Helsinki and hid out with a Finnish friend until the festival was over and the ship sailed without him. At least 40 others did the same.

Wilfred Thews, 15, is still in a West Berlin hospital and will probably be permanently crippled. He was hit by seven bullets, in the head, back, and shoulders, when he swam a border canal under Communist gunfire to West Berlin on May 23.

The list is far from complete. Hundreds more teenagers are known to have gone into Communist prisons and "reeducation institutions"—labor camps.

These are the last crop of war babies and their younger brothers and sisters. When they were old enough for school, or even nurseries, they entered institutions where the courses were aimed first at making them 100-percent Communists.

In their playtime they were dressed in red neckerchiefs and drilled with toy rifles "to defend our Socialist farmers and workers state."

When they entered their teens, most of them were signed up in the Free German Youth, with its blue blouses, "voluntary" farmwork, and more hours of tedious Communist lectures.

Many of them were taught to shoot with small arms, to drive motorcycles, even to parachute, in the paramilitary "sport and technique association."

They learned Russian. They went into the vocational courses for which the party decided they were fitted. They went through Communist coming-of-age ceremonies, a travesty of confirmation.

They heard continuously, year in and year out, how lucky they were to be getting a free education, free medical care, free vacations from the state, and how proud they must be to prepare to take their part in building it.

And when they were 18, or 17 or 16 they risked, and often gave, their lives to win the one thing they missed in the Communist curriculum—freedom.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF MASARYK'S DEATH

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today marks the 25th anniversary of the death of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, the first President and founder of the Republic of Czechoslovakia. Masaryk was a sincere believer in the values of representative government and the right of all peoples to self-determination. His nation was in many ways a model for other European states, and by his own example he offered to the world a lesson in honesty, integrity, and determination.

Although Czechoslovakia lies today under the yoke of Communist tyranny, and its people are not allowed to celebrate his achievements, there can be no doubt that his memory lives in the hearts of all freemen, and particularly in the hearts of those of Czechoslovak origin who are some of the very fine citizens of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I wish to take the opportunity to include in the *RECORD* at this point a brief appreciation of Thomas Masaryk, prepared by the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, which points out with perspective and perception the importance of this Czech patriot. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the *RECORD* following my remarks.

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

T. G. MASARYK, 1850-1937-1962—HE PASSED AWAY 25 YEARS AGO

The Council of Free Czechoslovakia reminds all Czechs and Slovaks at home and abroad as well as the whole cultured world that, on September 14, 1962, a quarter of a century has already elapsed since the death of the great philosopher and founder of the Czechoslovak Republic, T. G. Masaryk. Of course it was only his body and soul that left us. In our thoughts, in our daily life and in our political struggle he is with us more than ever. All democratic Czechs and Slovaks are inspired by his example and believe in the democracy he wanted, in a democracy of free and responsible people, in a humanitarian democracy of high cultural standards.

A quarter of a century after Masaryk's death we see his personality from a higher vantage point and in a deeper historical context. And from this vantage point, which only history can offer, Masaryk's personality, Masaryk's teachings, and Masaryk's work appear in a new light.

During the time of his professorship at Charles University and his public activity, his contemporaries considered Masaryk as being too modern and too radical. In his classes he discussed Western philosophical

ideas, little known at that time in Czech academic circles. He developed his own philosophy of Czech history. He advocated the emancipation of women and was opposed to their inferior position in the family and in public life. He opposed the domination of the state by one single church, and fought bitterly against the prejudices against Jews. He advocated more advanced education of the common people and opposed the special rights of the privileged social classes. He fought for the moral rebirth of the nation as well as for the full establishment of civil rights. He stood for humanitarianism and against autocracy. In the later part of his life he opposed the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and fought for its dismemberment and for the self-determination of the Austro-Hungarian nations. He favored the republican form of the new Czechoslovak state.

In the prime of his life Masaryk was so radical that even in his own nation he had a very small number of followers. But with the increased education of the masses and after the young intelligentsia entered into responsible positions and, of course, after World War I broke out, Masaryk's ideas were more and more accepted. And after the establishment of the Czechoslovak state they became part of the national culture.

But even then, despite his age, Masaryk was the strongest progressive force in the nation. More and more he put into effect the principles of his humanitarian democracy. For instance, he brought about the acceptance of compulsory establishment of municipal libraries. Likewise, he was instrumental in establishing a cooperation of German political parties in the government. His conception of a federated Europe anticipated the Common Market and the probable future political unification of Europe.

As a rule, 25 years after the death of a successful statesman or thinker, he cannot be considered as a modern radical. This does not apply to Masaryk for two reasons. First, the principles of humanitarian democracy were rejected and crushed among a large portion of mankind. This also happened within his own nation. Civil rights are rejected and replaced by terrorism and mass murder in Communist countries. Secondly, Masaryk's political principles and humanitarian ideals would have been still leading the political life of our nation if it were free. Nothing more modern can be found. The problem would be only their fuller development and realization.

And as far as the dictatorships of different kinds are concerned, history already has rejected many of them. The Fascist and Nazi regimes fell and their gruesome error has been acknowledged even by the majority of their erstwhile followers. Still in existence are only the Communist dictatorships and some personal dictatorships in Latin countries. But many of the South American dictatorships fell and the other ones as well as the Communist dictatorships will fall. The power of humanitarian and democratic ideals is irresistible even if it opposes the use of physical force.

