

work. The station has opened its microphones to an endless variety of community and educational projects. These activities are a natural expression of labor's interest in education and civic betterment. In addition, we have provided a broad variety of entertainment.

As we express our gratitude to those whose sacrifices helped create WCFL, we all pledge to continue the station's operation in their tradition. Service to labor, service to the community, service to the Nation—these

have been and will remain the objectives of station WCFL.

WCFL has moved from the original studios at the Navy pier and is now located at 666 North Lake Shore Drive. New facilities will soon be in operation at Marina City—the new, beautiful, and unique apartment and business complex, built and financed with union funds. Those locations, all within my congress-

sional district, make me especially proud of WCFL's progress and achievements.

I am sure that the many thousands of people in Chicago and throughout the Midwest, who deeply appreciate the outstanding public service which WCFL has performed, join with me in saluting them on their 38th birthday, and we all hope that they will be around for many more.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 1964

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

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

Our Father, God, with silenced hearts listening for Thy voice, we wait for Thy word, for in Thee only do we find light for life's meaning, wisdom for life's questions, strength for its duties, and courage for its unknown ways.

In these vernal days, thrilling and throbbing with the gardened loveliness of nature, standing knee deep in summer glory, we thank Thee for every sacrament of beauty of which our enraptured senses partake.

In all the anguish of the world's confusion and uncertainty, save us from being little persons in a big day. Forgetting the unworthy things that are behind, and stretching forth to the better things of a fairer world which are before, enable us to lay aside the weight of prejudice and the sins of covetousness that do so easily beset us, as with glad and eager feet we march with those who go to free, not to bind; to develop, not to rule; to cooperate, not to dominate; until the knowledge of the Lord, who is no respecter of persons, shall at last cover the earth as the waters now cover the sea.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 25, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 6) 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, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 6007. An act to permit the vessel SC-1473 to engage in the fisheries;

H.R. 9021. An act to authorize the conveyance of two tracts of land situated in Salt Lake City, Utah, to the Board of Education of Salt Lake City;

H.R. 11004. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act;

H.R. 11235. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 11 million pounds of molybdenum from the national stockpile; and

H.R. 11257. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 300) authorizing the disposal of approximately 98,000 long tons of pig tin from the national stockpile, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 6007. An act to permit the vessel SC-1473 to engage in the fisheries; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 9021. An act to authorize the conveyance of two tracts of land situated in Salt Lake City, Utah, to the Board of Education of Salt Lake City;

H.R. 11004. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act;

H.R. 11235. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 11 million pounds of molybdenum from the national stockpile; and

H.R. 11257. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 300) authorizing the disposal of

approximately 98,000 long tons of pig tin from the national stockpile was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress expressly approves, pursuant to section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (53 Stat. 811, as amended, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e)), the disposal from the national stockpile of approximately ninety-eight thousand long tons of pig tin.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

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

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE TODAY

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING WEEK OF JUNE 29

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate for the week beginning June 29, 1964.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING WEEK OF JUNE 29

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate for the week beginning June 29, 1964.

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

FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSIONS, WEEK OF JUNE 29, 1964

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate next week.

**INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS
COMMITTEE MEETING DURING
SENATE SESSIONS, WEEK OF
JUNE 29, 1964**

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate beginning the week of June 29, 1964.

**LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE COM-
MITTEE MEETING DURING SES-
SIONS OF THE SENATE, DURING
WEEK OF JUNE 29, 1964**

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the week beginning on Monday, June 29, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate.

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

**AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MES-
SAGES AND SIGN BILLS**

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate until Monday next, the Secretary may receive messages from the House, and that the President pro tempore or the Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, starting with those in the Department of Defense.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

**EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COM-
MITTEE**

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

George E. Bock, and sundry other persons, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service;

Peter E. Dans, and sundry other persons, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service;

Pasquale J. Ciccone, and sundry other persons, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service; and

G. Gilbert Ashwell, and sundry other persons, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with those in the Department of Defense, will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John T. McNaughton, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

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

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Solis Horwitz, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Daniel M. Luevano, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert Warren Morse, of Rhode Island, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Leonard Marks, Jr., of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

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

**U.S. AIR FORCE, U.S. ARMY, AND U.S.
NAVY**

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the U.S. Air Force, the U.S. Army, and the U.S. Navy be considered en bloc.

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

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James A. Washington, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term 3 years expiring June 30, 1967.

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

**THE AIR FORCE AND THE MARINE
CORPS**

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force and the Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

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

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

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

**CERTAIN NATIONAL GUARD
PROMOTIONS**

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in connection with the nomination of the four National Guard officers to the grade of major general acted upon by the Senate today, I desire to have the RECORD show the shocking manner in which the Department of the Army was guilty of legislative oversight and flouted the action of the Committee on Armed Services during the past year after that committee had rejected these four nominees for promotion from the rank of colonel to major general.

When the committee rejected such double promotion, the Army then sent the nominations back in the grade of brigadier general and the committee then approved the nominations. But in the meantime, the Army withheld from the committee the information that despite the committee's rejection of the four nominees in the grade of major general the Army continued them in that grade receiving the pay of major general and wearing the uniform and insignia of major general.

This is one of the worst breaches of faith on the part of the Department of the Army and the Department of Defense that I have ever experienced. I do not know who is responsible for such breach of faith, but I do know that it not only shocked me but it shocked the chairman of the committee as well for he expressed his shock yesterday in the executive session of the committee when I brought this matter up.

In legal terms, this action on the part of the Department of the Army and the National Guard is nothing less than a slick, shyster trick that reflects on the integrity of the Department of the Army. Whoever dreamed it up certainly did a disservice to the Department of the Army in the ultimate impairment of the committee's confidence in the Department.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement that I made at the meeting of the Committee on Armed Services yesterday, together with letters I received

from the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR SMITH BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief statement regarding nomination reference No. 196, which contains the names of the four brigadier generals—Harrison, Hostetler, Stevenson, and White—for appointments as major generals in the Army Reserve as a result of their positions as adjutant general of their respective States.

I would first like to say that my purpose in making this statement is not to oppose the list, but to point out certain events which have occurred since the committee's action last year and set forth certain changes which the Army has made in its regulations.

As the committee will recall, these four officers were federally recognized as major generals in the Guard on March 12, 1963, and their nominations for appointment in the Army Reserve were submitted to the Senate for confirmation in July of last year. Since these officers held only the rank of colonel, the committee indicated it would approve only a one-jump promotion to the grade of brigadier general. The two-star nominations, as you know, were withdrawn and their one-star nominations were subsequently submitted and confirmed in November of last year. As a result of the committee's action, the Army regulations have been revised to prevent any further two-jump promotions.

Some weeks ago, in a discussion with National Guard officials, I was dismayed to learn that the Army never withdrew Federal recognition of these four officers as major generals in the Army Guard. Since, legally, the drill pay and the rank and uniform of Guard officers is based on their federally recognized rank, these four officers since March of 1963 have continued to receive drill pay of the two-star rank and wear the uniform of a major general. The committee's action last year in refusing the two-jump promotions had no effect on the current status and appears to have been an exercise in futility. Appointments of adjutants general in the Reserve affects only their retirement rights and the rank they would serve in if called to extended active duty.

In a letter dated May 15, 1964, to me from General Wilson, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, it is stated: "The appointment as Reserve brigadier generals did not alter the fact that they had been properly federally recognized as major generals in the National Guard, nor did it provide a legal basis for withdrawal of Federal recognition in that grade." While I do not wish to debate this point, the records should reflect the fact that Army regulations provide that there will be a withdrawal of the Federal recognition when the Adjutant General of the Army fails to appoint a National Guard officer as a Reserve officer of the Army within a reasonable time after Federal recognition has been granted. (National Guard Regulation 20-4, sec. 3(n).)

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that it is my impression that General Wilson himself did not favor these officers continuing to receive two-star pay after last year's committee action. Apparently, however, there were other pressures that prevailed at the secretarial level in the Army.

I would like to point out to the committee that under such a policy the committee could reject an officer's nomination in the Reserve because of lack of qualifications or for other reasons, but as a result of continuous Federal recognition, he would continue to enjoy the pay and the uniform of the rank in which the committee rejected him.

I continued to pursue this matter, Mr. Chairman, and on June 17, 1964, I received a letter from Secretary of the Army Ailes stating that Army regulations have been changed with respect to National Guard general officers. Henceforth, a Guard officer will be given permanent Federal recognition only after his Reserve rank has been confirmed by the Senate. His initial Federal recognition will be temporary. The Federal recognition of his Guard rank will be withdrawn unless his appointment in the Reserve in that rank is confirmed by the Senate within 6 months.

Mr. Chairman, there still remains a number of areas in which the National Guard officer enjoys an advantage over his counterpart in the Reserve who is not a member of the National Guard.

(a) Even under this proposed temporary Federal recognition process, the National Guard officer will get the drill pay of the higher grade when federally recognized and wear the uniform, as compared to the Reserve officers who must wait until actual appointment in the higher grade.

(b) It should also be noted that a brigadier general nominated for two-star rank as adjutant general is required to remain in the grade of brigadier general only 1 year before he is eligible for two-star rank. Other Reserve brigadier generals must remain in grade 2 years before being eligible for two-star rank.

I recognize, however, Mr. Chairman, the progress in this general area is made in small steps. I did want to bring to the attention of the committee the change in the Army regulation which will in the future provide further conformity with any actions the committee might take.

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: General Wilson has discussed with me your letter of May 22, concerning the Federal recognition of Army National Guard officers in general officer grades.

