

credit to those who are trying to promote the cause of labor. No citizen, especially under the Constitution, and also when proceeding under rights given by a collective-bargaining agreement, should have his rights denied him by arbitrary dictatorial orders, issued by anyone including labor leaders. This contemplated action by the union leaders against these workers is wrong and deplorable.

BERLIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on this morning's news ticker appears an item about which I heard discussed over the radio last night. It states:

Senate Democratic Leader MANSFIELD has suggested that limited U.S. recognition of Communist East Germany might be inevitable in negotiations on the Berlin crisis. MANSFIELD said yesterday there was room for negotiation on Berlin. But he said the Western allies must insist on freedom for West Berliners, access to the city, and the right to keep troops there.

MANSFIELD, who based his views on "what I read, not what I hear," said that de facto recognition of East Germany "is being considered at the present time."

Mr. President, while I have not been misquoted, and I must say I never have been misquoted in my 19 years in Congress, nevertheless, it appears to me a strong interpretation may be placed on what I said, as the story was carried over the airwaves and in the press of the country.

It happened that on Saturday night, at the conclusion of the session, the distinguished minority leader and I went to the studios of ABC and participated in a program known as "Issues and Answers." The reporters at that program were Mr. William McIntyre, ABC Washington commentator, and Peter Clapper, ABC Capitol Hill correspondent. The producer was Peggy Whedon.

I should like to read the parts of the program to which I made reference in these remarks.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Senator DIRKSEN, there have been reports in the last day or two, a great nest of reports that the United States is taking a more elastic position toward Berlin bargaining. How elastic can we get without appearing?

Senator DIRKSEN replied. I will skip the reply which he made, and come to my answer:

May I say a good many people are pretty free and easy with the use of the word "appeasement." They have their minds made up that that is what should be done, and if anybody deviates from that, why then the term "appeaser" comes quite handy to mind, but I would say as far as Berlin is concerned, there has been, there is, and there will be three factors to keep in mind: One is the continued freedom of the people of West Berlin. Two, our continued rights of maintaining an allied force in that city, and, third, our continued rights of egress and ingress in and out of West Berlin, to West Germany in any direction we desire, whether over toward Hamburg or toward West Germany down toward Helmstedt.

Those things are not negotiable, but there are other things in connection with Germany which are negotiable, and undoubtedly Mr. Gromyko and Mr. Rusk are considering those at the present time.

Mr. CLAPPER. What ideas do you have for ending this impasse in Berlin, any new ideas?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, Pete, I have advanced ideas from time to time. For example, I suggested that all Berlin—not West Berlin—be considered as a free city. What people don't seem to realize is that East Berlin is a part of East Germany, that in East Berlin is Pankow, the capital of East Germany and that was one way of throwing the ball back to Khrushchev and Ulbricht but now you have a wall in between. There was some talk about the U.N. or some of its agencies being moved to West Berlin. There is talk about the recognition of the Oder-Neisse line which today separates present-day Poland from East Germany. There is talk of recognition—de facto at least of East Germany or continued conversations—or contacts between East and West German Governments. All these things have been talked about. Whether they are being considered I don't know.

Then, later in the program, Mr. Clapper asked this question:

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator MANSFIELD, getting back to the Berlin question, do you think de facto recognition of East Germany is inevitable?

Senator MANSFIELD. I wouldn't say it is inevitable, but I would say it might well be inevitable insofar as the fact that from what I read—not from what I hear—that that is being considered at the present time. There is of course as you may well recall, contact—in effect recognition—between West and East Germany because you have economic agreements to the tune of over \$300 million a year going between East and West, so while the West Germans won't admit there is an East Germany, nevertheless there is this contact, economically speaking. There are contacts between East and West Berliners. What will happen no one knows, but that is one of the things that is being talked about a good deal at the present time.

Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to state publicly that this was a most pleasant conversation with the distinguished majority leader, who, in my opinion, showed a type of statesmanship which all the country can applaud. He was most courteous and kind, as always, and he certainly indicated what his views were on the subjects which were discussed. I want to express my pleasure for being accorded the privilege of appearing with him on the program "Issues and Answers," on Sunday, September 24.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the transcript of the program "Issues and Answers."