Thus at the 25th anniversary of Masaryk's death we conceive of him more as the leader of the future development of mankind than as a historical personality. His philosophical and political legacy is more a program for the future than a mere historical reality. Even the dead Masaryk is a live spiritual force that inspires millions of people and that will influence the future political and social organization of mankind. In a way, Masaryk is more modern now than during his lifetime. Also the future liberation of Czechs and Slovaks will be carried out under his banner, which we follow proudly and with dedication.

REQUEST FOR PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY TO CALL UP RESERVISTS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the unanimous action taken yesterday on Senate Joint Resolution 224, granting the President standby authority to call up the Reserves, demonstrates this Nation's determination to respond immediately and decisively to any emergency which threatens our freedom—whether it arises 90 or 9,000 miles away.

I trust that the meaning of the Senate action will not be lost on Mr. Khrushchev or his Havana puppet whose "defensive" military buildup fools no one, least of all the countries in this hemisphere.

When a similar resolution was considered last summer in the face of the Berlin crisis, the Congress responded quickly and effectively to the President's request, enabling him to meet head on the Russian threat. As a result, West Berlin today remains free, although bordered by a "wall of shame."

The mobilization last year of nearly 150,000 members of the Ready Reserve testified to the high degree of preparedness of our citizen-soldiers. They had no easy task to perform and, in many instances, suffered severe personal hardship by returning to active service.

In too many cases, their burden was made heavier, when on their return from active duty, they have had difficulty in reclaiming their old jobs. Their performance, however, won the gratitude of their fellow countrymen and the respect of our enemies.

It is not easy for Congress to make it possible to call so soon again for services of our Ready Reserve. While no new clouds of war darken the horizon, the President feels that continuing crises compel such precautionary action. The understanding and support which this resolution received throughout the country serves to indicate the willingness to pay any price to protect our freedom.

The Senate Armed Services Committee amendments to the resolution wisely took into account the lessons of last year's callup. They will go far to avoid a repetition of them and should promote fairer distribution of the responsibility. I note with gratitude Secretary McNamara's testimony that in the event it becomes necessary to exercise this new authority, the armed services will first plan to fill their needs by encouraging reenlistments and by promoting voluntary recruitments. Only if these actions, together with increasing the draft, do not meet the needs will the authority to call up the Reserves involuntarily be used.

One amendment adopted by the committee places the burden of any future Reserve callup on those who have had only 6 months of active duty and are on drill pay status with organized units. This should go far to attain equity and fairness in meeting our manpower requirements by the assurance that only those with relatively less military service will be called.

Furthermore, the committee clearly spelled out exemptions from recall to

duty for members of the Ready Reserve, not only involuntarily ordered to active duty last year but who had their enlistment or periods of active duty extended.

Mr. President, although some of us voted for the resolution reluctantly, we voted aye because we do not wish to deny the Commander in Chief any request he considers essential "to provide for the common defense." Hence, it was that the Senate acted so decisively yesterday. The doubts about the proposal, raised in light of last year's experience with the callup, have been substantially removed by several amendments to the resolution.

The President's request for this resolution results in a violation of the principles that the Ready Reserves should be called upon only in event of a national emergency. It would be well that he consider between now and next January what the future will bring by way of continuance of present world conditions to judge the necessity for an increase in the Regular Forces rather than to resort to a repetition of this type of action.

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CONSERVATION OF FISHERIES IN THE HIGH SEAS AND ESTUARINE WATERS OF THE WORLD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution that it is the sense of the U.S. Senate that the President propose an international conference on the conservation of fisheries in the high seas and estuarine waters of the world. I submit the resolution today on behalf of myself, the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. SMITH], and the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]; but I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie on the desk, in order to provide an opportunity for additional Senators to join in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For how long a time does the Senator from Washington wish to have the resolution lie on the desk?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Until next Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, to those of us from States on the Atlantic, the gulf, or the Pacific coast, the desirability of such a world conference is, I believe, obvious.

Fisheries are an important economic and employment factor in the 22 of our 50 States which front the oceans, and to a degree in the 8 others which border the Great Lakes which we share with Canada.

Our fisheries are international, and the problems which confront our fisheries and those of other nations of the world are international.

These problems have increased enormously since World War II, with more and more nations competing for the rich resources of the seas, and with the world demand for high protein foods from the marine environment ever increasing.

One of these problems is maintaining the species which man has found most desirable as food, and also the species for which important industrial uses have been found. For several species, the peril point already has been reached; for others, it is approaching. This is occurring all over the world at a time when there is a world population explosion.

The world population, now estimated at 3 billion, has virtually doubled since the beginning of this century, and is expected by our Bureau of Census experts to double again, to 6 billion, by the year 2000.

U.S. population will top 200 million by 1970, our Bureau of the Census estimates, and will be over 300 million by the year 2000, only 38 years away.

With these population increases there will inevitably be increased demands for protein foods, from whatever source they may be obtained; and one of the principal sources is the sea and shore.