Your feelings in this regard, as elaborated on in your letter to General Wilson, are fully understandable. At my direction the applicable regulation was reviewed and changes have been approved which will enable permanent Federal recognition to be extended to an officer appointed in the Army National Guard of any State as a brigadier general or major general only after his nomination as a Reserve officer of the Army in that grade is confirmed by the Senate. If the nomination is not confirmed, his temporary Federal recognition will be withdrawn. Temporary Federal recognition will expire 6 months from the effective date if it is not sooner replaced by permanent Federal recognition.

Attached for your information is an extract copy of the pertinent changes.

Your continued interest is appreciated, and both General Wilson and I hope that you will find the regulation revisions outlined to be more compatible with the desires of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN AILES,
Secretary of the Army.

EXTRACT COPY OF CHANGES TO NGR 20-2, PERTAINING TO FEDERAL RECOGNITION OF ARMY NATIONAL GUARD GENERAL OFFICERS

"4. Temporary Federal recognition. (Suspended) Temporary Federal recognition may be extended to an officer who has been appointed in the Army National Guard of a State and found qualified by a Federal Recognition Board pending a final determination of his eligibility for, and his appointment as, a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army. Temporary Federal recognition is granted by the Federal Recognition Examining Board except that the Chief, National

Guard Bureau, will extend temporary Federal recognition to applicants for Federal recognition as general officers who are found qualified by the Board and approved by the Secretary of the Army. Such recognition may be withdrawn at any time, and if not sooner withdrawn or replaced by permanent recognition, shall automatically terminate six months after the effective date (32 USC 308). If a general officer nomination is not confirmed by the Senate, Temporary Federal recognition will be withdrawn.

"17. Disposition. After action by the Secretary of the Army, report will be referred to the Chief, National Guard Bureau, who will notify the officers concerned. Temporary Federal recognition will be extended by the Chief, National Guard Bureau, to those officers found qualified by the Board and approved by the Secretary of the Army. Temporary Federal recognition will expire 6 months from the effective date, if not sooner terminated or replaced by permanent Federal recognition. Permanent Federal recognition will be extended after Senate confirmation of appointment. If an individual is not confirmed by the Senate, temporary Federal recognition will be withdrawn."

MAY 15, 1964.

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: This is in reply to your inquiry of April 21, 1964, as to the legal basis under which four Army National Guard officers whose appointments as Reserve brigadier generals of the Army were confirmed by the Senate are authorized to wear the insignia of major generals of the Army, and to receive the pay and allowances appropriate to that grade for training performed under authority of Federal law.

A member of the National Guard is entitled to one-thirtieth of 1 month's pay for each day of authorized inactive duty training as provided by section 206 of title 37, United States Code. Full-time training duty performed by a member of the Army National Guard of the United States in his status as a member of the Army National Guard, authorized by section 503-505 of title 32, United States Code, is active duty for the purposes of section 204 of title 37 (37 U.S.C. 204(d)). The basic pay to which a member of the National Guard is entitled while performing duty under sections 503-505 of title 32, United States Code, is that of his federally recognized grade.

Before the National Defense Act amendments of June 15, 1933 (48 Stat. 153), there was no National Guard of the United States and the only basis for pay and other benefits was Federal recognition. Despite the fact that, between 1933 and 1952 federally recognized officers were also appointed in the National Guard of the United States, and after 1952 as Reserves of the Army or of the Air Force as appropriate, their entitlement to pay and allowances continues to be based upon Federal recognition. Pointing up this fact is the provision in section 204(a)(2) of title 37, United States Code, for paying members of the National Guard who are not Reserves of the Army or Air Force. Thus, a second lieutenant with no prior service is entitled to pay and allowances for authorized inactive duty or full-time duty performed by him from the date of Federal recognition and while awaiting his Reserve of the Army appointment.

Wearing of the uniform of the Army, including insignia of grade, is governed by chapter 45 of title 10, United States Code. Section 772(a) provides "a member of the Army National Guard * * * may wear the uniform prescribed for the Army National Guard." Army National Guard is defined in section 101(10) of title 10, United States

Code, as that part of the organized militia that is federally recognized. Accordingly, when an officer is appointed by State authorities in accordance with article I, section 8, clause 16, of the Constitution and is federally recognized by the Secretary of the Army, he is an officer of the Army National Guard and is authorized to wear the insignia of the grade in which recognized.

Colonels Harrison, Hostetler, Stevenson, and White were each appointed by State authorities to the grade of major general. They were federally recognized by the Secretary of the Army in that grade on March 12, 1963, based upon the findings and recommendations of the Army National Guard Federal Recognition Examining Board. As a separate and subsequent action on July 17, 1963, the nominations of these four ARNG colonels for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the grade of major general, Adjutant General Corps, were forwarded to the Senate for confirmation.

The regulations had recently been revised to comport with the information furnished to Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, by Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric in his letter of July 18, 1961. In that letter it was said, "Officers in the grade of colonel and above who are appointed as adjutants general will be required to be fully qualified as indicated above to be eligible for Federal recognition but may be extended Federal recognition and promotion in the Reserve to the grade of brigadier general or major general. This means that the only authorization for promotion of over one grade at a time will be in the case of colonels being promoted to major general."

Following consideration by the U.S. Senate Committee on Armed Services of the nomination of these four officers for appointment as Reserve major generals of the Army (they theretofore having been federally recognized in that grade), Senator RUSSELL, as chairman of the committee, wrote the then Secretary of the Army, informing him that the committee agreed that these officers should not be appointed as major generals but that it would approve their "appointment * * * in the rank of brigadier general in the Army Reserve."

The chairman suggested that the names of the officers be withdrawn and that "their nominations for appointment in the grade of brigadier general in the Army Reserve" be resubmitted.

Following this suggestion, the initial nominations were withdrawn, nominations for their appointment as Reserve brigadier generals of the Army were submitted, and the consent of the Senate was granted. The appointment as Reserve brigadier generals did not alter the fact that they had been properly federally recognized as major generals in the National Guard, nor did it provide a legal basis for withdrawal of Federal recognition in that grade.

Based upon the desires expressed by the committee in Senator RUSSELL's letter of October 10, 1963, pertinent regulations were again changed to preclude the future possibility of promotion of colonels appointed as State adjutants general to the grade of major general. Under current regulations, a colonel may not be federally recognized in a grade above brigadier general, thereby assuring that the individual's federally recognized grade will coincide with the grade in which he is to be appointed as a Reserve of the Army.

The situation whereby these four officers were federally recognized in the grade of major general (which entitled them to wear the insignia and to receive pay and allowances of that grade) without having had their nominations for appointment as Reserves of the Army in that grade submitted to the Senate will not again occur. However, Federal recognition must necessarily precede

the tender of appointment as a Reserve of the Army, and in the interim between the date of Federal recognition and confirmation by the Senate the individual will continue to be entitled to pay, allowances, and to wear the insignia of the federally recognized grade.

Sincerely,

WINSTON P. WILSON,
Major General,
Chief, National Guard Bureau.

REAR ADM. HORACE D. WARDEN

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today, the Senate confirmed the nomination of Horace D. Warden, of Montana, to be a rear admiral in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Navy. My distinguished colleague, Senator METCALF, and I know Admiral Warden well and we have great respect for the man as a person of integrity, intelligence, and capability. Our acquaintance goes back some 30 years, when Senator METCALF, Rear Admiral Warden, and I were at Montana State University together.

I wondered how long it would take the Navy to recognize this man's outstanding medical capabilities. I am glad that at long last his merits have been recognized and that the Navy and the President of the United States have recommended that he be appointed a rear admiral and that the Senate has unanimously followed suit in seeing that the nomination of Admiral Warden was confirmed.

Admiral Warden is the 14th or 15th admiral from the State of Montana in the period beginning with the Second World War and down to the present. He is a wise choice. He is a great man. He is an eminent and devoted doctor.

I know this will be a great moment for Admiral Warden and his wife, the former Joy Browning.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I want to concur in the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the majority leader, in praise of Admiral Warden. He has been a friend since he and I attended Montana State University together. Mrs. Warden was a sister of my next door neighbor here in Washington. I visited with them.

Admiral Warden was an outstanding medical officer and served with President Truman on the presidential yacht. He has now embarked on a career in space medicine, and will have a distinguished career in that field.

All of us in Montana are proud of his accomplishments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his pertinent remarks.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. HUMPHREY, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN DELAWARE, MARYLAND, GEORGIA, AND MISSOURI

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President,

transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Marshyhope Creek, Delaware and Maryland, Mill Creek, Georgia, Turtle River, Georgia, and Wellington-Napoleon watershed, Missouri (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DRAFTS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO INSPECTION ACTIVITIES UNDER FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION AND HUMANE SLAUGHTER LAWS AND POULTRY PRODUCTS INSPECTION ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting two drafts of proposed legislation, as follows:

1. To provide for collection and deposit of fees and charges for inspection and services under laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat-food products, humane slaughter of animals, and for other purposes; and

2. To amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to require charging of fees, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON UNJUSTIFIED DISPOSAL OF AIRCRAFT PARTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the unjustified disposal of aircraft parts, Department of the Army, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON VETERANS CANTEEN SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the veterans canteen service, Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CERTAIN ASSISTANCE UNDER PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION ACT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on assistance under the Public Works Acceleration Act to areas no longer burdened by substantial unemployment, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON INEFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION AND CONTROL OF TRAVEL ADVANCES AND PURCHASE OF TRANSPORTATION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on ineffective administration and control of travel advances and purchase of transportation, Department of Labor, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY COSTS TO THE GOVERNMENT THROUGH THE LEASING OF CERTAIN ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING SYSTEMS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs to the Government through the leasing of electronic data processing systems by the operating contractor, Aro, Inc., Arnold Engineering Development Center, Arnold Air Force Station, Tenn., Department of the Air Force, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS IN APPRAISAL OF LANDS ON THE THIRD DIVISION OF THE RIVERTON PROJECT, WYOMING

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on negotiations in the appraisal of lands on the third division of the Riverton project,

Wyoming (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN GEORGIA, KANSAS, MAINE, AND OHIO

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on the Hiwassee River, Georgia, Muddy Creek, Kansas, Presque Isle Stream, Maine, and West Fork Duck Creek, Ohio (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

H.R. 11049. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1121).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1186. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands (Rept. No. 1122).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

H.R. 2434. An act to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1123).