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

ISSUES AND ANSWERS, SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1961

Guests: Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, Senate minority leader, and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, Senate majority leader.

Panel: William McIntyre, ABC Washington commentator, and Peter Clapper, ABC Capitol Hill correspondent.

The ANNOUNCER. From Washington, D.C., the American Broadcasting Co. brings you "Issues and Answers." Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD and Senate Minority Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN here are the issues.

Mr. CLAPPER. Are you satisfied with the record of the 1st session of the 87th Congress?

Mr. MCINTYRE. How about President Kennedy's performance in his first 8 months of office?

Mr. CLAPPER. What are the prospects for the Kennedy program next year?

Mr. MCINTYRE. Should the United States get tougher with the Soviet Union?

The ANNOUNCER. You have heard the issues. Now for the answers.

From the top legislative spokesmen for the U.S. Senate, Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, and Minority Leader EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, in their first joint appearance on any network.

To explore the issues, ABC Washington Commentator William McIntyre, and with the first question, ABC Capitol Hill Correspondent Peter Clapper.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator MANSFIELD, as majority leader are you satisfied with the record of the first half of the 87th Congress?

Senator MANSFIELD. Very much. I think we have made a good record. I think we have put into operation at least in the Senate most of the Kennedy program, and I think we have done it with the cooperation of my distinguished colleague, the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN.

Mr. CLAPPER. Do you think the President is satisfied?

Senator MANSFIELD. I think he is well satisfied with what we have done in the Congress as a whole.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator DIRKSEN, the Republicans claim that out of the 33 so-called major items of legislation that have passed, most of them are just retreads, or have been gutted. Would you go along with this?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, I think in all fairness, first asserting my affection for the distinguished majority leader who in my judgment has done a great job in the 1st session of the 87th Congress, I think you've got to consider some of the refinements. There are so many things that are agreed upon. I saw this slip recently that was circulated around showing that as distinguished from 11 accomplishments in the Roosevelt administration and 12 in the Eisenhower administration, we have had 33 major achievements in this first session.

I think that is true as a numerical statement, but you have to remember, of course, that so much of it was agreed upon and has been incubated for a long time, and actually was without controversy.

I took a little look at the rollcalls, the recorded calls on these 33 issues, and actually there were only 12 of the 33 on which we had to bother to ask for a recorded vote of the Senate.

I think it indicates that Members on both sides of the aisle are deeply interested in matters of common concern and there has been general agreement on many of the items and that accounts for it. While that sounds like a tremendous claim, I think you always have to remember that so many of these things come out of earlier administrations. The incubation takes a long time before you hatch the chicken. So I suppose when you use the term "retread," it doesn't apply particularly to a chicken, but at least the spade work of a great many years has been done.

Mr. CLAPPER. Well, Senator MANSFIELD, I would like to ask you about foreign aid. Now this is either apparently a victory or a defeat, or perhaps a little of both. The President got what he asked in the power to make promises for long-term aid. He didn't get what he wanted in the way of Treasury borrowing authority. Was this a victory or a defeat?

Senator MANSFIELD. I would say on the whole it was a victory, that the idea which the President wanted to put across was given to him, that he does have the power to program or to plan on a long-term basis. It is

our hope that on this basis that with the new Administrator there will be reforms in the aid program to the extent there will be less waste and inefficiency, less duplication, less overlapping, and more in the way of return for the American dollars expended to help people who need help in this troubled world.

Mr. McINTIRE. Senator MANSFIELD, there remains the feeling that the President has not been entirely successful in translating his personal popularity into legislative results on the very hard issues. How effective has the President been, and would you suggest any means or method by which he might communicate more effectively with the American people?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I would have no suggestion to make because I think on the whole he has been very successful in his relations with the Congress. After all, he has served 14 years in the House and Senate combined. He is on a first-name basis with most of the Members of both Houses and especially so in the Senate where he served his last 8 years. I think that he has done his best through the TV, the radio, and the press in general to carry his message to the American people. I would suggest that he ought to be given a little more time because the job is new, the job is difficult, and no President in my memory has ever come on to a first year in office with the problems which face President Kennedy at the moment.