Clearly we must begin to think about the conservation of these resources. We must think about it internationally. The nations of the world must not only begin to think about conservation, but must do something about it; and that requires understanding, mutual agreements, and accommodations, which in my opinion can be arrived at only through an international conference such as the one which Senator SALTONSTALL, Senator SMITH, Senator BARTLETT, and I propose in this brief and readily understandable resolution.

Mr. President, we are also concerned about the future of our own U.S. fisheries industry, in this era of vastly augmented competition for the food resources of the seas.

Since World War II, the world catch has doubled, while that of the United States has declined.

Since World War II, the United States has slipped from second to fifth place among the leading maritime nations of the world; and today we trail Japan, Soviet Russia, Communist China, and Peru in the total catch. Each of them is making great gains in its fisheries.

As my good friend and colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH] and I have pointed out on the Senate floor, much of the increase achieved by Soviet Russia and by Japan has been in ocean areas adjacent to or not distant from our shores. More than a dozen nations are fishing off the New England coast, with the largest and most efficient fleet being that of Soviet Russia.

Russia also is very active in North Pacific waters, particularly in the Gulf of Alaska. In the North Pacific an attempt to maintain some sort of balance and conserve fisheries stocks of halibut and salmon has been made by international commissions composed of the United States, Canada, and Japan, and there has been discussion that Russia may also become a member.

I do not say that this is possible, or probable, or even at this time desirable, but I do believe that it would inure to the benefit of peoples of the world and to the governments participating if there was an international understanding of conservation needs and an international

agreement to observe uniform conservation practices on the high seas.

Mr. President, it is my hope that the resolution which Senators SMITH, SALTONSTALL, and BARTLETT join me in offering today will be reported favorably by the committee to which it is referred and adopted by the Senate before the adjournment of this Congress.

It is my hope also that when this world fisheries conference is proposed by the President and when it takes place, in whichever country or city it may be held, that my distinguished colleague, Senator SMITH of Massachusetts, will be a most active participant.

Senator SMITH has a practical knowledge of fisheries and the problems of the fishery industry that is unique in the Congress of the United States. Prior to coming to the Senate, BEN SMITH served as mayor of the principal fishing port on the Atlantic coast, and perhaps our oldest and most historic fishing port on either coast, Gloucester, Mass. Both in his public career and in his private life, he has endeavored with honor and distinction to advance the fisheries industries, not only of his native city and his State, but also of the Nation.

Senator SMITH, at the end of this session of the Congress, is voluntarily retiring from the U.S. Senate, where he has richly earned the friendship and esteem of all of us.

Mr. President, it would be a great misfortune, not only to the fisheries industry but to the people of the United States, if his voluntary departure from the Senate were to terminate his service to the industry and the Nation.

Sooner or later, an international fisheries conference such as we propose in the resolution introduced today will of necessity take place. The growing and vigorous competition for the resources of the seas will demand it. And when it does take place it is my hope that Senator SMITH be assigned a leading role in presenting the position of the United States and in participating in its decisions.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, which has legislative jurisdiction over the commercial fisheries of the United States, I personally will feel a great loss when Senator SMITH departs from our midst. His counsel and his guidance to the committee and myself have been invaluable. If there is any other person in the Congress of the United States who has had practical, direct, day-to-day knowledge of fisheries gained from experience in the industry, I do not know him.

I would like to see more such people elected to the Congress, more fisheries centers represented by people with a working knowledge of the industry, knowledge gained by practical experience.

In my home State of Washington there is such an aspirant for a seat in Congress. He has just been successful in the primaries which were held in Washington Tuesday, in which he sought the Democratic nomination for Congress from the Second District of Washington.

Many of us in the Senate know him because for 4 years he served as the fish-

eries expert on the professional staff of the Committee on Commerce, leaving that post to serve as director of the Washington State Department of Fisheries, a position from which he resigned last year.

Milo Moore, of whom I speak, is the son of a fisherman and fish merchant, and in his early years followed in his father's footsteps. For a number of years he, like Senator SMITH, was mayor of his home city. From 1945 to 1949 he served as State director of fisheries under Gov. Mon Wallgren, who previously, as many of us will recall, was a distinguished Member of this body.

From 1949 to 1951 Mr. Moore was fisheries consultant to the Government of Greece under our Government's aid program, and from early in 1952 until September 1954, he advised the Government of South Korea on its fisheries.

As a member of the professional staff of the Committee on Commerce, he specialized on fisheries legislation and gave notable assistance in connection with the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, in which Congress affected a broad reorganization of our fisheries services, and also in much other constructive legislation for the benefit of fisheries and fishermen.

Mr. Moore has served on both interstate and international fisheries commissions and is a dedicated proponent of conservation, such as that proposed in the resolution my colleagues and I submit today.