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 334); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-eighth Congress, \$5,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 2953. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chong Hyok Un; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2954. A bill for the relief of Jordan V. Peyev; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2955. A bill to amend section 4216 (relating to the definition of price) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 2956. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge

for the district of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 2957. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Joseph C. Sandberg and Anna Marie Sandberg; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 2958. A bill to conserve the human and natural resources of the Nation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

RESOLUTIONS

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 334) providing additional funds for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT WITH ADDITIONAL COPIES A REPORT ENTITLED "MINERALS AND WATER RESOURCES IN NEVADA"

Mr. CANNON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 335); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the report entitled "Mineral and Water Resources in Nevada", prepared by the United States Geological Survey and the Nevada Bureau of Mines, shall be printed as a Senate document. There shall be printed 5,000 additional copies of such Senate document which shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate from the State of Nevada.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4126 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill dealing with the amendment of section 4216 of the Internal Revenue Code. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanation of the purpose of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2955) to amend section 4216 (relating to the definition of price) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, 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 4216(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the determination of "constructive sale price") is amended to read as follows:

- "(b) CONSTRUCTIVE SALE PRICE.—
 "(1) IN GENERAL.—If an article is—
 "(A) sold at retail,
 "(B) sold on consignment, or

"(C) sold (otherwise than through an arm's length transaction) at less than the fair market price,

the tax under this chapter shall (if based on the price for which the article is sold) be computed on the price for which such articles are sold, in the ordinary course of trade, by manufacturers or producers thereof, as determined by the Secretary or his delegate. In the case of an article sold at retail, the computation under the preceding sentence shall be on whichever of the following prices is the lower: (i) the price for which such article is sold, or (ii) the lowest price for which such articles are sold to wholesale distributors, in the ordinary course of trade, by manufacturers or producers thereof, as determined by the Secretary or his delegate. This paragraph shall not apply if paragraph (2) applies.

"(2) SPECIAL RULE.—If an article is sold at retail, to a retailer, or to a special dealer (as defined in paragraph (3)), and if—

"(A) the manufacturer, producer, or importer of such article regularly sells such articles at retail, to retailers, or to special dealers, as the case may be,

"(B) the manufacturer, producer, or importer of such article sells such articles to one or more wholesale distributors (other than special dealers) in arm's length transactions and he establishes that his prices in such cases are determined without regard to any tax benefit under this paragraph,

"(C) in the case of articles upon which tax is imposed under section 4061(a) (relating to automobiles, trucks, etc.), 4191 (relating to business machines), or 4211 (relating to matches), the normal method of sales for such articles within the industry is not to sell such articles at retail or to retailers, or combinations, thereof, and

"(D) the transaction is an arm's length transaction, the tax under this chapter shall (if based on the price for which the article is sold) be computed on whichever of the following prices is the lower: (1) The price for which such article is sold, or (ii) the lowest price for such articles are sold by such manufacturer, producer, or importer to wholesale distributors (other than special dealers).

"(3) SPECIAL DEALER.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the term "special dealer" means a distributor of articles taxable under section 4121 who does not maintain a sales force to resell the article whose constructive price is established under paragraph (2) but relies on salesmen of the manufacturer, producer, or importer of the article for resale of the article to retailers."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The explanation presented by Mr. McCARTHY is as follows:

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT TO SECTION 4216(b) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to further the congressional objective of equalizing the excise tax imposed upon similar articles sold at different levels of distribution by competing manufacturers so as to equalize the tax burden of the ultimate consumer regardless of the mode of distribution.

The manufacturers excise tax is imposed upon the manufacture and sale of certain articles named in chapter 32 of the code. Where sales are made by the manufacturer in what is considered the normal method of distribution—that is, sales to independent wholesale distributors—the tax, in most cases, is imposed upon the price for which articles are sold. However, there are instances in which it is necessary to construct a price because the sale is made outside the normal method of distribution; for example,

sales to retailers, sales at retail to the ultimate consumer, and sales at less than fair market value to a wholly owned selling subsidiary of the manufacturer. For that matter, the tax is also imposed where the manufacturer uses the article rather than selling it. In this case also, of course, it is necessary to construct a price since no price has actually been paid.

This equalization would be accomplished in the case of sales made by a manufacturer directly to retailers or to consumers by providing for a constructive sale price that is comparable to the constructive sale price used by a manufacturer in the case of sales made to a wholly owned sales subsidiary. This constructive price would also be comparable to the tax base used by the manufacturer where a taxable use is made of the article.

The manufacturer's lowest price to independent wholesale distributors has historically been the base used as a constructive price in the case of the tax imposed upon the use of an article by the manufacturer, himself, and, also, in the case of sales by the manufacturer to a wholly owned selling subsidiary. This amendment would accord the same treatment to the manufacturer who sells to retailers or at retail to the ultimate consumer.

It has no purpose other than to achieve this obviously desired goal of uniformity and equality of treatment.

HUMAN AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION ACT OF 1964

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to conserve the human and natural resources of the Nation. Today America faces twin crises: through sheer failure to act we are wasting irreplaceable natural resources at an ever-increasing rate; at the same time there are millions of men who want to work but who cannot find jobs who are wasting their lives in poverty.

I propose we face both crises boldly and that we begin a substantial program to put men to work to conserve our natural resources. Such a program will at the same time conserve the human resources of the Nation.

America must begin at once to make a massive investment at the local, State, and national level to save our natural resources from destruction. If we fail to act in the few years we have left, we could destroy not only the resources which provide much of the beauty and recreation in our life but our most important, lifegiving resources as well—the water we drink and the air we breathe.

Much of our priceless heritage is already lost. The 200 billion board feet of pine in northern Wisconsin, which could have made this area rich forever, is gone, and heartbreak and financial problems have lingered ever since. A substantial percentage of the rivers of the east are also hopelessly polluted, and the dull gray tide of pollution is slowly spreading over the surface waters of America.

The coastlines of America, the greatest recreational and scenic resource that America has, have been largely ruined by the most vulgar types of commercial exploitation or walled off on private ownership that allows public access to only 2 percent of the coastlines. Much of the true wilderness—our last real link

with the world which God created—has been destroyed.

Many of our most beautiful highways have become ugly slums of garish signs and shoddy development.

These resources—gone and never to be replaced—were lost because our optimistic young country believed in what Secretary of the Interior Udall has called "the myth of superabundance." It shocked America to learn that it could run out of timber and land and minerals and scenic vistas and a lot of other things.

Today we face a genuine crisis. To retreat any further threatens America with the kind of resource destruction which turned a green forest into the Sahara Desert, and which made it virtually impossible for China and India to sustain the lives of all their citizens.

Look at some of the chilling facts:

First. Our population is expected to double by the year 2000—which is only 36 years away.

Second. We are presently using water at the rate of 355 billion gallons a day, and encountering serious water shortages in many parts of the Nation. By 1980, experts tell us we will need 600 billion gallons a day—almost twice our present water supply in a scant 17 years, and by the year 2000 we will need almost 900 billion gallons. Meanwhile, the relentless spread of pollution makes more and more water unsuitable for use each day.

Third. Automobiles are creating a nationwide traffic jam which is blighting the landscape of America and chewing up much of the valuable land—land which can never again be used for farms or forests or parks or homesites. The American Automobile Association estimates that our present 68 million passenger cars will increase to 95 million by 1976.

Fourth. The increase in population, in the number of cars and in leisure time is causing a geometric increase in demand on all parks and recreational space. Yet we are making no comparable increase in the amount of space available.

Fifth. Resources for the Future, an outstanding research organization, estimates that there will be 10 times the demand for outdoor recreation in the year 2000 that there was in 1950. The bipartisan report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission estimates that at the very least the overall demand for outdoor recreation will treble.

Sixth. Marion Clawson, the expert who made the study for Resources for the Future, estimates that the present 750,000 acres of city and county parks should be doubled right now, just to meet present demand. By the year 2000, we will need 5 million acres, Clawson estimates. The greatest demand of all—for a major increase in national park lands—simply cannot be met because there is no longer that much additional outstanding land available. The result will simply be more overcrowding—and the more unique, the more desirable an area it is, the more it will be crowded and overused.

The conservation crisis can be briefly summarized: our natural heritage of water, timber, and outdoor recreation

space is disappearing. It is disappearing at the Federal, State, municipal, county, and private level.

Even as we begin to realize the dimensions of this crisis at all levels of endeavor, we are becoming more and more aware of the crisis of poverty in America. The President has shown that at least a fifth of our Nation lives in unacceptable conditions:

First. During 1962 there were 9.3 million families—or 35 million individuals—with family incomes of less than \$3,000.

Second. Three million six hundred thousand of these families were headed by individuals who did not work at any time during the year.

Third. Of the remaining 5.7 million families, the heads of 1.5 million worked at part-time jobs only and 1.8 million work at full-time jobs for less than 50 weeks.

Fourth. Only 2.4 million of the family heads of these families worked full time. There were 6 million people in families with income below \$3,000 who were dependent on family heads unemployed for 5 weeks or more.

These are some dimensions of the poverty crisis. Many members of these families are either too ill or too old to work. But many are not; unemployment or underemployment is a most unnecessary and unacceptable facet of American poverty. There is work to do in this country. Nevertheless, we find men without jobs throughout the Nation.