Mr. McINTIRE. Senator DIRKSEN, within a segment of that great American population, the American business community, there has been a feeling lately that the present administration might be following a general antibusiness policy. Would you like to comment on that?

Senator DIRKSEN. Oh, yes.

Before you get to that, I hope you don't quite ignore this issue of foreign aid. I have sought always to be helpful in that issue and I think there you've got to make a little refinement of these quantitative analyses of how successful the Congress has been. You have to impose there whether or not the Congress or the President won. I think so far as our approaches are concerned, the Congress won. It left the planning, of course, on a 5-year basis, but it did insist that these proposals where the money was involved come back for annual scrutiny. And that was very definitely a victory for the Congress. That certainly represents my viewpoint, of course. I was glad to see the President have authority to plan in advance. And as a matter of fact, in the controversy between the House and the Senate about the amount of the money that was involved, I sought to be helpful because I think in a perilous and critical period you have to uphold the hand of your President. He is the director of foreign policy. He is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and as a result where international policy is involved we ask only that we be consulted, we have a chance to comment and criticize and thereafter, even though we don't always agree, we close ranks and then support the President because you never must exhibit to the world that there are divided ranks in our country when it comes to an issue of that kind. So I didn't want you to get away from that issue without having at least one word to say about it.

Senator MANSFIELD. And may I say there that the minority leader has been most constructive in what criticism he had to make and most helpful in trying to get all aspects of our foreign policy and defense posture strengthened and put through.

Senator DIRKSEN. There you have another example of an issue that confronts not the Republican Party, not the Democratic Party, it confronts the country. Where survival and all the challenges of security and freedom are involved. There, of course, we think

as Americans and think in terms of the common well-being and not in terms of our party. And I must say that I have been in almost complete agreement with my very esteemed friend, the majority leader from Montana on that issue.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator DIRKSEN, moving on to the next part of Bill's question, Has the administration been antibusiness?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, I am not sure that I can give you a good answer to that question, because I presume the question comes out of the enhancement of authority in the Attorney General with respect to antitrust cases, and so forth. Now it was only a day or two ago that we conferred upon the Department of Justice additional authority with respect to civil investigations. We had to hedge it about with some protection and it might be argued, of course, that there is a disposition to move more deeply in that field and turn the hand of Government against business. But when you raise that question in its general perspective, it is difficult to make an answer. Now if you were to pick out some individual instances, the chances are I could give you a better answer. And I have had some rather distinct feelings about it. Where, for instance, our Government has moved against people, our own people, by doing business in foreign countries and most of their business abroad, I did not feel that that was a warranted intrusion on the part of the Government.

Mr. CLAPPER. How about the President's letters to the steel companies?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, of course, we all had our say there. The majority party occupied one afternoon to state its case. We occupied another afternoon to state our case and the only point I made was this, I have no comment as to whether steel prices should go up or whether they should go down. I want to be sure that no kind of price control in a peacetime period, whether it is direct or whether it is psychological in its approaches, ought ever to be imposed, because if you do, you take the first long step on a long journey that might finally be a deep intrusion into the whole free market competitive system of this country.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator, who would you blame, though, if a round of inflation should follow possible steel price hikes?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, who shall say what all the contributing factors are with respect to inflation and can you put your finger on any one particular person?

All this eventuates from the fact that on the 1st of October, there will be a wage increase for the steelworkers. Do then the producers of steel have to raise their prices? I went all through the hearings with these steel producers, going into many months of testimony. They think in terms of a 50-year, 100-year objective.

Think, for instance, of United States Steel going into Africa to mine a mountain of ore. It costs \$450 million to build the railroads and the docks where the vessels can get that ore to the mills in this country. Whence shall come the money? Do they go into the market and borrow? Do they take part of it from earnings? How shall they get it?

And that is one of those delicate industrial problems that one on the outside cannot so readily answer and certainly I am always having my fingers crossed when a Harvard professor comes up with the answer on that subject, and then I am willing to back off in the corner and take a good long look.

Senator MANSFIELD. May I say I think the President was perfectly within his rights in addressing a personal plea to the heads of the steel companies in this country urging them to give all possible credence to keeping prices down as much as possible, even though, as Senator DIRKSEN has said, come October 1, some raises will go into effect. I think that is part of his responsibility.

