

NDIX

April 25

It is carried in the current issue—May—of the Digest.

This article tells an inspiring story of the dedication of a handful of Americans who so deeply believe in their country and its freedoms that they have devoted more than a decade of their private time to work for an idea which may well spell the difference in the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism.

Mr. Speaker, keeping in mind the fact that hearings on this important bill are to soon start, I earnestly commend the attention of my colleagues to this article and to the Freedom Academy.

I think after you have read this article your interest will be such that you will want to learn more about this important proposal which may well be presented to the House later this year after it receives the careful and earnest attention of the Members of the other body. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to have this article placed in the Record at this point.

The article follows:

[From the Reader's Digest, May 1963]

LET'S DEMAND THIS NEW WEAPON FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Eugene H. Methvin)

(For 13 years a group of private citizens and legislators has battled to establish a Freedom Academy for training leaders in cold-war techniques. You will be inspired by their dedicated efforts, dismayed by the frustrations that still, incredibly, beset them.)

Late one afternoon in March 1954, a lean young man named Alan Grant walked into the post office in Orlando, Fla., and stood fingering a hefty brown envelope. He looked at the address label with the boldly typewritten words "The White House, Washington, D.C.," and wondered whether anyone would read what was inside. Then, with a shrug, he dropped it into the box.

When the packet from Orlando was sorted out from the mounds of White House mail and routed to Brig. Gen. Robert T. Cutler, Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, he looked skeptically at the accompanying letter. Its letterhead said unpretentiously: "The Orlando Committee." Yet as he read the enclosed 51-page study, he began to get excited. Few ideas as fresh and stimulating as this Orlando plan had ever come across Cutler's desk in Washington.

With clarity and force it analyzed Moscow's political warfare machine and showed how communism was assaulting freedom with an arsenal of weapons perfected in 60 years of revolutionary experience. Then in detail it proposed a new counterweapon for democracy: a national academy where top experts could instruct free world representatives, from labor leaders to diplomats, in Communist strategy and techniques. The goal: to teach men and women how to defeat communism's destructive tactics and how to build strong free societies. This "Freedom Academy," the proposal made clear, was to be privately financed, but obviously it needed official backing by Washington.

For 13 months Cutler had fought a losing battle to overhaul our creaky cold war machinery and install more effective policies to stop Moscow's many-sided offensive. Now he was astounded to find grassroots Americans laying a finger on the heart of complex problems.

He fired back a letter whose White House is no doubt that you have identified and clearly analyzed a most important aspect of

Let's Demand This New Weapon for *Bill file* Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, at the first of next week, beginning on Monday, April 29, according to a notice I have read, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will hold hearings on a bill jointly sponsored by 13 Senators.

This measure is the Freedom Academy bill, S. 414, to establish a comprehensive cold war training institution.

Discussion of the Freedom Academy proposal is not new to this body. On a previous occasion, in August of 1959, this bill was adopted by the Senate.

However, this was as far as this bill advanced. No action was achieved in the House, and the bill died.

Since that time, this measure has been proposed to the Congress but has not had the benefit of further hearings, that is, not until the forthcoming hearings get underway next week.

And it is with these hearings in mind that I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent report detailing how this Freedom Academy idea came to be developed; how it grew from the concern of a former paratroop commander of World War II; and how it came to the attention of a handful of Senators and Congressmen.

This report is in the form of an article by Mr. Eugene H. Methvin, a member of the Reader's Digest Washington staff.

**Address by Hon. Thomas J. Dodd at
Opening of Theater on the Campus of
the University of Connecticut**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on April 17, I had the pleasure of participating in ceremonies attending the opening of a splendid new theater on the campus of the University of Connecticut, the New College Theater. This marked the first new theater opening in Connecticut in more than 10 years and it provides an outstanding entertainment facility for the people of the university and the surrounding area.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks which I made on that occasion.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD AT THE
OPENING CEREMONIES OF THE NEW COLLEGE
THEATER UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT,
STORRS, CONN., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 1963

I wish to thank the sponsors of these opening ceremonies at Stanley Warner's New College Theater, here on the beautiful campus of the University of Connecticut, for inviting me to take part.