Unemployment is particularly severe in some regions of the country. In Appalachia, for example, there were 380,000 unemployed worker in 1960—7.1 percent of the total work force. What is worse, there are apparently a number of men who simply have withdrawn from the work force out of despair at ever finding a job—for the number of Appalachians either employed or seeking work is 700,000 less than we would expect if Appalachia followed the normal jobseeking patterns of the Nation.

Unemployment is particularly severe among certain groups; the average migrant farmworker, for example, worked at farm labor for only 161 days in 1962. His average earning from farmwork was \$874; his average earning for all work was \$1,123 per year.

The House Education and Labor Committee estimates that unemployment or underemployment is the major cause of poverty in about half of the 35 million families with incomes of less than \$3,000.

The crisis of conservation and the crisis of poverty are completely complementary: to save our natural resources, much work must be done; to save the impoverished of the Nation, jobs are needed. It seems to me we must put men to work to conserve our natural and human resources.

The obvious and simple logic of such a program is recognized in certain parts of the President's antipoverty legislation. The Equal Opportunity Act of 1964 would use a number of youths and unemployed fathers in experimental programs involving conservation work. But this is only a start. I believe that we should embark upon a massive program which would put

large numbers of unemployed men to work on the vast backlog of constructive conservation projects.

Today, I am introducing a bill to establish a National Conservation Council with broad authority to utilize unemployed men on much needed conservation projects. In its first year, the Council would have authority to spend approximately \$1 billion to employ men throughout the Nation. I estimate that between 100,000 and 125,000 men could be put to work with this amount of money.

This legislation would direct the Chairman of the National Conservation Council to work through existing Federal, State, municipal, and county agencies. It would not involve a new administrative structure. Rather the Council would only supervise a program to be run on the spot by existing agencies at the national and local level.

The most important features of this program are: It can put unemployed, unskilled men to work without further training; it can put the men to work immediately without new administrative structure or new planning; and it will help stem the wasting tide of resource destruction.

What kind of work could be done by unskilled labor?

We could reforest 28 million acres of timberland; embark upon timberstand improvement of another 140 million acres; expand fire protection in another 200 million acres.

We could establish soil and watershed conservation programs on 300 million acres of farmland; embark upon revegetation of the strip mine areas of the Nation.

On western rangelands we could clear brush, spread water and vegetation over 200 million acres of Federal grazing districts and forest service lands.

We could establish and refurbish recreational acres on National and State parks, national forests, and other public lands.

We could establish wildlife habitat and structural improvements on wildlife refuges, expand wildlife cover development on private lands.

The work can be done at all levels of Government activity. The Forest Service, in the Department of Agriculture, estimates that currently there are 70 million acres of unproductive land in need of reforestation by planting and seeding. Another Federal agency, the Department of the Interior, estimates that there are more than 57,000 annual man-years of labor needed in its programs through the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Reclamation, and Bureau of Sport, Fisheries, and Wildlife.

Another Federal agency, the Army Engineers, tells me that a substantial number of workers could be utilized in its programs on public lands. The kinds of work which could be done include: construction of recreational facilities, such as boat launching ramps and docks, buildings, structures, water supply and sanitary systems, safety devices, signs, markers, and so forth; beach improve-

ments, safety devices; landscaping and public use site improvement; roads and parking areas; walks, trails, foot bridges, overlooks, and so forth; shoreline maintenance and improvement.

Fencing recreation areas for exclusion of livestock, construction of cattle guards, and cutting and treating of posts; inspection of fencing; establishing and developing natural areas; timber stand improvement, weeding, thinning, release; roadside cleanup and demonstration areas; establishing fire lanes and protection measures; weed control, cutting and spraying; disease, rodent and pest control, removal, spraying, trapping, cleanup, burning, and so forth; fish and wildlife conservation improvements, small subimpoundments, habitat improvements, food and cover plantings; soil erosion control, drainage improvement, ditching, diking, seeding, sodding, fertilizing, cover planting; establishing nursery stock for landscape plantings; navigation markers and channel improvement for recreational boating; general construction; boundary surveying, monumentation, marking, posting, clearing, maintenance; and collection of basic data on resources and public use.

The kinds of work outlined here for Federal lands can be done on State and local and private lands as well. Indeed, a number of existing Federal programs authorize the use of Federal funds on private lands when there is a substantial public interest. The most obvious example, of course, is the development of watersheds. This necessarily involves the interrelation of both private and public lands. However, much more can be done. The Department of Agriculture informs me that there is a great quantity of work which could be done immediately by unskilled workers in soil and water conservation measures. These include:

Revegetation of critical sediment source areas, including tree planting and permanent grass cover; streambank stabilization, including small stabilizing structures; small impoundments or retardation and sediment reduction; stream channel improvement by brushing, snagging, and minor amounts of cleaning and realining; structural works of improvement for flood prevention, agricultural water management and watershed protection; timber stand improvement practices for thinning, pruning, site preparation, fencing, erosion control on logging roads and trails, firebreaks, ponds for woodland protection, and removal of undesirable vegetation; planting trees for erosion control and forestry purposes; strip mine spoil bank improvement; developing upland area or marshland habitat; providing forage and cover for wildlife habitat; and erosion control measures within the rights-of-way State, county, and township roads.

Beyond these programs there are, of course, countless programs which could be started tomorrow on State, municipal, and county parks. I was amazed to find that there is no reliable inventory of the work which must be done. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the demand for

work greatly exceeds the number of workers available.

I have written to more than 2,000 State, county, and city officials asking them what kinds of projects are urgently needed. The response has been tremendous. From all over the Nation, I have received letters such as this one from Mr. Horace Caldwell, Director of the Department of State Parks in Georgia:

The legislation which you are drafting to provide funds to Federal, State, county, and municipal agencies to utilize unemployed workers on conservation projects such as park development, etc., would be of considerable help in improving and expanding the facilities of the Georgia State Parks.

The program that you are suggesting seems to be the type of program that State parks departments might certainly use to good advantage in the elimination of unemployment in so many of our distressed areas. The work that we could give these people is of a nature that could be performed without any additional training on their part.

We think that by expanding the facilities of our State parks, tourism can be increased considerably in those areas and many new jobs can be created: jobs in building campsites, picnic areas, parking lots, trails, fishing lakes, and restrooms. Construction alone in these areas could provide many years' work for many of the skilled, semiskilled, and even unskilled workmen.

As the jobs are completed, operations and maintenance would then begin. In the visitors' season people are needed to provide basic services such as garbage collection, cleaning, checkin and checkout, fire prevention, concession operation, water safety, etc. Considerable maintenance would also be needed in the off season.

The Pennsylvania State Forester, R. C. Wible, has written me:

We are convinced that legislation which would put the unemployed to work would go far in providing constructive conservation projects for our State.

The State Forester of North Carolina, Mr. F. H. Claridge, has written:

It is my belief that there exists a real need for the work which can be accomplished by an adequate labor force and we would be most happy to have such projects underway.

The regional park manager of the Allegany State Park Commission of New York, Mr. Leigh J. Batterson, writes:

I can say that we can utilize many workers for an unlimited time on such projects as park development, roadside improvement, timber stand improvement, et cetera, without very extensive preparation provided funds, supervision, and transportation for the workers are made available.

Mr. Norman S. Johnson, director of the California Department of Parks and Recreation, writes:

Our preliminary investigation reveals that we can productively use an extensive labor force on minimum and primary improvements to major regional park facilities throughout our jurisdiction.

In my own State of Wisconsin, the conservation department has 170,000 man-months of vital, constructive work that could be initiated immediately on the State lands. We have no idea of the amount of work which could be done on the city and county parks in Wisconsin. Nevertheless my correspondence shows at

least one index of the tremendous backlog which exists.

Not only do we know that there is much work to do, but we know that practical programs can be started immediately. This is no question of mere theory. Under the Accelerated Public Works Act, a number of similar programs were undertaken. We have a record of amazing success. The hard evidence shows that the jobs can be done, that they can be started immediately, that they can produce great results in conserving both human and natural resources.

In fiscal year 1963, for example, 650 men were at work on the Superior National Forest in Minnesota under the APW program. The total work during the first 8 months of the program amounted to 2,860 man-months of labor. Without the program, it is estimated that possibly two-thirds of the men hired would have been on relief rolls. This new source of employment began within 24 hours of receipt of APW allocations. Men were ready and willing to work and began immediately on needed conservation projects.

Accelerated public works funds were made available to the national forests in West Virginia on October 29, 1962. Laborers were recruited the following day and by the end of the second week, 156 men were employed. During the period November 1962 through June 30, 1963, a total of 786 man-months of employment were provided. All of the laborers were from rural areas.

In New Mexico, the third day after the receipt of APW funds, 117 men were at work on the Rio Grande Gorge Recreation area.

Such examples prove the practical feasibility of the program. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has tried similar experiments with similar success. In December 1963, Kentucky received a grant to put unemployed fathers to work. By February of 1964, the Kentucky Legislature had authorized the expansion of the limited program to include 39 hard-hit east Kentucky counties.

At the State level, Mr. J. M. Wedemeyer, the director of the California State Social Welfare Department, recently told the House Labor and Education Committee that a similar California program has had amazing success:

No effort launched in the welfare field for achieving constructive results has had as favorable an impression publicly as the adoption of the work experience and training program. The recipients as well have responded favorably.

Not only is there work to be done, workers to do it, and a backlog of experience showing the practicality of such programs, but there is evidence that the program is money saving—not money using. Any investment in conservation has a great payback value. To save our water, to invest in our timber, and to develop our recreational areas, is not to waste money but to conserve it. Though the point is obvious, the Department of Agriculture submitted valuable information on this subject which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last year. Estimating that there are over 300,000 man-years of development work on the

national forest alone that could be done, the Department went on to state:

The direct financial revenues to the Treasury from the national forest, if all of this work was accomplished, would rise to over \$200 million annually by 1972. Payments from national forest revenues for county schools and roads would increase correspondingly. The capital value of the timber, forage, and lands of the national forests would increase by about \$2 billion.