And speaking of business in general, I would say that since the beginning of this administration when business was not too good, that there has been a remarkable comeback, not due, of course, by any means to what the administration has done entirely—that was a contributing factor—but a comeback to such an extent that in this present quarter, if my memory serves me correctly, the figures will indicate that American industry is enjoying the highest profits in its history.

Senator DIRKSEN. Let me add a postscript: The majority leader is quite right about the authority of the President to write to the steel producers and suggest to them there will be no price increases. I think the President was not only within his proper jurisdiction but perhaps we can think of it as a duty. The difficulty arose, of course, in the discussions on the Senate floor that I interpreted as threats. When one Senator said there is power in the Federal Trade Commission, there is power in the Department of Justice, there is inherent power in the Presidency. We may go back and reexamine the consent decree in 1921 when it affected the steel people. It seemed something of a veiled threat. That, however, did not involve the President of the United States and I fully concur he was within his rights in addressing himself to the steel producers of the country and they were within their rights in addressing him in all candor in their response.

Mr. McINTIRE. Senator MANSFIELD, there is a feeling some of the really toughest issues this Congress will tackle lie ahead: tax revision, reciprocal trade, medical care, and social security, and that many of these issues involve the citizens' pocketbook.

Do you think it is going to be more difficult or less difficult to get issues of this type through in an election year?

Senator MANSFIELD. I would think more difficult by and large. As far as this year is concerned, we have had in effect a sort of a honeymoon. A new administration, a new Congress, and we have been treated very nicely, but I think beginning next year some of the more difficult problems, some of the real New Frontier problems will begin to emerge and to be considered and I think next year will be extremely difficult in comparison with the one we are just finishing.

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, I could add to that and I think I concur in that view, that a new administration enjoys two things. First, it enjoys a honeymoon. Everybody wants to see a new President succeed—and I do—and I ought to add at this point I think that the President of the United States has served either in the House or Senate with virtually every Member of the leadership on both sides in both bodies. That goes for my esteemed friend from Montana. It goes for myself. I served with the President in the House and in the Senate, and I wish him well. So there is a honeymoon period. And then secondly there is what I am pleased to call a "honeymoon" period. You don't draw the line too finely. When he makes a request, you try to oblige, if he feels it is necessary.

Take for instance in the foreign aid bill. The House sharply cut his contingency fund. I insisted it be restored. I did that for President Eisenhower. I will do it for President Kennedy. How can he foresee all the imponderables all over the world. And for the sake of a few hundred million dollars, you must never tie the hands of the President as the Commander in Chief and the Chief Executive.

But it will be increasingly difficult as we go on because then you will have had an opportunity also to measure the impact of the program and then determine what you do in the interests of a balanced budget and a sound, solvent fiscal program.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator President do ne aid, will he a Senator MANSFIELD of the Union state his belief in the field of He will ask Co at the picture, I honesty that in have been two 2 ed areas and the Act passed thi

However, the Senat aid to education ed for school cor as. That bill is all through nex and if the E I think we coul with a very good program and in t what the Preside

Mr. CLAPPER. Senat ed that general sc legislative failure Senator MANSFIELD. I was concerned, b ed for in the Senat come out of com ed or has passed is now in the Hou

McINTIRE. Sena been reports in t nest of reports, t ing a more elastic bargaining. How el appealing?

Senator DIRKSEN. We rights, fundamer E contrived either f is signed long ago, a occupation?—and ing very particula tion.

ow let it be said ic have applauded the We have applauded the firmness of tl ed to the Americ certainly support h theory, of course, th ears the nibbling y the Soviet Union ha continue. And tr

you assert the rig you say "This is it cannot negotiate. you negotiate away a then you can negoti al rights of the Am nals, vouchsafed to them by the (ed States.

McINTIRE. Provide then are maintai ed give the Preside doubt in negotiat ry concessions?