I understand that this is the first new theater to be opened in Connecticut in more than 10 years. So we have here something of a gamble; a demonstration of the new spirit of resurging confidence in an industry which has had its growing pains in recent years.

Up to tonight, this fine edifice has been just a building, a splendid building to be sure, but still mere stone, steel and mortar. Henceforth, however, it will somehow take on a new dimension and become interwoven into the lives and minds and imaginations of its patrons in a way that is difficult to describe or assess.

I try to think of what the local moving picture theater meant to me when I was a boy growing up not far from here in Norwich, and what the theater has meant to me in other places.

I think first of the hours of vicarious adventure, of the fascinating look at distant worlds, of the glimpse of the infinite variety of man's experience which so excited the imagination and stretched the horizons of the mind.

I think of the violent emotions so readily conjured up by the artistry of the screen; joy, sadness, indignation, inspiration, contempt, adulation.

Ofttimes, of course, the objects of these emotions were unworthy; the distance worlds

recapture for a brief hour some of our childhood, with all its fears and all its limitless horizons; and to feel with a new immediacy and compassion the chords which link us to other men and to other times.

The motion picture is at once a distinct and sophisticated art form, and, as well, the popular art of the American people. As we view the development of this art, we learn something about a free society, something of alarm and something of hope.

In movies, as in all other aspects of a free society, we see the conflict between artificiality and artistry; between the shoddy and the substantial; between the tinsel and the true; between the shallow and the sublime.

For art, like politics, like economics, is another testing ground upon which the free way of life must prove itself.

We believe in the free system. We believe that men and women possess that divine spark which the fuel of free inquiry and free interchange of thought will ignite and cause to burn ever brighter.

We believe in the competition of ideas rather than in the censorship of ideas, and we are willing to accept much that is cheap and shoddy because we hold that over the decades a free people, seeing the contrast between the bad and the good, will not only in large measure reject the bad, to which the would be censor rightly objects, but will also go far beyond that and will come to insist upon a level of art and of truth higher than that which the mere censor could perceive or attain to.

This is the heart of our national creed and tonight, in a small way, we pay tribute to that creed by celebrating the opening of a new forum of free expression, as well as a center of entertainment for the people in this area.

And so I see this opening of the College Theater at the University of Connecticut as a notable occasion.

I am grateful for the opportunity to be here and I wish each of you the first of many, many, memorable evenings within its

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2491

the Soviet threat," Cutler said. Would the Orlando Committee send a representative to Washington to explain the Freedom Academy plan to a selected group of Government officials?

Would they.

For more than 3 years they had worked constantly—studying, researching and formulating the Freedom Academy concept. Now at last they, ordinary smalltown Americans concerned about their country's future, were to have a hearing in the Nation's highest councils.

The Orlando plan had a modest beginning back in September 1950. Alan Grant, then a 28-year-old attorney just months out of Harvard Law School paid a visit to Orlando's high school principal, Joseph Boone, and asked him if his school was giving its students any courses about communism and its techniques. "I'm afraid we aren't teaching a thing on communism," Boone replied. "Why do you ask?"

Grant explained that before he became a World War II paratroop commander, he had organized and taught a course in guerrilla warfare at Harvard based on writings of Mao Tse-tung, then an obscure Communist guerrilla. This experience had taught Grant to respect the tactics and leadership if not the principles the Communists were applying around the world. As he watched their progress after World War II in Czechoslovakia, China and elsewhere, he grew more worried. Now, in 1950, every day's headlines carried news of U.S. soldiers dying in Korea to keep Red armies from pushing them into the sea.

"It looks as if we're in for a long-term struggle with communism," Grant said. "Don't you think we ought to be teaching our young citizens what they're up against?"

Boone agreed. So Grant persuaded the school board to sponsor a series of "Know Your Enemy" lectures. Next he hand-picked 17 young lawyers, businessmen and educators as speakers. But before any public announcement was made, he resolved, they must all know absolutely what they were talking about.

For 6 months he and his recruits met nightly in Grant's cluttered law office. Dividing themselves into five research teams, they pored over case histories of Communist coups, analyzed Red riots, strikes, and guerrilla movements. Each man had to read 15 to 50 carefully selected books on Communist strategy, history, party organization, recruiting, and training methods. Finally, in February 1951, Grant felt ready to unveil the program to Orlando's high school students. What they received was one of the most comprehensive presentations on communism to be found anywhere in the country.