We are hopeful that he will be able to participate in the International Conference or in negotiations leading up to the International Fisheries Conference. If we do not take the initiative and do something about having conservation practices adhered to by all the nations using the high seas, very soon, in the next two or three generations, there will not be any fish for any country to take from the international waters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

The resolution (S. Res. 392) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Whereas the increasing world population and the consequent growing demand for animal protein, together with industrial and economic development in all parts of the world have resulted in remarkable expansion of world fishing effort; and

Whereas technological developments have vastly improved man's ability to harvest the living resources of the sea; and

Whereas estuarine fishery resources, to which little attention has been devoted on a worldwide basis in spite of their increasing importance as a source of human food, present unique scientific and technical problems; and

Whereas these developments raise new technical and scientific conservation problems the solution of which would best be approached on a worldwide basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should propose an international conference on the conservation of fishery resources to consider the technical,

economic, and scientific problems relating to the conservation, utilization, and regulation of living marine resources in the high seas and estuarine waters of the world, and that government, industrial, scientific, and technical participation in such conference on as wide a basis as may be practicable should be encouraged.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Washington, chairman of the Commerce Committee, in his commendation of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH]. Senator BEN SMITH is one of the most diligent, cooperative, and perceptive Members of this body. I deeply regret that he is not going to be with us. He is voluntarily retiring from service in the Senate. I hope the President of the United States will find other important assignments for him to fulfill, and the proposal which has been made by the Senator from Washington in respect to the international conference on problems of the fishing industry seems a very logical assignment.

I know of the keen and devoted interest that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH] has had in the fishing industry. He has worked side by side with the Senator from Washington and other Senators here who have attempted to preserve, and even to expand, the American fishing industry.

I merely wanted to add my word to the kindly and well-deserved remarks about the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I again stress the urgency of such an international conference, because the increase of fishing on the high seas, in many cases with a complete lack of conservation practices by certain nations which have the right to fish in international waters, will result to the detriment of every nation. I am sure those nations understand it and will agree to some reasonable means by which all of us will adhere to conservation practices in fisheries. We do it in the United States. We restrict our own people pretty well in the practice of conservation, but, unfortunately, some of the other countries do not. I think when the importance of such measures to the future of fisheries on the high seas is brought to the attention of many of the countries in which fishing is a great industry, they will come to an agreement with us.

A FORCEFUL U.S. RESPONSE TO SOVIET PROVOCATION IN CUBA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Soviet intervention in this hemisphere has had at least two salutary effects: First, it has sharpened our awareness of the dangerous vulnerability of Latin America to Soviet penetration; and, second, it has clarified our determination, by the policy statement of our President and the many utterances of Members of Congress, to resist and defeat aggression not only in other parts of the world, but specifically here in this hemisphere.

Every Member of this body will certainly welcome the timely and forthright declaration of principle by President Kennedy at his news conference yesterday. It would not be surprising if this statement by our President were to become known as the Kennedy doctrine—a modern application of the principles of the historic Monroe Doctrine to the recent developments in our hemisphere.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the President's opening remarks at his news conference of yesterday, as well as his answers regarding the circumstances under which we would act under the terms of the Monroe Doctrine and our other treaty commitments to safeguard our security and the security of our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in his statement and amplifying remarks, the President raised a number of points which bear repeating and closer study by every informed American citizen. Needless to say, they should also be studied—indeed, memorized—by any potential aggressor, by our Latin American friends, and by our NATO allies. Permit me, then, to summarize in my own words what I look upon as the heart of President Kennedy's message, or the Kennedy doctrine.

First, Castro's betrayal of his own revolution, and, indeed, of his own people and country, and the economic dislocation brought about by his Marxist-Leninist dogmas have thrown Mr. Castro and Cuba into the clutches of the Soviet bear. Cuba now, under the regime of Dr. Castro, pursues a policy of calculated hostility toward the United States.

Second, Cuba is not now a military threat to the United States, but if it ever becomes one, then no Soviet threats or Communist weapons will prevent us from nullifying this threat. We shall remove it. As the President clearly stated:

If at any time the Communist buildup in Cuba were to endanger or interfere with our security in any way, including our base at Guantanamo, our passage to the Panama Canal, our missile and space activities at Cape Canaveral, or the lives of American citizens in this country, or if Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this hemisphere, or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union, then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies.

Those were the words of the President. To my mind, they represent a clear-cut, meaningful declaration of American policy which friend and foe alike should learn, respect, and understand. I am pleased, Mr. President, that what our President had to say in his news conference yesterday is very much the same sort of philosophy and statement as it was my privilege to make in the Senate on Tuesday. I have long believed that we must remove any am-

biguity, any lack of clarity from our position on these important matters of national and hemispheric security.

Third, we propose to isolate the Castro virus in this hemisphere through close consultation with the Organization of American States—though always without prejudice to our vital security interests—and we will continue our urgent efforts to dissuade our NATO allies from allowing their ships to conduct the traffic in chains for Cuba.

Fourth, as the President himself put it:

We shall continue to work with Cuban refugee leaders who are dedicated as we are to that nation's future return to freedom. We shall continue to keep the American people and the Congress fully informed. We shall increase our surveillance of the whole Caribbean area. We shall neither initiate nor permit aggression in this hemisphere.

Every American—and especially every Member of Congress, which bears a unique responsibility for shaping public opinion—should heed the President's call for sanity in the midst of crisis. We must justify his confidence "that the American people, defending, as we do, so much of the free world, will, in this nuclear age, as they have in the past, keep both their nerve and their head." That is why I particularly urge favorable consideration of the resolution introduced yesterday by the majority leader, which expresses our determination to prevent, by all necessary means, the export of Castro subversion and revolution.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to share with my colleagues an especially perceptive editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, entitled "Soviet-Cuban Crisis." With objectivity, sound scholarship, and a thorough understanding of current policy implications, the Post editorial lays to rest—I hope for the last time—the notion that, in Mr. Khrushchev's words, the Monroe Doctrine is "dead."