The timber stand improvement and reforestation work would contribute materially to a long-term investment resulting in timber production of 21 billion board feet of sawtimber annually by the year 2000, worth \$350 million annually in timber sales.

In addition to direct financial income to the United States as a result of national forest development, there will be both substantial secondary benefits and very real intangible benefits. Secondary benefits include such things as numbers of people employed directly on the program work and the harvesting of national forest timber and other products and the value added to those products by manufacturer, distribution, and marketing.

In timber alone, it is estimated that for every dollar of national forest stumpage sold, the end products will be worth about \$20 by the time they reach the ultimate consumer. The estimated employment directly associated with the utilization of timber harvested from the national forests will amount to about 800,000 man-years annually by 1972. This will be more than twice the current level.

Development of the recreation facilities on national forests would serve the recreationists who will be putting into trade channels by 1972, \$1.5 billion for sporting equipment, transportation, licenses, lodging, and other items.

Development and improvement of the small and big game habitat and fishing waters by a youth conservation corps would increase the use of many national forest areas by hunters and fishermen. It is estimated that fishermen and hunters spend about \$10 for each man-day visit to national forests. Increase of this use through improvement of the wildlife habitat would put a large share of this man-day expenditure into the local economy.

Of the reservoir of national forest work available to a youth conservation corps program and the resultant total benefits, the following examples indicate possible benefits attributable to the program.

On a national average, recreationists spend about \$5.50 per person-trip day. It is estimated that national forest recreation visitors spend about half of this average, or about \$2.50 per man-day. Every family recreation unit constructed by a youth corps on the national forests, at an approximate cost of \$1,000 per unit, would return approximately \$1,060 annual expenditures by recreationists into the local economy in a year or two. It is estimated that a youth corps of 15,000 enrollees could construct at least 12,000 family recreation units annually, which would return approximately \$12 billion into the local economy in a year or two.

Millions of acres of young growth timber stands on the national forests or on timber stands partially or completely denuded by fire, insects, diseases, or other causes will, when culturally treated, return \$5,000 or more in 10 years on a \$3,000 investment. There are nearly 30 million acres of national forest lands in need of such treatment. A 15,000 Youth Corps could accomplish about 2,000 man-years or \$7 million worth of work annually. This would return about \$11.7 million annually in 10 years.

Similar benefits can be indicated in wildlife habitat improvement to increase use of many national forest areas by sportsmen; watershed restoration to stabilize soil, improve streamflows, and enhance water

quality; insect and disease control to prevent annual losses in timber of about \$94 million annually; and forest road and trail maintenance and construction to increase public use and access to resources.

This kind of information—and much more which is readily available—shows that an investment to put men to work on conservation projects is a sound one. But I believe this is only one justification for such a program.

Today America is faced by twin crises: we are losing natural resources which cannot be replaced and we are losing millions of man-years of labor which disappear each day that men lie idle. The crises of conservation and of poverty should not and cannot be ignored. We have work to do and men to do the work. I propose we face our responsibilities boldly and embark upon a creative new program.

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

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

S. 2958

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Human and Resource Conservation Act of 1964".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. Throughout the United States, the wise development, conservation, and utilization of our natural resources requires an immediate and urgent effort. Much useful work can be accomplished on Federal lands and on State, county, and city parks, recreational areas and other lands. The development of recreational areas, path and park development, conservation of stream beds and the forestlands are only a few of the countless projects which command attention. At the same time, there are substantial numbers of men, many of whom have little education and poorly developed skills, who are unemployed. The longer these men are left idle, are unable to find useful work, the deeper they will become entrenched in a cycle of poverty. The United States can achieve its full economic and social potential as a nation only if its natural resources are conserved and every individual has the opportunity to obtain useful employment and to develop his capabilities. It is, therefore, the policy of the United States to provide a program to conserve both the natural and human resources of the Nation by putting unemployed men to work on constructive conservation projects and, where necessary, to provide training which can help these men develop their potential skills and capabilities to higher levels. It is the purpose of this Act to strengthen, supplement, and coordinate efforts in furtherance of this policy by assisting to carry out programs in the fields of conservation and the development of natural resources and recreational areas by providing useful work for unemployed men and, where necessary, offering new work training programs to increase the employability and education of these men.

NATIONAL HUMAN AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION COUNCIL

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a National Human and Resource Conservation Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") which shall be composed of a representative from each of the Departments of Defense, Interior, Agriculture, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare to be appointed by the head of the department

and a representative from the Office of Economic Opportunity to be appointed by the Director of such office. Members serving on the Council under the provisions of this subsection shall receive no additional compensation for such service but shall be reimbursed for travel and other necessary expenses in carrying out such service. The Council shall consult with and advise the Chairman, appointed pursuant to subsection (b), in carrying out his functions, including coordination with all segments of the Federal Government.

(b) The Chairman of the Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Chairman") shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. He shall administer the provisions of this Act, and shall be compensated at the rate of \$20,500 per annum.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 (b) of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1332-3(b)), at any time after one year from the date of enactment of this Act, the President may, by complying with the provisions of such Act, provide for the transfer of the functions of the Chairman to such other official of the executive branch of the Government as he deems appropriate.

FUNCTIONS

Sec. 4. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Chairman shall assist and cooperate with State and local and Federal agencies in the planning and execution of projects he deems to be useful, for the conservation and development of natural resources. For this purpose, the Chairman is authorized to enter into agreements providing for payment out of funds appropriated for the purpose of this Act of such part of the costs, as he determines in accordance with section 5, of State, local, and Federal programs submitted hereunder if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe that,

(1) the program will contribute to the conservation, development, or management of natural resources of a State or community or the Nation or to the development, management, or protection of State, community, or Federal recreational areas;

(2) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services;

(3) the rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee;

(4) to the maximum extent feasible, the program will be coordinated with vocational training and other educational services sponsored by State or local public educational agencies, and where such services are inadequate or unavailable, the program may make a provision for the enlargement, improvement, development, or coordination of such services, with the cooperation of, or where appropriate pursuant to agreement with, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and

(5) the program includes standards and procedures for the selection of applicants for employment, including provisions assuring full coordination and cooperation with State and local authorities, to insure that such applicants are from individuals deemed by the Chairman to be long term unemployed or existing in conditions of poverty.

LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Sec. 5. Funds provided under the provisions of this Act for any program shall not exceed 75 per centum of the cost of such program except—

(1) in areas of unusual poverty, as determined by the Chairman, where such maximum per centum shall be 90 per centum; and

(2) where funds authorized in this Act are used in accordance with the provisions of this Act to assist a program under Federal law other than this Act, such funds authorized in this Act shall not exceed 50 per centum of the Federal funds used for such program.

EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

Sec. 6. The Chairman shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this Act among the States. In developing such criteria, he shall consider among other relevant factors population, unemployment, and family income levels. Not more than 12½ per cent of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this Act shall be used within any one State.

GENERAL AUTHORITY

Sec. 7. (a) In order to carry out his functions under the provisions of this Act, the Chairman may—

(1) appoint in accordance with the civil service laws such personnel as may be necessary, and fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.);

(2) employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), compensate individuals so employed at rates not in excess of \$100 per diem, including travel time, and allow them, while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed, but contracts for such employment may be renewed annually;

(3) appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, one or more advisory committees composed of such private citizens and officials of the Federal, State, and local governments as he deems desirable to advise him with respect to his functions under this act, and compensate the members of such committees in the same manner provided in section 8(b);

(4) with the approval of the President, arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal agencies for the performance of any of his functions under this Act, and, as necessary or appropriate, delegate any of his powers under this Act and authorize the redelegation thereof;

(5) utilize, with their consent, the services and facilities of Federal agencies without reimbursement, and, with the consent of any State or a political subdivision of a State, accept and utilize the services and facilities of the agencies of such State or subdivision without reimbursement;

(6) accept in the name of the Council, and employ or dispose of in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, any money or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, received by gift, devise, bequest, or otherwise;

(7) accept voluntary and uncompensated services, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679(b) of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665(b));

(8) allocate and expend, or transfer to other Federal agencies for expenditure, funds made available under this Act as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions hereof, including (without regard to the provisions of section 4774(d) of title 10, United States Code) expenditures for construction, repairs, and capital improvements;

(9) disseminate, without regard to the provisions of section 321n of title 39, United States Code, data and information, in such form as he shall deem appropriate, to public agencies, private organizations, and the general public; and

(10) establish such policies, standards, criteria, and procedures, prescribe such rules

and regulations, enter into such contracts and agreements with public agencies and private organizations and persons, make such payments (in lump sum or installment, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in the case of grants, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments), and generally perform such activities and take such steps as he may deem to be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) To the maximum extent feasible, the Chairman shall administer programs developed pursuant to this Act through existing Federal agencies and utilize personnel within such agencies.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

Sec. 8. (a) There is hereby established a National Advisory Council on the Human and Resource Conservation Act (hereinafter referred to as the "Advisory Council"). The Advisory Council shall be composed of the Chairman or his designee, who shall also be Chairman of the Advisory Council, and not more than fourteen additional members appointed by the Chairman without regard to the civil service laws. The appointed members of the Advisory Council shall be persons (including persons from public and voluntary organizations) representing the fields of conservation, agriculture, education, training, youth employment, labor, management, and the public in general. Upon request of the Chairman, the Advisory Council shall review all or any part of the program carried out pursuant to this Act, and shall from time to time make recommendations to the Chairman relative to the execution of his responsibilities under this Act. The Advisory Council shall meet at least twice each year and at such other times as the Chairman may request.

(b) Appointed members of the Advisory Council, while attending meetings of the Advisory Council or otherwise serving at the request of the Chairman, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Chairman, but not exceeding \$75 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. Notwithstanding the foregoing or any other provision of law, the Chairman may accept the services of appointed members under this section without the payment of compensation therefor (and with or without payment of travel expenses or per diem in lieu of subsistence).