Senator DIRKSEN. Al much concerned ab to the world as an bly concerned, of e age as to the deci place, but we uphol ment always when and says "This is try, and beyond t

Senator MANSFIELD. M people are pretty one of the word "ap their minds made should be done ed from that, why t comes quite han stay as far as Be has been, there is, factors to keep in ed freedom of tr

SVII—1335

September 25

ess in general, beginning of this ness was not, too remarkable come- by any means to as done entirely- ctor—but a come- at in this present rves me correctly. hat American in- hest profits in its

c add a postscript, t right about the t to write to the st to them there I think the Pres- is proper jurisdic- think of it as a , of course, in the floor that I inter- one Senator said ral Trade Commis- he Department of nt power in the ack and reexamine l when it affected something of a ever, did not in- United States and thin his rights in steel producers of were within their in all candor in

MANSFIELD, there is lly toughest issues lie ahead: tax re- medical care, and many of these in- pocketbook. ig to be more dif- get issues of this ion year? would think more s far as this year ad in effect a sort administration, have been treated k beginning next difficult problems- ntier problems will be considered and extremely difficult one we are just

I could add to r in that view, that enjoys two things ymoon. Everybody did at this point i- nt of the United in the House of ery Member of the s in both bodie- emed friend from self. I served with use and in the Sen- ell. So there is a nd then secondly d to call a "money" t draw the line too a request, you try is necessary. be foreign aid bill, s contingency fund- d. I did that for will do it for Pres- n he foresee all the ne world. And for red million dollars, hands of the Presi- in Chief and the

ingly difficult as w- t will have had a- sure the impact of, determine what you e balanced budget a- gram.

CLAPPER. Senator MANSFIELD, what will President do next year about general aid, will he ask for it again?

Senator MANSFIELD. I anticipate in the Union message he will once state his belief that something should be done in the field of Federal aid for education. He will ask Congress again to take a look at the picture, but I will point out in honesty that in view of the fact that there have been two 2-year programs for inner city areas and the National Defense Education Act passed this year, that it may be sufficient.

However, the Senate did pass a good general aid to education bill this year which would be for school construction and teachers' salaries. That bill is still alive. It will be passed all through next year. It is in the hands of the House and if the House desires to take action, I think we could, on that basis, come up with a very good Federal aid to education program and in that way be in accord with what the President wants.

Senator CLAPPER. Senator MANSFIELD, you will be disappointed that general school aid was the biggest legislative failure Mr. Kennedy had?

Senator MANSFIELD. Not as far as the Senate was concerned, because everything he has done for in the Senate in that field either came out of committee and is on the books or has passed through the Senate and is now in the House for consideration.

Senator MCINTIRE. Senator DIRKSEN, there have been reports in the last day or two, a number of reports, that the United States is taking a more elastic position toward Berlin bargaining. How elastic can we get without appeasing?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, can you be elastic on rights, fundamental rights that have been contrived either in the form of documents signed long ago, or rights that stem from occupation?—and I suppose you are talking very particularly about the Berlin situation.

Let me let it be said for the minority that we have applauded the President's position, we have applauded always the firmness, the firmness of the message that he has turned to the American people. And we certainly support him, because I go on the theory, of course, that over a long period of years the nibbling process on the part of the Soviet Union has continued and it will continue. And there comes a place where you assert the rights of your country when you say "This is it," and beyond that cannot negotiate. For after all, how do you negotiate away a right? If you could then you can negotiate away the fundamental rights of the American people as individuals, vouchsafed to them and guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the United States.

Senator MCINTIRE. Provided our vital interests then are maintained in Berlin, you would give the President the benefit of the doubt in negotiating so-called security concessions?

Senator DIRKSEN. Always. We are as much concerned about what war could be done to the world as anybody, and we are equally concerned, of course, in this negotiation as to the declamation that could be made, but we uphold the hands of the President always when he takes a firm stand and says "This is the position of our country, and beyond this we do not retreat."

Senator MANSFIELD. May I say a good word for the people are pretty free and easy with their use of the word "appeasement." They should be done and if anybody is to be blamed from that, why then the terms "appeasement" comes quite handy, but I would stay as far as Berlin is concerned, as there has been, there is, and there will be a number of factors to keep in mind: One is the continued freedom of the people of West

Berlin. Two, our continued rights of maintaining an Allied force in that city, and third, our continued rights of egress and ingress in and out of West Berlin, to West Germany in any direction we desire, either over toward Hamburg or toward West Germany down toward Helmstedt.