At one point in the lectures the speaker assigned to cover Lenin's life was called out of town. Grant lined up a University of Florida political science professor to pinch-hit. To everyone's dismay, after only a few words about Lenin, the professor launched into a flagwaving speech full of emotion but empty of information. When he finished, he apologized to Alan. "I sat down last night to write my speech and after three sentences realized I'd run out of gas. I hate to admit I know so little about the most influential political leader of the 20th century."

Grant was appalled. Like most Americans, he had always assumed the universities were centers of expertise about such vital matters as the history and techniques of communism. But on investigation he was shocked to find the Nation's entire educational system being run as if the Communist challenge did not exist. He could find only two colleges in the United States that offered even one course on Communist subversion methods.

Slowly an idea began to crystallize in Grant's mind. Why not a school to train our people in unconventional warfare and non-

military conflict, just as we train military men in the arts of conventional war at the service academies and advanced war colleges? On October 3, 1952, Grant made a speech to the junior chamber of commerce in Sanford, Fla., proposing such a school—a Freedom Academy.

"Military weapons are not enough," Grant said. "Man is the ultimate weapon—and nobody understood it better than Lenin. When he and his followers captured Russia, they immediately established a training system that today numbers 6,000 special schools in the tactics of espionage, subversion, infiltration, agitation, and propaganda. Today graduates of these schools staff 75 Communist Parties throughout the non-Communist world.

"But where," he asked, "can a young African, Asian, or Latin American learn how to organize a democratic political party or labor union, draw up and execute effective social reforms and fight back against the disruptive tactics of the trained Communist professionals? Worse yet, there is nowhere our own officials and students can go for a thorough course in the tactics of communism, let alone the sophisticated techniques for defeating it."

Grant's idea struck his listeners as so urgent that his friends pressed him to develop it, and volunteered to help. He assembled a four-man team; for 18 months they labored putting together the 51-page study that so impressed General Cutler.

When Grant arrived in Washington on July 22, he went to the headquarters of the Operations Coordinating Board across from the White House. In the second floor conference room, seated around a long table, the 25 top officials Cutler had called together from the Pentagon, State Department and other cold war agencies greeted Grant stiffly and extolled his "patriotism" and "interest" in coming to Washington to "help." Grant sensed a patronizing attitude.

Undaunted, he gave them the details about the proposed Freedom Academy. The Orlando Committee's thorough study, Grant explained, convinced them the program must encompass two levels. One would give career officials in Government 2 full years of training in cold war strategy through advanced study of democratic methods and Communist tactics. The other would brace up democratic anti-Communist defenses outside of Government, by offering basic short courses to labor leaders, journalists, agricultural technicians, civic and school leaders, from the United States and abroad.

When Grant finished, he felt hostility in the questions that followed. "Won't foreign governments resent the idea of their citizens being trained in a school run by the United States?" one official objected.

"Dozens of nations have been sending their own citizens into Annapolis and West Point for years," Grant replied. "We also have 7,500 foreign students from 70 countries in our numerous nonmilitary schools right now, and they'd send more if we'd let them."

"But Soviet propaganda is bound to brand this as an 'imperialistic plot' for training spies," said another.

"They tried to do the same thing to the Marshall plan and it didn't stop us," said Alan. "I don't think the time has come when we must give Communist propagandist a veto power over the U.S. Government, do you?"

For 4 hours the questioning continued. After the meeting one intelligence official, Dr. Stefan T. Possony, an internationally known authority on psychological warfare, introduced himself. "Mr. Grant, the Government will turn down your proposal, brilliant as it is. Have you ever heard of that obscure bureaucratic disease, NMH?"

Grant admitted he had not.

"It's shorthand for 'not made here.' To ask an agency to adopt a new idea it didn't

think up is to ask it to confess its own shortcomings."