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

Sec. 9. There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964, and for each fiscal year thereafter, not in excess of \$1,000,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DEFINITION

Sec. 10. For the purposes of this Act the term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether that is the committee to which the bill would normally be referred?

Mr. NELSON. I do not know. It is a program which involves employing workers in city parks and State areas. It could go to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs or to the Committee

on Labor and Public Welfare. It is preferable that it be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

The bill (S. 2958) to conserve the human and natural resources of the Nation, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964—PRINTING OF BILL WITH HOUSE AMENDMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 6, the mass transit bill, which passed the House yesterday, be ordered printed with the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONSTRUCTION OF TOLL BRIDGES ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1077)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 260) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of certain toll bridges across the Rio Grande. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed, printed in full in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate.

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

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) That the Donna-Rio Bravo Bridge Company of Donna, Texas, is authorized to construct a toll bridge and approaches thereto across the Rio Grande, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Donna, Texas, and for a period of sixty-six years from the date of completion of such bridge, to maintain and operate same and to collect tolls for the use thereof, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters', approved March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 491 to 498, inclusive) subject to—

"(1) the conditions and limitations contained in this Act;

"(2) the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico;

"(3) The approval of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico; and

"(4) the approval of the Commissioners Court of Hidalgo County, Texas; with respect to the construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge.

"(b) The Donna-Rio Bravo Bridge Company may fix and charge tolls for transit over the bridge referred to in subsection 1(a) of this Act in accordance with the laws of the

State of Texas, and the laws of the United States, applicable to such tolls, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed under the authority contained in section 4 of the Act of March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 494).

"(c) The Donna-Rio Bridge Company may sell, assign, transfer, or mortgage the rights, powers, and privileges conferred on such company by this Act to any public agency, or to an international bridge authority or commission, and any such agency, authority, or commission is authorized to exercise the rights, powers, and privileges acquired under this section (including acquisition by mortgage foreclosure) in the same manner as if such rights, powers, and privileges had been granted by this Act directly to such agency, authority, or commission.

"Sec. 2. (a) The Rio Grande Bridge System, of McAllen, Texas, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or bridges and approaches thereto, across the Rio Grande at or near Hidalgo, Texas, and for a period of sixty-six years from the date of completion of any such bridge, to maintain and operate same and to collect tolls for the use thereof, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable water', approved March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 491-498, inclusive), subject to—

"(1) the conditions and limitations contained in this Act;

"(2) the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico;

"(3) the approval of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico; and

"(4) the approval of the Commissioners Court of Hidalgo County, Texas;

with respect to the construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge.

"(b) The Rio Grande Bridge System may fix and charge tolls for transit over the bridges referred to in section 2(a) of this Act in accordance with the laws of the State of Texas, and the laws of the United States, applicable to such tolls, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed under the authority contained in section 4 of the Act of March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 494).

"(c) The Rio Grande Bridge System may sell, assign, transfer, or mortgage the rights, powers, and privileges conferred on such company by this Act to any public agency, or to an international bridge authority or commission, and any such agency, authority, or commission is authorized to exercise the rights, powers, and privileges acquired under this section (including acquisition by mortgage foreclosure) in the same manner as if such rights, powers, and privileges had been granted by this Act directly to such agency, authority, or commission.

"Sec. 3. (a) The Pharr Municipal Bridge Corporation, of Pharr, Texas, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or bridges and approaches thereto, across the Rio Grande at or near Pharr, Texas, and for a period of sixty-six years from the date of completion of any such bridge, to maintain and operate same and to collect tolls for the use thereof, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters', approved March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 491-498, inclusive), subject to—

"(1) the conditions and limitations contained in this Act;

"(2) the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico;

"(3) the approval of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico; and

"(4) the approval of the Commissioners Court of Hidalgo County, Texas;

with respect to the construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge.

"(b) The Pharr Municipal Bridge Corporation may fix and charge tolls for transit over the bridges referred to in section 3(a) of this Act in accordance with the laws of the State of Texas, and the laws of the United States, applicable to such tolls, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed under the authority contained in section 4 of the Act of March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 494).

"(c) The Pharr Municipal Bridge Corporation may sell, assign, transfer, or mortgage the rights, powers, and privileges conferred on such company by this Act to any public agency, or to an international bridge authority or commission, and any such agency, authority, or commission is authorized to exercise the rights, powers, and privileges acquired under this section (including acquisition by mortgage foreclosure) in the same manner as if such rights, power, and privileges had been granted by this Act directly to such agency, authority, or commission.

"Sec. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 496), this Act shall be null and void as to any bridge authorized to be constructed by this Act unless the actual construction of such bridge is commenced within three years and completed within five years from the date of enactment of this Act.

"Sec. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved."

ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1078)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

RESCHEDULING OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDMUND PORT TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the hearing scheduled for Monday, June 29, 1964, on the nomination of Edmund Port, of New York, to be U.S. district judge, northern district of New York, vice Stephen W. Brennan, retired, has been rescheduled for Tuesday, June 30, 1964, at 10 a.m., in room 2228 New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

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

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

By Mr. CHURCH:
Statement by him on the Basque people of Idaho.

**SENATOR McCLELLAN'S ADDRESS
AT DEDICATION OF NEW CHANCERY
OF UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA IN MEXICO CITY**

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to have been a member of the small delegation for the dedication of our newly completed Chancery of the United States of America in Mexico City. The dedication was held on Saturday, June 20, and the principal speaker for the occasion was the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, JOHN L. McCLELLAN. Since Senator McCLELLAN is chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of State, it was most appropriate for him to dedicate this building. Other distinguished Members of the Senate comprising the delegation were Senators E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska, and B. EVERETT JORDAN, of North Carolina.

I am happy to report that this new chancery is a most impressive building and has been widely accepted by the Mexican people as well as by those Americans who have had the opportunity to see it. It is a permanent symbol of the affection between the United States of America and our host neighbors to the south, the United Mexican States.

I should like to insert in its entirety in the RECORD the brief speech delivered by Senator McCLELLAN. I should also like to express my own appreciation and that of the Congress to those who gave of their energy and technical ability to plan and construct this building.

I refer particularly to Southwestern Architects-Engineers, of Texas, headed by Mr. Max Brooks and Mr. L. W. Pitts, and to the Constructora Marhnos, headed by Messrs. Nicholas and Mariano Mariscal, who were prime contractors for the building. Included also are the artisans and all the workers who made erection of this building possible. Ambassador Fulton A. Freeman and his entire Embassy staff of Americans and Mexicans are to be congratulated for the energy and devotion they displayed to make the dedication ceremony a great success. Similar mention should be made of the other members of the delegation, including Messrs. Merrick and Gonzalez of our own staff, and the official State Department delegation headed by Assistant Secretary Dwight J. Porter and Deputy Assistant Secretaries James R. Johnstone and Verne B. Lewis, who accompanied Senator McCLELLAN and the other Senators and who contributed toward the success of the official opening of the American chancery.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

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

ADDRESS OF SENATOR JOHN L. McCLELLAN
AT THE DEDICATION OF THE CHANCERY OF
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, MEXICO
CITY, JUNE 20, 1964

Mr. Master of Ceremonies, my first visit to Mexico was some 2½ years ago. That visit proved to be most instructive and beneficial in gaining a better understanding of the Mexican Government and the aspirations of the Mexican people. It was a real joy and

privilege to be here then, and I am highly pleased and happy to be here again today.

It is a great pleasure, indeed, to welcome you to this ceremony. We are honored to have you present at the dedication of this, our new American Embassy. With keen anticipation and intense satisfaction, we have long looked forward to this most delightful and gratifying occasion.

Citizens of the United States and Mexico, working together, have constructed this building. Together they have made engineering history. We are all mindful of the challenge that Mexico City presents to architects and engineers. The foundation of this building rests on mud and water, 30 feet deep, but it is as secure as Torre Latinoamericana, which, as you know, has weathered earthquakes since it was built without losing so much as a windowpane.

We are proud of this building, proud of its marble-faced beauty which reflects the grandeur of this city, proud of its design which so artfully blends Mexican and North American cultures, and proud that it represents the achievements of Mexico, achievements as old as the pyramid of Cuicuilco, not far from here, and as new as the modern progress that is present all about us.

This is a pride that we of the United States share with you. It was only with the help of Mexicans that this Embassy now stands, or I might more aptly say floats, on the subsoil of Mexico City. The foundation for the building was ingeniously devised by Dr. Leonardo Zeevaert, as you well know, an outstanding Mexican structural engineer. It was Dr. Zeevaert who adapted the splendid architectural plans of Max Brooks and Skeets Pitts, associates of the Southwest Architects & Engineers firm of Houston, Tex., to the subsoil and seismic conditions of Mexico City.

The joint ingenuity of Mexicans and Americans met this challenge. There were setbacks, but the work went on, and the task was finished. I am sure the Constructora Marhnos of Mexico City must be proud of its accomplishment.

Let us draw inspiration today, then, not from the grandeur of this building alone, but from the fact that it was built here despite the natural obstacles that stood in the way. Let us draw inspiration from the fact that here a challenge was boldly met, so that we can turn our eyes to the greater challenges that face us in this hemisphere and which are being met by the Organization of American States and the Alliance for Progress. Let us continue to meet these challenges with the same spirit, determination, and mutual cooperation that made the construction of this Embassy possible.

Let this Embassy, therefore, be dedicated to the true spirit of the Alliance for Progress, for we must remember that the Alliance for Progress will be successful only if it is kept a venture of lasting partnership. Mexico and the United States have long demonstrated that we can be partners in progress. We have long demonstrated how countries should work and live together in peace.