Those things are not negotiable, but there are other things in connection with Germany which are negotiable, and undoubtedly Mr. Gromyko and Mr. Rusk are considering those at the present time.

Mr. CLAPPER. What ideas do you have for ending this impasse in Berlin, any new ideas?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, Pete, I have advanced ideas from time to time. For example, I suggested that all Berlin—not West Berlin—be considered as a free city. What people don't seem to realize is that East Berlin is a part of East Germany that in East Berlin is Pankow, the capital of East Germany and that was one way of throwing the ball back to Khrushchev and Ulbricht, but now you have a wall in between. There was some talk about the U.N. or some of its agencies being moved to West Berlin. There is talk about the recognition of the Oder-Neisse line which today separates present-day Poland from East Germany. There is talk of recognition of—de facto at least of East Germany or continued conversations—or contacts between East and West German Governments. All these things have been talked about. Whether they are being considered I don't know.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Senator DIRKSEN, do you agree with Senator MANSFIELD's listing of our three vital interests? Do you agree that these other things are negotiable?

Senator DIRKSEN. Generally speaking, I do, except that insofar as our rights of ingress and egress are concerned, where those have been documented and signed, obviously we cannot lose them. We cannot forfeit them without finally cutting off communication.

Now you have to remember this. You have to look down the road a little. The Soviet Union—if they carry out the general attitude once expressed by Peter the Great—thinks nothing of time. A year, 10 years, 25 years, 100 years—is this a program first to detach East Berlin? Secondly, to sweat out West Berlin? Finally, to detach West Germany, or the Federal Republic of West Germany, from the Western World?

They take plenty of time, and, of course, they resort to every psychological advantage that they can develop in that field. And so thinking in that frame, of course, there is coming a time when it is going to have to be stopped. Otherwise what Peter the Great once referred to as a "window on the Baltic," will become a window on the Atlantic, and then they will be looking across the Atlantic at the one great free bastion of civilization, and that is the United States of America. And without others to stand in our place, and with us, how long then can freedom and survival be made to endure?

Mr. MCINTIRE. Senator MANSFIELD, would you comment on that?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I would say, what Senator DIRKSEN has said has good historical precedent and background. He mentions the fact that Peter the Great used to look upon the Baltic, and that may be in time the modern Russian may look upon a window to the Atlantic and that means he will be looking across a space of water toward us.

The thing we have to remember now is that he will be looking, not visually but through rockets and missiles and it is my understanding that ICBM's, intercontinental ballistic missiles have been developed to the extent they can traverse the Atlantic in a matter of 15 or 20 minutes, because after they reach a certain height they develop a certain speed and if they hit their target, of course then there will be hell to pay.

It is a changed world we live in. President Kennedy is right when he says that the decade of the sixties will be the most dangerous in the history of mankind. Look what has confronted him since he has been in office, and look how hard it is to find the answers to those difficulties.

And may I say that as far as the Republican leadership and the Republicans generally are concerned, they have been most helpful in the support of the President in the field of foreign policy and it is most appreciated.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator MANSFIELD, getting back to the Berlin question, do you think de facto recognition of East Germany is inevitable?

Senator MANSFIELD. I wouldn't say it is inevitable, but I would say it might well be inevitable insofar as the fact that from what I read—not from what I hear—that that is being considered at the present time. There is, of course, as you may well recall, contact—in effect recognition—between West and East Germany because you have economic agreements to the tune of over \$300 million a year going between East and West, so while the West Germans won't admit there is an East Germany, nevertheless there is this contact, economically speaking. There are contacts between East and West Berliners. What will happen no one knows, but that is one of the things that is being talked about a good deal at the present time.

Senator DIRKSEN. You ought to have refined your question a little bit when you talk about recognition. You have to think of the countries that would recognize, if a peace treaty with each other is consummated.

Actually your satellite countries under the domination of the Soviet Union would be quick to sign, but you see the important thing from our standpoint is the attitude of the United States, of France, of the Republic of West Germany, of Great Britain, of Italy. And the other countries we are pleased to think of as a part of the great free structure of the Western World.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Well, Senator DIRKSEN, are you then relatively satisfied with the Kennedy administration's handling today of the Berlin crisis?