To the contrary, the Monroe Doctrine is still an irreplaceable declaration of current U.S. policy toward the weak and vulnerable nations at our doorstep. To be sure, circumstances have changed since 1823, when the Monroe Doctrine was issued.

I add, it was then the czarist Russian threat to this hemisphere to which the Monroe Doctrine was directed. Today the Kennedy doctrine is directed to the Soviet Communist threat to this hemisphere. In both instances, the threat has come from Moscow. We ourselves have intervened in Europe's affairs to save the European democratic heritage. Yet our worldwide commitments have in no wise invalidated our legitimate and vital concern for our physical security. Ultimately, we must rely on ourselves for the neutralization of any foreign threat to this security—just as we did during World War II, when Nazi penetration of Latin America assumed menacing proportions. Let the world know that this is our steadfast resolve in the ominous situation that faces us at this juncture.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD.

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

SOVIET-CUBAN CRISIS

It is a curious irony of history that the Monroe Doctrine, which was enunciated in 1823 to keep Imperial Russia and her associates in the holy alliance out of America, has again been directly challenged, after 139 years, by another Russian imperialism.

This country has not directly invoked the Monroe Doctrine in an explicit warning to the Soviet Union of the sort it has hitherto sent to many European powers. The reason is not far to seek. The Monroe Doctrine, in one formulation after another, up to World War I, was made to rest on two cardinal points: that this country would regard intervention in the Western Hemisphere as an unfriendly act and that the United States did not interfere in the quarrels or affairs of Europe. The changed posture of the United States in European affairs may not have invalidated the doctrine, but it has outmoded one part of it and made it impractical to assert that the inviolability of the Western Hemisphere is a corollary of our own noninterference in the quarrels of Europe. Were this country to make this assertion now, it would be reminded of our intervention in two World Wars, our assistance to European nations, and our economic and military aid around the world.

Yet, if it would be inconsistent to invoke both premises of the Monroe Doctrine, it is equally inconsistent to argue that the whole theory of the Monroe declaration has been outdated and the practical necessity of maintaining the inviolability of the Western Hemisphere has disappeared. It can be said with truth and consistency that the safety of this country demanded that potential enemies be kept out of this hemisphere in 1823, and that the necessities of defense in 1962 demand more, not less precaution and require resistance, not only on the soil of this hemisphere but on the lands of independent nations all over the world who wish to maintain their national integrity. The Monroe Doctrine branded as an unfriendly act European conquest or interpositions that would involve "controlling in any other manner" the destiny of American nations. Without abandoning that doctrine, the United States has been, in fact, if not by proclamation, asserting that in the smaller world of 1962 the conquests of small and independent nations around the world also represent acts "unfriendly" in disposition toward this country. The support of the United States has been extended, by the fact of our aid and assistance, to independent nations everywhere, in a candid acknowledgment that it is no longer sufficient to the safety of our system of government to allow conquest to come to the shores of the Western Hemisphere before resisting it. The experience of two World Wars counsels us to erect our defenses at more remote points; but nothing that has happened in those two military encounters or the cold war that has followed World War II, suggests that this experience advises also the abandonment, at the same time, of defensive perimeters nearer home, prescribed when the Nation was not strong enough to keep its enemies farther away.

The Soviet intervention in Cuba is no less dangerous, no less objectionable, and no less unfriendly in disposition toward this country, than were the Russian colonial ambitions on the Pacific coast in 1823. The ships and arms that Khrushchev has sent to Cuba are as menacing as the fleet that Emperor Alexander gave to Spain to help her subdue her former American colonies in 1818. This country resisted Russia then; it must resist its penetration of the Western Hemisphere now.

The relations of the United States to Europe have altered, to be sure, but these changes have not eliminated this Nation's practical concern about the presence of a hostile European power in Cuba or elsewhere in the hemisphere. Daniel Webster, in a House debate in 1826, when the Monroe Doctrine was being attacked, defined its practical meaning in these terms:

"A member has said that if Spain chose to transfer the island to any other power she has a right to do so, and we here cannot interfere to prevent her, I must dissent from this opinion. The rights of nations in matters of this kind are much modified by circumstances. Because France or Great Britain could not rightfully complain of the transfer of Florida to us, it does not follow that we could not complain of the cession of Cuba to one of them. The transfer of Florida to us was not dangerous to the safety of either of these nations, nor fatal to any of their great and essential interests. Proximity of position, neighborhood, whatever augments the power of injuring and annoying, very properly belong to the consideration of all cases of this kind. What might otherwise never be thought of is justified for these reasons and on these grounds."

To state our concern and our interest in Cuba's independence, to declare our objection to its transfer to any hostile power, to insist that European powers participating in such ventures are guilty of acts unfriendly to us—these diplomatic steps are not the equivalent of instant resort to arms. It is one of the anomalies of history that although this country frequently has invoked the Monroe Doctrine it has not yet had to resort to arms to gain its acceptance by European powers. It withheld military intervention for 5 long years while the Maximilian regime rose and fell in Mexico from 1862 to 1867. War is not the only device open to an affronted power, even though it is the ultimate device.