Weeks dragged by until August 20, 1954. Another letter bearing the White House seal arrived in the morning mail. Grant tore open the envelope. His eyes widened in disbelief. "You are aware, I am sure, that ideas of this nature sometimes generate a wide divergence of opinion within Government circles," said Operations, Coordinating Board Executive Officer Elmer Staats. "The variance of opinion with respect to your plan prohibits any concerted effort" by the Government.

But as Grant and his group reeled from this brushoff, an astounding thing happened. A delegation of Pentagon and National Security Council officials, indignant over the rejection of the plan, flew to Orlando. Grant's team learned that the rejection letter had actually been written by senior State Department officers who had blocked a favorable recommendation by persuading Staats to reject the plan.

"Don't quit now," the Orlandoans were told. Heartened, the Orlando Committee launched an alternate attack. They wrote 160 organizations and prominent people, representing many viewpoints, who had shown responsible interest in cold-war problems, appealing for help. The response was overwhelming, particularly from the academic world, and in the spring of 1955 it looked as if the Freedom Academy might open for the fall term.

Then came a shattering blow. President Eisenhower announced he would meet with Stalin's successors, and the euphoric "Spirit of Geneva" enveloped the Nation. The word went out from Washington: Stop all activity that might irritate the Communists. Suddenly prospective financial support for the Freedom Academy disappeared.

In 1958 the Red-managed stoning of Vice President Nixon in South America jolted the Nation. New members joined the Orlando Committee, and Grant tried again, this time through Congress. In 1959 Representative A. SYDNEY HERLONG, Democrat of Florida, introduced legislation to establish a Freedom Academy. Representative Walter Judd, Republican of Minnesota, enthusiastically cosponsored the bill. On the Senate side KARL MUNDT and PAUL DOUGLAS enlisted a dozen cosponsors for a comparable bill.

All Orlando pitched in to launch a national drive. Letters from the Orlando Committee for a Freedom Academy went to every one of the Nation's 1,745 daily newspapers. Members of the Orlando Business and Professional Women's Club wrote and phoned other clubs across the Nation, and brought their national officers to Orlando for briefings. Result: the national federation, representing approximately 175,000 members in all States, endorsed the bill. The Orlando Jaycees won national endorsement of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce convention representing 50 States and 215,000 members. The national AFL-CIO added its backing. Support for a Freedom Academy swelled across the Nation.

One Friday early in June 1959 the news hit Orlando that the Senate Judiciary Committee would hold hearings on the Freedom Academy bill with several other anti-Communist measures. By the following Monday morning Grant and his team had such an imposing array of witnesses waiting to testify that the Senators set aside 3 days for hearings on the Academy alone.

The Senate overwhelmingly passed the bill on August 31, 1960. Then, tragically, late in the session it bogged down in the House. This meant starting all over again with a new Congress in 1961.

Meantime, behind the scenes, State Department officials were trying to sell the idea that our cold war training was adequate. They answered citizens' letters urging an Academy by claiming existing Fed-

eral and private institutions were doing the job. But when pressed for evidence, State admitted that one official who signed such letters "doesn't know anything about the bill."

With the new administration installed in Washington, the Orlando group redoubled its efforts. Circumstances favored them, for the New Frontier was soon facing dismaying cold war realities. When Attorney General Robert Kennedy returned from a trip around the world he reported, "In every country well-organized and highly disciplined (Communist) cadres concentrate their activities in universities, student bodies, labor organizations and intellectual groups. Against this, as I saw repeatedly, there is no one to question their positions, their facts. There is no organization. There is no cadre. There is no disciplined and calculated effort to present the other side. And so it is that a small, able, and well-trained unit can take over a meeting or an organization or even a government."

Gradually, the vital need for the Orlando plan gained wider recognition. A Gallup poll showed that the American people supported the Freedom Academy bill 4 to 1. In Latin America 17 liberal political parties from 14 countries joined under leadership of former Costa Rican President José Figueres and started an Institute of Political Education at San José, Costa Rica. In May 1962 the Asian People's Anti-Communist League, representing 21 nations, appealed to Congress to pass the Freedom Academy bill even as the League went ahead without U.S. help to found its own "Freedom Center" in Seoul, Korea.