Senator DIRKSEN. I would say they have been firm, and the President has reasserted over and over again that those rights will be maintained and reasserted it, and that certainly scores in my book.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator DIRKSEN, I would like to ask you this: If recognition of Red China is voted by the U.N., what action could the United States take?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, Peter, I wish that issue had been made far more clear than it has been thus far. When you speak of recognition—you see the element of membership is not involved here. There is an entity called China which is a part of the U.N. and actually occupies a place on the Security Council as a permanent member. But this, now, is a question of representation.

Mr. CLAPPER. That is what I mean.

Senator DIRKSEN. Which of the two Chinas. And you see that requires no recommendation by the Security Council, as I understand. That is a matter on which the General Assembly will vote. If it does take place, then of course difficulties no end will ensue before we are through with that issue. My own feeling, of course, is abundantly clear.

Mr. CLAPPER. Gentlemen, we have about 1 minute left.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Senator MANSFIELD, what if the United Nations should incorporate the troika principle? What do we do vis-a-vis our relations with the U.N.?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I think we ought not to make a decision now. We ought to face up with it. We ought to fight the application of the troika principle.

We ought to come forward with the name of some outstanding world leader who could take over for Dag Hammarskjöld and I would suggest offhand that a man like Mr. Nehru, of India would be the type for consideration, and I cannot see the Soviet Union in its advocacy of the troika principle going against a man of the stature of Nehru to head an organization of that kind.

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, let's talk about this solo principle, and substitute solo for troika, one for three, and then we will have what we ought to have in the United Nations.

Senator MANSFIELD. And that is what we believe in.

Mr. CLAPPER. I am sorry I have to interrupt you here, our time is up.

Senator MANSFIELD and Senator DIRKSEN, thank you very much for being with us today on "Issues and Answers."

Senator DIRKSEN. We thank you.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senate for its courtesy in allowing me to make this statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the majority leader is always objective, always gracious, always fair, and it is a delight to go before a nationwide audience and discuss with him the questions that are addressed to a panel consisting of the majority leader and myself. I thought it was a very fruitful discussion, and it was my delight to participate in it. I salute the majority leader in the same spirit in which he has saluted me. He knows of my affection for him and my recognition of his sense of objectivity and constancy in serving the cause of the Nation at a critical and perilous time.

A HALF CENTURY OF KANSAS JOURNALISM—FRED W. BRINKERHOFF

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this week Kansas is honoring Mr. Fred W. Brinkerhoff, dean of Kansas newspaper editors, for his 50 years of continuous outstanding service as editor of the Pittsburg, Kans., Headlight.

During this half century of Kansas journalism, Mr. Brinkerhoff has averaged writing 100 editorials a month on every conceivable subject, and these editorials have carried great weight and influence on the people, not only in his own community, but all over the State of Kansas.

He is recognized as an outstanding authority on Kansas history, and during this, our centennial year, he has devoted much of his time to lecturing and writing about our great State and its history.

He has received many journalistic awards, both national and State, including the William Allen White Award for Journalistic Merit in 1956.

The people of Kansas are paying this well-deserved tribute to the dean of Kansas journalism, not only because he is a great citizen whose written messages and views have influenced the thinking of the people of our State for these many years, but also because of his untiring devotion to Kansas and Kansas people.

Mr. Lawrence A. Barrett wrote an article entitled "A Half Century of Kansas Journalism," which appeared in a recent issue of the Christian Science Moni-

tor and I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of these remarks.

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

A HALF CENTURY OF KANSAS JOURNALISM (By Lawrence A. Barrett)

PITTSBURG, KANS.—F. W. Brinkerhoff, dean of Kansas newspaper editors, cannot be accused of being a rolling stone. He is this month celebrating his 50th year of continuous service as editor of the Pittsburg, Kans., Headlight. During that half century he has averaged writing 100 editorials a month on every conceivable subject, many of which have been quoted in papers around the area.

Mr. Brinkerhoff came to Pittsburg on an assignment in 1911, liked the community, was made editor of the Headlight; 15 years later had the editorship of the Pittsburg Sun added to his work; and in 1940 still more work was added when he was made manager and publisher of the two newspapers.