It would salve all our frustrations, gratify all our angry impulses, soothe our ruffled pride, and lay balm to our burning sense of affront and injustice to fly into arms against an intervention so plainly filled with hostile intent. If and when it is apparent that the threat to our interests is too instant to be deferred, too dangerous to be tolerated, too imminent to be countenanced another moment, military steps may yet have to be taken. Despite all the clamor, however, for any peaceful country, they must be a last and not a first resort.

There is reason to believe that the dangers to us, whatever they are, do not multiply so swiftly that reliance cannot be put first on lesser means. While the proximity of hostile power is still a factor of modern war, it has lost some of the pertinence it had more than a century ago and, in a thermonuclear age, military peril is not as measurably increased by proximity as once it was. Apart from the direct military threat, there is the menace of the threat of Soviet Cuba expanding to the rest of the Caribbean and to other South American countries. That threat can be met by military means without attacking Cuba itself. No measures of containment should be neglected. Under the circumstances now existing in Cuba, the overthrow of any government in the Caribbean, by force or violence, and the institution of any irregular regime likely to be supported subsequently by Soviet arms is a threat to the law and order of this hemisphere. This Nation must be prepared to resist such a threat instantly, with our American allies if possible, without them if necessary. The arms buildup in Cuba itself could take on a coloration that would constitute a measurable increase in the thermonuclear capability of the Soviet Union against us. The island of Cuba must be kept under a

close surveillance to detect such a development and if there is any evidence that medium-range missile sites are being built, to bring most of the United States within the first-strike range of Russian thermonuclear power, the military response of this country must be prompt, decisive and overwhelming.

Meanwhile, without any further anxieties about thrusting Castro into Soviet arms, or any further misgivings about support in the Western Hemisphere, every diplomatic device that will make more difficult the path of Soviet Cuba must be pursued without flagging. With the fullest respect for our every international obligation, we have every right to seek by all legitimate means, the frustration of Soviet-Cuban ambitions and hopes.

This country, moreover, is under no legal or moral compulsion to obstruct or deny the efforts of anti-Communist movements of Cuban citizens elsewhere in the Caribbean, in the exercise of their natural rights, to overthrow the foreign tyranny that has been imposed upon them by stealth and fraud and force and violence. Such freedom movements, throughout the history of this country, have attracted open sympathy and the financial support of American citizens, and no government ever has or ever will have the power to prevent such manifestations of American respect for the courage and daring of those willing to fight for the freedom of their own land when it is under the occupation of a foreign foe.

This must be our posture for the present. Rash and impulsive military adventures, much as they may be clamored for, are to be resisted as long as direct military safety permits and so far as the integrity of the other American countries allows. The brave Cuban people who have thrown off both foreign and domestic tyrants before, may yet deal with this crisis in an effective way, for all their immediate helplessness. Soviet bluster must not frighten us from the interposition of instant military force against the spread of this danger elsewhere in the hemisphere or against any gathering of offensive weapons on Cuba, and it should not deter us from making adequate preparation for the day when American aid can help Cubans restore their country's independence and revive its prosperity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am convinced, that firm leadership on the part of our country, with our neighbors in Latin America and in the councils of the Organization of American States—combined with our determination to protect the freedom and security of this hemisphere, and our determination to work cooperatively with our friends in Latin America—will gain for us the cooperation and assistance that we need in this endeavor.

I am also of the mind, Mr. President, that we must do what needs to be done. We ought not to be overly concerned about the complaints of some people or of some nations. We are not engaged in a popularity contest. We have responsibilities for freedom at home in this country and in many other areas of the world. We are engaged in a monumental and momentous struggle with the international Communist movement. The only way I know in which we can win that struggle is to bring with us as many friends as we possibly can who are dedicated to common objectives and common purposes.

Above all, friends and allies need leadership. The leadership given by President Kennedy and so clearly and unmistakably restated in his press conference

of yesterday and in his statement to the American people and the world, will bear good fruit. That leadership will bring the response the President has hoped for—the response of stalwart men and of strong nations which seek to preserve freedom in this hemisphere and in other parts of the world.

Following is the transcript of President Kennedy's news conference yesterday:

EXHIBIT 1

I have a preliminary statement.

There has been a great deal of talk on the situation in Cuba in recent days both in the Communist camp and in our own, and I would like to take this opportunity to set the matter in perspective.

In the first place, it is Mr. Castro and his supporters who are in trouble. In the last year, his regime has been increasingly isolated from this hemisphere. His name no longer inspires the same fear or following in other Latin American countries. He has been condemned by the OAS, excluded from the Inter-American Defense Board, and kept out of the (Latin American) Free Trade Association. By his own monumental economic mismanagement, supplemented by our refusal to trade with him, his economy has crumbled, and his pledges for economic progress have been discarded, along with his pledges for political freedom. His industries are stagnating, his harvests are declining, his own followers are beginning to see that their revolution has been betrayed.

So it is not surprising that in a frantic effort to bolster his regime he should try to arouse the Cuban people by charges of an imminent American invasion, and commit himself still further to a Soviet take-over in the hope of preventing his own collapse.