Finally President Kennedy appointed his own White House Committee, headed by Dr. J. A. Perkins, now president of Cornell University, to look at the situation. Last December the White House reported its findings: "Existing public programs of training, education, and research in U.S. foreign affairs fall dangerously below" what the country should be doing and must be renovated by creation of a "National Academy of Foreign Affairs" independent of any department, paralleling the Orlando plan in significant detail.

President Kennedy immediately accepted the recommendation and promised to "move forward with this basic idea as soon as possible." Then the drafting of legislation was turned over—to the State Department. Not surprisingly, the draft finally sent to Congress was a lame substitute for the Orlando plan. It proposed to train primarily Government career men in the same old conventional diplomatic techniques.

Advocates of the Freedom Academy idea are frankly dismayed by the State Department substitute. The proposed Academy of Foreign Affairs, they argue, makes no solid provision for developing the whole new range of policy tools, governmental and nongovernmental, nor for training non-American specialists for the common struggle, as originally envisioned. The State Department plan, they believe, might well kill the chance of establishing a genuine graduate level "West Point" of political and psychological warfare. Some critics, indeed, charge that official opposition to the Freedom Academy reflects policies geared to stalemating the cold war rather than winning it.

Despite covert State Department efforts to dissuade them, the original sponsors, eight Republican and five Democratic Senators,¹ have therefore introduced their own

Freedom Academy bill again. "With White House backing, some plan for a cold war research and training program may be enacted at long last," says Senator Dodd. "At stake is whether Congress will shape the legislation so that the new institution will actually pioneer new democratic methods for defeating communism and strengthening freedom, or whether it will be watered down into a propaganda center for more foreign aid and conventional methods."

Today, thanks to the sacrifice, bold thinking, and unremitting efforts of Grant and his Orlando colleagues, the Nation is vastly more alert to the education gap in the free world's cold war defenses. Their dedication is heartening reinforcement to the sagging principle that individual citizens can and must participate in the vital process of government, even in the face of overwhelming odds and a massive and lethargic bureaucracy. Their performance presents a clear challenge to Congress and the American people to see that the Freedom Academy opens its doors, and soon.

Indonesian Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 25, 1963

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on March 19 of this year I had printed in the RECORD a review of Mr. Arnold C. Brackman's book "Indonesian Communism: A History." Public response to Mr. Brackman's analysis of the history of the Indonesian Communist Party has been so favorable, that I would like to draw the Senate's attention to another review of this work. This review appeared in the March 28, 1963, issue of Reporter magazine and was written by Denis Warner, an expert observer of Indonesian affairs.

There is one portion of Mr. Warner's review that is especially well worded:

The worst thing we can do now is to shore up Sukarno's regime. We have blundered enough, and we shall compound our blunders if we help Sukarno recover from his self-inflicted economic wounds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the review containing this timely warning be printed in the RECORD.

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

A LAND BEYOND HELP?

(By Denis Warner)

"Those poor Russians," said Sutan Sjahrir when the first significant deliveries of Soviet military equipment arrived in Indonesia 20 months ago. "They could spend 10 percent of their gross national product here for the next 10 years and still not be sure of the result."

Sjahrir, a right-wing Socialist with a profound appreciation of democracy and personal liberty, emerged during the struggle for independence between 1945 and 1949 as Indonesia's ablest and most responsible political leader. A measure of Indonesia's current irresponsibility is that Sjahrir and others like him are now involuntary guests in Sukarno's political prisons. "They have no place in our society," says Dr. Subandrio, now Foreign Minister and Sukarno's choice as his heir. With this remark Sjahrir would agree. Su-

karno's "guided democracy" is the negation of everything Sjahrir believes in. Built on a framework of meaningless slogans, it has served primarily as a platform for Sukarno's own demagoguery. His regime, Mr. Brackman finds, has been corrupt, demoralized, and inept. Such goals as the acquisition of West New Guinea's worthless real estate have been achieved only "at the cost of wrecking the economy, snuffing out representative government, trampling on civil liberties, mortgaging Indonesia's future to Soviet arms shipments, and providing the Communist Party with a rare opportunity to develop a base of mass power in Indonesia."