The resources of the United States can provide help, perhaps that margin of help which will make the difference between success and failure. But the United States, itself, cannot do the whole job, nor even the major part of it. Progress is and must be of mutual concern; it must be a joint effort, just as was the construction of this building.

Mexico has already shown the way for our sister republics in this great hemisphere. As President Kennedy recognized in the joint communique issued at the end of his visit to Mexico in 1962—"the fundamental goal of the Mexican Revolution is the same as that of the Alliance for Progress—social justice and economic progress within the

framework of individual freedom and political liberty."

You have shown what a country can do when it really sets its mind to the task of raising the standards of living of its people.

You have opened the doors of your universities to hundreds of Latin Americans who seek to learn new techniques and to perfect old ones. In addition, our two countries have developed a joint program in which the United States provided transportation and Mexico the training for some 300 Latin Americans last year under the Alliance for Progress. Our universities are working with yours in research and study programs which are of mutual benefit.

Today, education is the largest single item in your budget. Surely you have set an example for all in this hemisphere to follow by adding a new schoolroom every 2 hours in your continuing campaign to wipe out illiteracy.

Your gross national product has increased almost five times since 1930. Your per capita income has more than doubled. You have distributed over 100 million acres of land.

Your research in basic food crops has not only materially increased your own production but has helped to provide a better life for people in other countries. Your Government is making a continuing effort to achieve a technological revolution in agriculture. It has provided not only land but also credit, technical knowledge, and other needed assistance to the farmer.

Last year Mexico modified its banking laws and took other steps to launch a major attack on housing problems. Mexico requested the Inter-American Bank and the Agency for International Development to cooperate under the Alliance for Progress. We joined forces in a program that will cost almost a billion pesos. With this program, Mexico should, in a few years, reduce its housing shortage to manageable proportions.

You have achieved what our Secretary of State has called the "miracle of Mexico," and it gives us, and it should give all Latin America, confidence that the goals of the Alliance for Progress are attainable if each member country will only meet its commitments and responsibilities.

There are many reasons for your success, and there is much that other members of the Alliance for Progress can learn from Mexico's experience.

Mexico has set its own national objectives and sought to achieve them with its own resources. Your efforts have shown that if the Alliance is to be a success, each country must carry the heaviest part of its own burden.

One of the chief criticisms of the Alliance for Progress is that some Latin American countries have not fully accepted the responsibility for their own economic and social welfare. Instead, they have relied too heavily on others to provide the resources that create the essential conditions for development. This criticism, however, cannot be directed to Mexico.

Mexico has already proved its self-confidence and determination. But, undoubtedly, much remains to be done. You in Mexico realize this, and so do we, as we endeavor to face up to our own problems in the United States.

As President Johnson said in Los Angeles, Calif., a few months ago, "So long as there remains a man without a job, a family without a roof, a child without a school, we have much to do. Our permanent revolution is dedicated to broadening for all Americans, the material and the spiritual benefits of the democratic heritage."

Democratic institutions should be strengthened, private enterprise should be fostered and allowed to operate without undue and unnecessary restrictions. Educational systems must be further developed and expanded.

The spirit of friendship and cooperation that unites our peoples makes it possible for us to do this.

In this Embassy, Mexicans and Americans will work together in cooperation and understanding. Here U.S. officials who handle economic, cultural, and political matters will meet with their Mexican associates on projects of mutual interest and joint concern. Here we will receive citizens of Mexico who contemplate visiting the United States, as well as our own citizens who have business to transact with the Mexican Government and the Mexican people.

The official home that we have constructed and dedicate here today is a striking symbol of what can be done by our two countries in joint ventures and in mutual cooperation and friendship.

Some people may be greatly disappointed, because the Alliance for Progress has not achieved the new millennium in 3 short years. No doubt many obstacles and delays in this program will be encountered. But these should not be a cause for despair. They should simply stimulate and inspire us to a firmer resolve to get on with the tasks of economic and social development. For, as President Johnson remarked at the Mexican Embassy in May of last year:

"From the unity achieved through the Organization of American States through the new sense of common purpose arising from the Alliance for Progress—we can believe now that a new day is dawning in the New World. It is a day of unity, a day of cooperation, a day of joint efforts and mutual purpose dedicated to freedom, to social justice, and to universal peace."

"In the fulfillment of this new day," the President said, "we of the United States recognize and believe that the relations between our country and our great next door neighbor, the Republic of Mexico, will always be vital and decisive to the destiny of the hemisphere and of the world."

Long live Mexico, our good neighbor!

May the example of mutual friendship, and the unswerving dedication of our two countries to the cause of peace and justice, ever inspire other nations and peoples throughout the world to march in unison with us toward the realization of this the highest goal and noblest aspiration of all mankind.

GOVERNOR HATFIELD: "NO" TO FARM LABOR FREEDOMS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute longer than the usual 3 minutes.

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

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon State Committee on Children and Youth is sponsoring the Oregon Youth Harvest Corps which is being created to help harvest crops in Oregon this summer. The Youth Harvest Corps will be a clearinghouse to make work available to young people and to provide fruit and vegetable growers with a supply of harvesters.

Teams of teenage boys and girls will be transported, under adult supervision, to farms where workers are needed. Growers provide suitable housing and recreation while the teams prepare their own meals and do their own housekeeping. The Governor of Oregon, Mark O. Hatfield, has enthusiastically endorsed this program.

But it was with regret and even amazement that I noted Governor Hatfield's advocacy of an extension of Public Law

78, allowing the continued importation of Mexican braceros into this country. This law, which was enacted in an emergency period following World War II, has been thoroughly scrutinized by both Houses of Congress and considered unnecessary. The U.S. Labor Department has supported its repeal. It is unconscionable that Oregonians so enlightened in social problems should desire the continuance of a program that prevents normal economic forces from working in the agricultural labor market and which permits trafficking in human beings as if they were commodities to be bought and sold in a fluctuating market.

The human equation of the migrant and bracero program has been poignantly described in a Senate report of 1960:

The migrant and his family are lonely wanderers on the face of our land. They are living testimonials to the poverty and neglect that is possible even in our healthy and dynamic democracy that prides itself on its protection and concern for the individual. Behind the screen of statistics, showing migrant laborers toiling for as little as 50 cents an hour, and working only 131 days a year, we see families crowded into shelters that are more like coops for animals, with children undernourished and in poor health, 2 or 3 years behind in school, with little chance to fully develop their talents and become useful to themselves and their country. This is the ugliest kind of human waste. The plight of the migrant families is a charge on the conscience of all of us.

The agricultural editor of the Portland Oregonian, reporting the activities of the Governor's symposium on agricultural labor, wrote that those attending the symposium of the Governor adopted a resolution asking for continued importation of Mexican braceros, and this resolution was some weeks later forwarded to me by the Governor. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the articles, the resolution, and the covering letter from the Governor.

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

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, May 14, 1964]

HATFIELD GIVES HELP TO BRACERO MEASURE (By Joe Bianco)

Gov. Mark O. Hatfield Wednesday called for the formation of a statewide committee to cope with what may be a serious farm labor shortage. At the same time, the Governor endorsed a move to seek the extension of the controversial Mexican farm labor law which expires December 31.

The Governor established his position on the measure in an address to the opening session of a 2-day symposium on agricultural labor in Oregon. The conference, sponsored by the Oregon department of employment, was at the Mayflower Farms Building in Portland.

The symposium, the first of its kind on the Mexican farm labor situation, was to examine the complexities of the farm labor problem in Oregon and the relationship with the Mexican farm labor bill, known as Public Law 78, an amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949.

CONCERN EXPRESSED

Hatfield expressed concern with what may develop in the State's second largest industry if measures are not taken to recruit

farm replacements. Although Oregon uses only 300 Mexican nationals or braceros during peak of harvest it depends on some 19,000 interstate migrants to help farmers pick and plant crops, he said.

The bulk of Mexican farmworkers are employed by California growers, and it was reported that the absence of these workers there will create a greater demand for domestic farm labor, said the Governor. Many growers in Oregon are of the opinion that the demand for domestic farmworkers will keep the interstate migrants in California, thereby reducing a source of supply for farmers here.

Hatfield said, "we don't believe these migrants will come here when they can find jobs closer to their homes." He said the migrant can remain in California and work 10 to 11 months a year, while in Oregon farm work is available from 5 to 6 months.

Hatfield said Public Law 78 has had its advantages in that it has made jobs available to Mexicans and there has developed a better understanding between the two countries. He also pointed to the advantage of the law as a deterrent to communism.

The Governor said the State department of employment has accelerated its recruitment program here and in other States to fill the gap that may occur if Public Law 78 dies. He said efforts are underway to enlist the aid of youth corps and student platoons to assist in the harvest as well as the planting. There also are some 230,000 teenagers in Oregon who represent a possible labor supply source, said Hatfield.

A speaker, who took an opposite view, was Frank A. Potter, director of farm activities, U.S. Department of Labor.

"I'm not so sure that the loss of Public Law 78 will affect Oregon. I think that Oregon which has not used many braceros, has during the years been able to develop a sound base for recruiting interstate migrants," said Potter. He said migrants, who have worked in Oregon, will come back because of the good conditions which exist here. Potter said Oregon ranks third in the Nation in wages paid to farm laborers.

He did approve the Governor's recommendation for a committee to study the migrant problem. He suggested the committee concentrate on obtaining a domestic labor force because he felt the Mexican farm labor bill will not be extended. He told the conference that migrants will come to Oregon or any other State if wages are fair, housing good, and transportation adequate.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, May 15, 1964]

FARM INTERESTS PLEAD FOR LABOR IMPORTS (By Joe Bianco)

All segments of agriculture Thursday joined ranks to recruit farm labor and seek the passage of Federal legislation to import foreign labor.