Ever since communism moved into Cuba in 1958, Soviet technical and military personnel have moved steadily onto the island in increasing numbers at the invitation of the Cuban Government.

Now that movement has been increased, it is under our most careful surveillance. But I will repeat the conclusion that I reported last week, that these new shipments do not constitute a serious threat to any other part of this hemisphere.

If the United States ever should find it necessary to take military action against communism in Cuba, all of Castro's Communist-supplied weapons and technicians would not change the result or significantly extend the time required to achieve that result.

However, unilateral military intervention on the part of the United States cannot currently be either required or justified, and it is regrettable that loose talk about such action in this country might serve to give a thin color of legitimacy to the Communist pretense that such a threat exists. But let me make this clear once again:

If at any time the Communist buildup in Cuba were to endanger or interfere with our security in any way, including our base at Guantanamo, our passage to the Panama Canal, our missile and space activities at Cape Canaveral, or the lives of American citizens in this country, or if Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force against any nation in this hemisphere, or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union, then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies.

We shall be alert, too, and fully capable of dealing swiftly with any such development. As President and Commander in Chief I have full authority now to take such action, and I have asked the Congress to authorize me to call up Reserve Forces

should this or any other crisis make it necessary.

In the meantime, we intend to do everything within our power to prevent such a threat from coming into existence. Our friends in Latin America must realize the consequences such developments hold out for their own peace and freedom, and we shall be making further proposals to them. Our friends in NATO must realize the implications of their ships engaging in the Cuban trade.

We shall continue to work with Cuban refugee leaders who are dedicated as we are to that nation's future return to freedom. We shall continue to keep the American people and the Congress fully informed. We shall increase our surveillance of the whole Caribbean area. We shall neither initiate nor permit aggression in this hemisphere.

With this in mind, while I recognize that rash talk is cheap, particularly on the part of those who do not have the responsibility, I would hope that the future record will show that the only people talking about a war or an invasion at this time are the Communist spokesmen in Moscow and Havana, and that the American people defending as we do so much of the free world, will in this nuclear age, as they have in the past, keep both their nerve and their head.

OFFENSIVE ACTION

Question. Mr. President, coupling this statement with the one of last week, at what point do you determine that the buildup in Cuba has lost its defensive character and become offensive? Would it take an overt act?

Answer. I think if you read last week's statement and the statement today, I made it quite clear, particularly in last week's statement when we talked about the presence of offensive military missile capacity or development of military base and other indications which I gave last week, all those would, of course, indicate a change in the nature of the threat.

MONROE DOCTRINE

Question. Well, Mr. President, in this same line, have you set for yourself any rule or set of conditions at which you will determine that the existence of an offensive rather than a defensive force in Cuba, and in that same connection in your reading of the Monroe Doctrine, how do you define intervention? Will it require force to contravene the Monroe Doctrine or does the presence of a foreign power in any force, but not using that force in this hemisphere, amount to contravention of the doctrine?

Answer. Well, I have indicated that if Cuba should possess a capacity to carry out offensive action against the United States, that the United States would act. I have also indicated that the United States would not permit Cuba to export its power by force in the hemisphere. The United States will make appropriate military judgments after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others, after carefully analyzing whatever new information comes in, as to whether that point has been reached where an offensive threat does exist. And at that time the country and the Congress will be so notified.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement. I am hopeful that every Senator will read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD over the weekend.

On behalf of the Senate leadership, I wish to give notice to the Senate as to the possibility of action, either Monday or soon thereafter, on the bills to which I shall now refer. I am hopeful that

our colleagues will be present to attend to consideration of these bills.

Calendar No. 1741, H.R. 8181, the National Fisheries Center bill.

Calendar No. 1775, S. 3313, to increase the borrowing authority for the District of Columbia.

Calendar No. 1881, S. 2138, relating to payments to counties for wildlife refuges, which is the pending business.

Calendar No. 1947, House Joint Resolution 489, to provide protection for the golden eagle.

Calendar No. 1957, H.R. 575, relating to the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon.

Calendar No. 1963, H.R. 11164, the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District bill.

Calendar No. 1977, H.R. 11665, relating to the National School Lunch Act.

Calendar No. 1869, H.R. 10541, the mass inoculation bill.

Calendar No. 2015, H.R. 12628, the act to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949, in order to provide low and moderate cost housing, both urban and rural, for the elderly. This is very important proposed legislation. All Senators interested in it should be on notice it will be called up for action very shortly.

I also call the attention of Senators to the fact that it is our intention very shortly to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1958, H.R. 12135, the Highway Act.

Senators interested in particular proposed legislation are on notice that all these bills have been cleared by the policy committee, and they will be acted upon, and promptly.

In addition, other bills will be brought before the Senate, to which objections have been registered.

The calendar of the bills which rests on the desk of the majority leader contains a list of all bills cleared by the respective committees and placed on the calendar, with the names of Senators who have asked that certain bills be held up, and a list of bills to which objection has been made by individual Senators.

I speak for myself in this instance, Mr. President. The time has arrived, if we are ever to conclude the business in the Senate, for Senators who have objections to bills to be present to object to them in debate, and not merely rely on objections by written word in the calendar. Otherwise we shall not be able to complete the business of the Senate.