In a decade the Indonesian Communist Party has increased its membership from fewer than 8,000 to 2 million. What are its chances of coming to power and turning Indonesia into the Cuba of southwest Asia? As the Indonesian Communists see it, the chances are very good. In Mr. Brackman's words, they were lifted to ecstatic heights by Cuba. Time, they are now sure, is on their side, and the process that has led to the party's spectacular growth will also lead to power. As the biggest and best organized political party in Indonesia, with every island of consequence honeycombed with cells and with front organizations controlling another 10 million, including 4 million peasants, their chances might indeed seem very good. But Mr. Brackman is a qualified optimist of the Sjahrir school. In the chaos and the crumbling of guided democracy that will follow Sukarno's death, either naturally or by assassination, he believes the army, not the Communists, will move into the void and probably turn either to the Sultan of Jogjakarta or to former Vice President Mohammad Hatta, in either case with Sjahrir quietly in the background, to restore republican unity and hope to the disillusioned Indonesian people.

Yet with Gen. A. H. Nasution, the defense minister, and General Jani, the army chief of staff, now out-Sukarnoing Sukarno in the dispute with Malaya over Malaysia and even threatening a direct military invasion of the British Borneo territories, Mr. Brackman and all other serious students of Indonesia must be troubled by the growing irresponsibility of the army leadership. Given their Russian weapons, the military now seem all too anxious to get on with the job—any job. Sukarno has not given up the front running when it comes to expansionism; but jogging at his heels are that ill-matched pair, Nasution and Subandrio, and, of course, the Communist leader, Aidit. A good many Western hopes, including Mr. Brackman's, have been shaken by the new ambitions Nasution, who only a year ago dismissed Malaysia as of no concern to Indonesia but is now prepared to go to war to destroy it.

This does not detract from the value of Mr. Brackman's book, which is easily the most important on Indonesia since George McTurnan Kahin's "Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia" (1952). Communism in any of its forms presents the historical author with the most difficult of tasks, inasmuch as fact and what the Communists claim to be fact rarely bear any relation to each other. Over a period of many years, however Mr. Brackman has sifted and screened his material, and the result is an admirable account not merely of the rise of the Indonesian Communist Party but also of the far from happy history of Indonesia through independence to the present day.

Mistaken Western policies and Sukarno's ambitions both contributed to the Communist advance. But Sukarno has no intention of putting the Communists into power—though he may do so by folly or miscalculation, neither of which Mr. Brackman feels can be completely ruled out. As the self-styled "Great leader of our revolution," he wants no competitors for the revolutionary leadership. The perpetual dilemma for the

¹Republicans MUNDT of South Dakota, FONG of Hawaii, GOLDWATER of Arizona, HICKENLOOPER and MILLER of Iowa, KEATING of New York, SCOTT of Pennsylvania, and CASE of New Jersey; Democrats DODD of Connecticut, LAUSCHE of Ohio, PROXMIER of Wisconsin, SMATHERS of Florida, and DOUGLAS of Illinois.

INCLUSION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEMPORARY TEACHERS IN HEALTH AND LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, temporary teachers employed by the District of Columbia Board of Education cannot participate, as matters stand, in the Health and Life Insurance programs available to permanent employees. I am informed that the reason for this situation is that the U.S. Civil Service Commission, by regulation, has excluded all employees in a temporary category.

I am informed that there is a high percentage of teachers employed by the Board of Education who are considered temporary even though they may have many years of service in the District of Columbia school system. In my judgment, it is desirable and equitable that remedial legislation designed to afford such employees an opportunity to participate in the health and life insurance programs open to other Federal and District of Columbia employees, be enacted.

Thus, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill designed to include such temporary teachers employed by the Board of Education within the purview of the health and life insurance programs now available to permanent teachers employed by the District of Columbia Board of Education. This legislation has the endorsement of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed at this point in the Record.

The bill (S. 1340) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health-benefits plan established pursuant to such act and to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers; introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(a) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 710; 5 U.S.C. 3002 (a)) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: " Provided, That no teacher in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, whose salary is established by section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 521), as amended (sec. 31-1501, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), shall be excluded on the basis of the fact that such teacher is serving under a temporary appointment if such teacher has been so employed by such Board for a period or periods totaling not less than two school years."