The two papers, one a morning and the other an evening paper, are published in the same plant but with different staffs. Much of the load of all the departments is carried on the shoulders of this native-born, stockily built Kansan.

Less than a dozen issues of the Headlight have gone to the presses without their containing some words written by Mr. Brinkerhoff. Even when he is out of town on business he leaves behind either some typewritten copy or words written in his hard-to-decipher scrawl ready for the next edition. He put in longer hours than any of his staff and usually works 7 days a week with "vacations" almost an unknown word in his vocabulary.

Mr. Brinkerhoff is vice president of the Pittsburg Publishing Co., a vice president and director of the Stauffer chain of newspapers, and is on the board of directors of the Topeka, Kans., Capital. In 1956 he was the recipient of the William Allen White Award for Journalistic Merit. He is past president of the Kansas Associated Press and is past president of the Kansas Historical Society and currently is on the board of directors of the Kansas Centennial Commission.

RECORD OF CONGRESS IN THIS SESSION

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to an article which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post, in the "Outlook" section, entitled "Honeymoon Congress Ran Up a Solid Record," whose author is Robert C. Albright.

The burden of the assessment of the record of this session of Congress which is about to adjourn, is one of tribute to the caliber of the program that we finally carried into law. Proper and appropriate tribute is paid to the leadership of both Houses in cooperative efforts to attain this record. Most important of all, there is a true perspective of the real meaning behind the many new facets of the New Frontier program, now the law of the land, as pointed out in this survey, for despite difficulties in the House of Representatives, and otherwise, speculated upon from time to time, a rather remarkable program, even so, was forthcoming.

I quote from the article:

In many instances, the massive program of domestic measures pushed through represented bills that had passed the Senate

in early Congresses and some that had passed both House only to collide with an Eisenhower veto.

Mr. Albright also states:

The overall list can be considered the most formidable that any President in history could point to.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD.

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

HONEYMOON CONGRESS RAN UP A SOLID RECORD

(By Robert C. Albright)

The 1st session of President Kennedy's 87th Congress is completing its honeymoon run and leaving behind it one of the most productive records in history.

In sheer legislative output, President Kennedy's first Congress has confounded the prophets. The results he obtained in 247 days of persistent give-and-take courtship compare favorably with Franklin Roosevelt's 100-day sweep of the field back in 1933.

There are gaping flaws in the analogy, of course. In the great depression of the early 1930's, Mr. Roosevelt had only to ask and Congress complied with his calls for economic remedies. Mr. Kennedy in 1961 has been dealing with a slower paced Senate and an often fickle House, bowing sometimes to the will of a Republican-southern Democratic coalition.

The President is represented as very well pleased with the legislation resulting. But with the paper-thin political division in the House, the wonder is that so much of the New Frontier program survived. The larger marvel is that he got through as many domestic economic measures as he did at a time of world crisis.

UNPRECEDENTED LIAISON

The explanation lies in part in the tremendous reservoir of good will President Kennedy has built up at the Capitol. Here in recent memory has an occupant of the White House maintained closer contact with individual legislators.

He works through the established Democratic leadership at the Capitol with the GOP leadership as well often made privy to his confidences.

Relaxed, pipe-smoking Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, does the pitching for him in the Senate. That Chamber gave him nearly everything that he asked. Unofficial scorekeepers say the Senate rates a B-plus on its Kennedy session.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, the "Old Sam" of song and story, helped the President through many of his legislative battles in the recalcitrant House before RAYBURN came down with lumbago and went home for a rest. As temporary Speaker, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, Massachusetts, finished out his stint. His performance, some rate the House only barely passing C-minus.

How did the President come out of it with a good program?

Vice President LYDON B. JOHNSON says the key word is "cooperation." He put it that way after the President called in Democratic Senators and thanked them last week:

"I don't know that there has ever been a period of greater cooperation and respect between the leadership and the executive. And that doesn't mean one man has been doing all the thinking."

JOHNSON, whose hard-driving leadership produced legislative miracles in the past, has been staying scrupulously on the legislative sidelines as Vice President. Administration associates say he has been available for