While it is fairly well understood that Congress may well be in session until the first week in October, it may be here longer, unless bills can be acted upon promptly. Therefore, as the assistant majority leader, and one who has some responsibility, I am asking Senators to be on notice that the bills to which I have referred will be called up for debate and decision.

A number of other bills will also be called up during the coming week. I would like Senators who are interested to be on notice that, starting with Calendar No. 2007 through Calendar No. 2014, certain bills reported from the Committee on Finance will be called up. Some Senators have indicated their desire to

have those bills held up. Those bills have been held up. They are going to be acted upon. On behalf of the leadership of the Senate, I give notice now that those bills will be called up for action within the next few days.

The end of the session is approaching. Senators having objections to or interest in measures on the calendar should be prepared to be present in the Senate—on the Senate floor—to contest or support those measures.

I recognize that committee duties are pressing and important, but so is floor action on bills that have been cleared by committees, reported to the Senate, and placed on the calendar for action.

In order to accommodate a number of Senators who are unable to be present today, the leadership has canceled its plans to bring up various measures on the calendar. However, I express the hope that those Senators will be equally accommodating to the leadership in the days to come. Senators should be prepared for consideration of any measure reported and on the calendar.

I repeat that statement. Senators should be prepared for consideration of any measure that is reported and on the calendar, and particularly bills that have been cleared by the policy committee.

An announcement will be made to the members of the policy committee as to our next meeting, so that we can proceed for further clearance of bills in the policy committee.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, September 17, 1962, at 10 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 14, 1962:

U.S. ASSAY OFFICE

Paul J. Maguire, of New York, to be assayer of the U.S. assay office at New York, N.Y.

U.S. NAVY

Vice Adm. Harold T. Deutermann, U.S. Navy, to be U.S. representative of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations as a senior member, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 711.

The following-named officers for appointment to the grade indicated while serving, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5231, having been designated for commands and duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section:

To be vice admirals

Rear Adm. Paul D. Stroop, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. Horacio Rivero, Jr., U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officers for appointment to the grade indicated on the retired list, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

To be vice admirals

Vice Adm. Charles Wellborn, Jr., U.S. Navy.
Vice Adm. Robert B. Pirie, U.S. Navy.
Vice Adm. Clarence E. Ekstrom, U.S. Navy.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Irma L. Jaakola to be major, Army Medical Specialist Corps, and ending Larry R. Tinberg to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 27, 1962.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Larry R. Coll to be ensign in the Navy, and ending Thomas L. Cusick to be first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 5, 1962.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues, and with freemen everywhere, in paying tribute to the memory of a great man and a true champion of liberty who passed away 25 years ago today.

I am referring, of course, to Thomas G. Masaryk, philosopher and statesman, who contributed probably more than any other single individual to the founding of the modern Czechoslovak Republic.

His name, his writings, and his concrete achievements in establishing working democratic institutions in prewar Czechoslovakia should be known to all freemen. He stood as a giant among men. It was most fitting, therefore, that the U.S. Government, in recognition of his achievements, has honored his memory by issuing a commemorative stamp in the Champion of Liberty series. It is equally fitting that we here today pay tribute to his works.

It is with profound sadness that we must reflect on this occasion upon the current tragic plight of the Czechoslovak people. Of all the once-free nations behind the Iron Curtain, Czechoslovakia is probably the one which has been least affected by the passing away of the Stalinist era. Stalinist methods of overt repression are still being inflicted upon her

people by the Soviet-supported Communist regime of Dictator Novotny. Her people live in dire bondage, denied their inalienable rights and freedoms, cut off from all effective contacts with the West. Their plight is indeed tragic.

On this occasion of the 25th anniversary of Masaryk's death, we should, and we must, reaffirm our determination to continue to support the legitimate aspirations for self-determination of the Czechoslovak people. We shall not rest until freedom and liberty are once again restored to them.

In Memory of Thomas Masaryk— 1850-1937

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago on September 14 Czechoslovak people lost their founding father and the first President of their Republic, Thomas Masaryk.

Even at the time, his grievous death was seen as a great loss to the Czech people, but today we are all much more aware that in the death of this elder statesman, great teacher, eminent philosopher, illustrious man of letters and wise leader, freedom and democracy lost one of the staunchest champions in central Europe.

Thomas Masaryk was the greatest Czechoslovak of modern times. As the unrivaled and beloved leader of his people during the last quarter of the last century and the first third of this, he did more for his country and his people than any one man, or group of men. This gifted, born teacher was destined to be the liberator of his people, and the real architect of the Czechoslovak Republic. He was elected to the Presidency of the Republic in 1918, which position he then held through four successive elections. In 1935, at the age of 85, he resigned, and died 2 years later. Today we pay our respects to the memory of this great and good man, Thomas Masaryk of Czechoslovakia, whose long, arduous, and fruitful life was an inspiration to all.

Farmer-Elected ASC Committeemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 14, 1962

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, keeping farmers and the public informed is a major responsibility of USDA's county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees known throughout rural America as the ASC committeemen.

Because of the millions of farmers and the billions of dollars involved, I think a little explanation of the work of key people involved is in order here today as we