Sec. 2. Section 2(a) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 736), as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091 (a)), is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu

thereof the following: "and in no event shall any teacher in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, whose salary is established by section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 521), as amended (sec. 31-1501, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), be excluded on the basis of the fact that such teacher is serving under a temporary appointment if such teacher has been so employed by such Board for a period or periods totaling not less than two school years."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins not later than the sixtieth day after the date of its enactment.

STEEL SHIPPING CONTAINER IDENTIFICATION ACT, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator of Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill intended to permit the buyers of steel shipping containers to know when steel is used in the manufacture of the containers and to promote the use of steel produced in this country.

The bill, to be known as the Steel Shipping Container Identification Act of 1963, is endorsed by the Steel Container Shipping Institute, who believe that such legislation will be of great benefit to the steel industry, to the steel shipping container industry, and to the general public.

U.S. customs laws require that a foreign product be plainly marked with the country of origin in which it is produced. The courts sustain the fact that the authority and jurisdiction of the Bureau of Customs ends when the product has been released from its custody. This, in turn, means that while the bundles or coils of sheet steel are marked with the country of origin upon arrival in this country, no agency of the United States under present regulations has any further jurisdiction over the marking or identification of products, such as drums, pails, and like containers, which are ultimately manufactured from the imported sheet steel.

The proposed bill, Mr. President, would require that drums, pails, and like containers, made of foreign steel be plainly marked with the country of origin of the steel and would place enforcement of the act under the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission and would include their usual penalties for noncompliance.

This act is not otherwise punitive and does not ask special favors, increased duties or tariff protection. It only requires that containers made from foreign steel be so identified.

It is hoped, Mr. President, that with the practice of our own steel producers being beat competitively with the use of foreign steel in drums, pails, and like containers that these items should be marked so that the general buying public at least will know whether they are purchasing a product made with foreign steel or with domestic steel.

Mr. President, so that my distinguished colleagues may have the opportunity to join with me in sponsorship of this proposed legislation, I ask unanimous consent that the bill to lie on the table until Friday, April 26, 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will

be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 1342) to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. SCOTT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

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

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. The Senator is putting forth a most commendable idea. It is very foresighted action on the part of the Senator to introduce the bill. I should like to join him in sponsoring it.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator from Maryland. He has always stood with me in these matters both in the Committee on Commerce and in the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CANYONLANDS PARK—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald there appeared an editorial entitled "Canyonlands Park," which discusses the proposal which will be before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this coming Thursday, for the creation of Canyonlands National Park in southeastern Utah. This editorial is a very clear exposition of the situation now existing, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record.

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

CANYONLANDS PARK

The outlook for creation of another magnificent national park in the West has notably improved with the current agreement within the Utah congressional delegation and among State officials. The park would be located in what has come to be known as Canyonlands at the confluence of the Green and Colorado Rivers in southeastern Utah. This is one of the wildest and most inaccessible areas in the United States, and the proposed park is said to be a wonderland that cannot be matched by any Ameri-

6304

can scenery now outside national park boundaries.

Canyonlands has found high favor with the National Parks Service, and National Parks Association, conservationists and outdoorsmen. Senator FRANK E. MOSS has sponsored a bill to authorize establishment of the proposed park, but in the last session of Congress there was sharp disagreement over the land to be included. Now a compromise has been reached between Gov. George Clyde and Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, on one hand, and Senator Moss, on the other, to limit the area to a little more than 250,000 acres.

Agreement has also been reached on the phasing out of mineral and oil exploration in the area within 25 years. Mines and wells developed during that period could continue to operate. This is the most questionable aspect of the agreement but there is some precedent for such continued operations in areas that have become national parks. The most important thing is to set aside the finest scenic features of this area for park purposes. Additional land can be acquired later if that seems desirable. The reduced acreage would include the spectacular areas that have come to be known as Chesler Park, Virginia Park, Druid Arch, Angel Arch, Elephant Canyon, Upheaval Dome, the Needles, and the Basin of Standing Rocks.

Hearings on the new Moss bill will be held by the Senate's Public Lands Subcommittee on April 25, and it is to be hoped that similar action will be taken on the House side. The rapid growth of the country makes it especially desirable to conserve scenic areas of national park quality. If it is found feasible to link Canyonlands with the Zion, Bryce, and Grand Canyon National Parks, with the Glen Canyon Dam and the Arches and Natural Bridges National Monuments in the same general area, the combination would make a strong bid for first place among the country's scenic playgrounds.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to submit at this time two proposed amendments to S. 27, which is the Canyonlands National Park bill; and that these amendments may be printed, so as to be available at the time of the hearing on Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS AND RAILWAY LABOR ACTS—RESCISSION OF ORDER FOR BILL TO LIE ON DESK

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, previously the bill (S. 1330) to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act with respect to emergency labor disputes, was ordered to lie on the table. I ask unanimous consent that that order be rescinded, and that the bill be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the bill (S. 1171), in aid of housing for the elderly, is next printed, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mrs. NEUBERGER) may be added as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A METRIC SYSTEM IN THE UNITED STATES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Oregon (Mrs. NEUBERGER) be allowed to become cosponsor with me of S. 1278, which I introduced on April 4. I ask that her name be included at the next printing of this bill. This bill, which would authorize the Bureau of Standards to study the feasibility of adopting the metric system in the United States, is of basic importance to the entire Nation; and I am immensely pleased and honored to have the Senator from Oregon associated with me in its passage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY LABOR DISPUTES ACT OF 1963—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of April 18, 1963, and today April 22, 1963, the name of Mr. AIKEN was added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1330) to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act with respect to emergency labor disputes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS on April 18, 1963.

PRESS RELEASE ON CERTAIN HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point the text of a press release issued on April 19 announcing hearings on S. 414 and other bills pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations which relate to the training of foreign affairs personnel.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

APRIL 19, 1963.

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman, announced today that on April 29 and May 1, the Committee on Foreign Relations would hold hearings on S. 414, a bill to create a Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy. S. 414 was introduced on January 22 by Senator MUNDT, for himself and other Senators.

On April 4 and 5 of this year the committee held public hearings on S. 865, an administration bill to establish a National Academy of Foreign Affairs. S. 865 was introduced by Senator SYMINGTON, for himself and other Senators on February 20.

Also pending before the Committee are S. 32 and S. 99, bills to create a U.S. Foreign Service Academy. Both of these bills were introduced on January 14, S. 32 by Senator SMATHERS and S. 99 by Senator DOMINICK.

Anyone wishing to present testimony on any of the aforementioned bills during the course of the hearings announced today should contact without delay Mr. Darrell St. Claire, chief clerk, Committee on Foreign Relations.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 63, TO PROVIDE FOR REPRESENTATION OF INDIGENT DEFENDANTS, AND S. 1057, TO PROMOTE THE CAUSE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE BY PROVIDING FOR THE REPRESENTATION OF DEFENDANTS WHO ARE FINANCIALLY UNABLE TO OBTAIN AN ADEQUATE DEFENSE IN CRIMINAL CASES IN THE COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled beginning Monday, May 6, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in Room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on S. 63, a bill to provide for representation of indigent defendants, and S. 1057, a bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above bills may make such representation as may be pertinent.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF L. J. ANDOLSEK TO BE A CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I wish to announce that a public hearing on the nomination of L. J. Andolsek to be a civil service commissioner will be held Wednesday, April 24, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building.

The hearing will be open to the public and will be held before the full committee.

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

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

By Mr. HARTKE:

Address by Senator BAYH at Indiana Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner on April 6, 1963.

Editorial entitled "Wabash Could be Navigable," published in the Pike County, Ind., Dispatch of April 4, 1963.

Editorial entitled "Lincoln Heritage Trail," published in the Elkhart, Ind., Truth, dealing with the need for marking the trail which Abraham Lincoln took during his formative years.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

Address entitled "Upstream Flood Control in Oklahoma," delivered by Miss Sally Cooksey, a high school senior from Ada High School, Oklahoma, before the 34th annual State convention of the Oklahoma Garden Clubs, Inc.

By Mr. MORSE:

Article entitled "U.S. Agencies Praised," written by Frank E. Karelsen, published in the New York Times on April 6, 1963.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Article entitled "Senator ROBERTSON Explains Cost of Adding National Holidays," written by Frank E. Taylor, published in