The action was taken at the closing session of the symposium on agricultural labor sponsored by the Oregon Department of Employment. The move by the representatives of agriculture was virtually an endorsement of a move initiated Wednesday in the opening address to the symposium by Gov. Mark O. Hatfield. The conference was at the Mayflower Farms Building.

The ranks of agriculture seek an alternate to the source of farm labor which they believe will be cut off when the Mexican farm labor bill dies December 31. An agricultural committee to study the problem of migrant labor was formed under the temporary chairmanship of Dunbar Carpenter, a Medford pear grower.

It will be the committee's job to represent the growers and assist the National Council of Agricultural Employers. The growers at the symposium also favored the passage of new national legislation to import foreign

workers or extend the present law until such time as a new measure was enacted.

The growers were of the opinion that foreign farm laborers would always be needed for harvesting or planting.

This, too, was the belief of an earlier speaker, G. C. Henry, manager of employment and labor relations, California Packing Corp.

Henry said growers should seek new legislation to import foreign workers. He explained that domestic workers living in an industrial society will not and cannot compete efficiently with those workers, who are of an agrarian background. "For this reason," Henry said, "efforts must be made to recruit the foreign worker." He said the long run projection is that foreign workers will be used in agriculture and that in the interim growers will have to accept the domestic replacements.

Henry said American agriculture has its roots in the foreign laborer who was brought to this country to help with the tilling and picking. Henry said mechanization will never eliminate entirely the need for workers. The California executive said the domestic worker wants something better and is influenced by the rewards of the industrial society. "It is that reason which will take him from the farm to the factory," said Henry.

Other members of the newly formed committee were Don Curtis, The Dalles; Ross Hukari, Hood River; Everett Taylor, Ontario; Walter Collett, Salem; Orlo Carver, Milton-Freewater; Henry Kato, Portland; and Howard Fujii, Salem.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
STATE CAPITOL,
Salem, Oreg., June 4, 1964.

The Honorable MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MAURINE: On May 14 this office sponsored a meeting of agricultural leaders to study the problem of supply of agricultural labor. The meeting was well attended and the problems were thoroughly aired. A resolution was adopted which expresses the point of view of those present. I am enclosing a copy of that resolution. It would be appreciated if your attention could be directed to the resolution and to action on the problem which is outlined.

Sincerely yours,

MARK,
Governor.

RESOLUTION BY AGRICULTURE PRODUCERS ATTENDING THE GOVERNOR'S SYMPOSIUM ON AGRICULTURAL LABOR IN OREGON, MAY 14, 1964

Whereas the economy of the State of Oregon would suffer serious injury if an adequate supply of farm labor is not available to harvest fruits and vegetables promptly as they mature, which must be done to assure peak quality for distribution and processing; and

Whereas loss of any portion of such crops would result in loss of employment for workers who pack and process such crops and create loss to the suppliers of paper, cans, cartons, and boxes, and their employees for the shipping of such products and to many other segments of the economy of this State, and

Whereas Oregon farmers and the Oregon State Employment Service have made and will continue to make every effort to recruit sufficient domestic farm labor to properly harvest and handle such crops at the peak seasons, such labor has not been available and there has been a continuing need for supplemental foreign laborers at such times, and experience shows supplemental foreign farm labor will be needed in the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the agricultural interests of the State of Oregon, That we recommend

to the Government of the United States and to the U.S. Department of Labor that legislation be enacted under which necessary foreign laborers can be admitted into the United States for the period beginning January 1, 1965, after the expiration of Public Law 78 and in the event such legislation is not developed and passed by December 31, 1964, that Public Law 78 be extended to allow time for the enactment of the necessary legislation.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the argument for the decision of the symposium appears to be based on these two assumptions: first, the abolition of the bracero program will open up crop work in areas closer to the domestic migrants' homes than Oregon and thus Oregon growers will not be able to recruit enough domestic workers for their needs; second, Public Law 78 is of great benefit to Mexico.

The crux of the resolution is the statement that domestic migrant labor has not been available and therefore there is a continuing need for foreign laborers. Let us examine these arguments in turn:

Putting aside the issue of what home is to a migrant family, it is instructive to note the experience of a farm placement officer in California, the State so feared by the writers and supporters of this resolution. As quoted in the July 21, 1962, issue of the California Farmer:

Twelve States sent representatives to woo workers to their respective States, and would you know it, we just don't compete with the other States wanting the domestic migrants.

Almost all the migrant housing in California is designated for the single male worker. We just don't have family housing units.

Another thing California came up short in was this business of transportation. An Idaho representative was there with \$17,000 in cash. In addition to offering family housing and \$1.25 per hour, he was passing out the "long green" on the spot to pay for transportation in advance to Idaho. He says those that will take money and then not report are nil.

When the Mexican national program is dropped and California has to go out and actively compete for these available domestics, some changes are going to be necessary.

It would appear from this statement that California has more to fear from the attractions of Oregon than vice versa. The State of Washington is not dissimilar to Oregon in its crop demands, yet its example is instructive. Representatives of the Washington State Employment Service and of grower associations have conducted a vigorous and active recruitment campaign of migrants in Texas and California during the off-season, offering good wages, amenities, and money for transportation. Oregon has done exactly the same. The experience of Washington has been so good that it has not used any braceros for the last 3 years. On the basis of the experience of those close to the operating picture, the advice to the Governor's symposium by Mr. Frank Potter of the Department of Labor appears to be sound: "Migrants will come to Oregon or any other State if wages are fair, housing good, and transportation adequate."

The argument that the bracero program "has developed a better under-

standing between the two countries and is a deterrent to communism" must have been plucked from thin air. Only last year when I spoke of the bracero program in a speech to the Senate I included some rather pointed data from the Department of Labor on bracer discrimination in this country. This discrimination did anything but improve relations between the two countries. Rather than assume Mexican reaction to the program, some members of the House Agriculture Committee sought out Mexican opinion on this question, and the following is an extract from their report to the House:

Many Mexican leaders, especially among the Mexican clergy, are willing to do without (Public Law 78) because they believe the migration of hundreds of thousands of men each year causes harm to the family structure and village life. Many leaders of democratic parties and groups in Mexico are worried because the bracero program provides the far left, the Castro supporters, such an excellent weapon.

Apparently there are those responsible figures in Mexico who do not share the enthusiasm of Governor Hatfield for the benefits of the bracero program as a Good Neighbor influence or as a deterrent to communism.

Turning now to the resolution, the third paragraph reads as follows:

Whereas, Oregon farmers and the Oregon State Employment Service have made and will continue to make every effort to recruit sufficient domestic farm labor to properly harvest and handle such crops at the peak seasons, such labor has not been available and there has been a continuing need for supplemental foreign laborers at such times, and experience shows supplemental foreign farm labor will be needed in the future.

A question immediately arises. How can there be such a crying need for braceros in Oregon if, contrary to the over 300 estimate of the Governor, only 67 braceros were employed last year compared to the 19,000 domestic migrant workers in Oregon. A reason often cited for the preference for braceros over our own domestic laborers is that the former are the only ones that will do stoop work. But the 67 braceros in Oregon last year were used for the pear harvest, which hardly qualifies as stoop work. Could it be a conflict of interest when the committee deciding on the use of Mexican farmworkers in Oregon, as recommended by Governor Hatfield, is headed by Mr. Dunbar Carpenter, of Medford? Mr. Carpenter is director of the Jackson County Fruit Growers League, the sole user of braceros in Oregon last year.

Nowhere is there any indication of an awareness that the bracero program is a national problem. The United States imported 187,000 Mexican workers last year at a time when our number of unemployed was in excess of 4 million. What an extraordinary picture this presents. At the very time that automation and mechanization are reducing the number of jobs available in agriculture, we are asked to continue the recruiting of hundreds of thousands of foreign workers of an unskilled character to do unskilled work.

Last fall the Oregon Journal carried the following editorial endorsing the end of the bracero program:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bracero Law Deserves To Die," which was published in the Oregon Journal on Thursday, October 31, 1963.

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

BRACERO LAW DESERVES TO DIE

One of those Federal programs begun as an emergency measure in World War II and continued until it almost seems immortal comes up for renewal in the House of Representatives this week. It is the law under which Mexican farm laborers are imported under U.S. Labor Department supervision to work on farms in the United States, and it is time the program was ended.

It simply does not make sense to be bringing nearly 200,000 foreign nationals a year into this country for temporary jobs, and then shipping them back to Mexico again, at a time when thousands of American farm laborers are out of work and there is an increasing shortage of jobs which unskilled workers can do.

More than two-thirds of the Mexican "braceros" work in the cottonfields of Texas and the fruit and vegetable farms of California. Oregon is the only Northwest State where braceros have been employed in recent years, and here the only place they are used is in the pear harvest around Medford. As many as 367 have been brought into the Medford area in past years, but in the 1963 harvest season only 67 were used.

One of the arguments used in favor of the bracero program is that the Mexicans will perform hard "stoop" labor which U.S. migrants are unwilling to do. But under the master agreement with the Mexican Government, the braceros also enjoy protection a U.S. migrant may not get. They are given transportation to and from the job, free accident insurance, housing, and a guarantee of work on at least three-quarters of the days covered by their contract. The contracting farmer must pay them the prevailing local wage, and no less than 50 cents an hour.

It might well be that offering similar protections to a U.S. migrant would induce him to become a more stable and dependable worker than some of them now are. As it is, there is strong evidence that the availability of braceros in some areas—though not in Oregon—keeps down the farm wage level for Mexican and U.S. migrants alike.

The war-born Mexican farm labor law has been given several temporary extensions. It is scheduled to die next December 31, unless the House passes another temporary 1-year extension which already has gone through the Senate. Congress should let it expire and turn its attention to proposals for recruiting and protecting U.S. migrants.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, since the bracero law is due for extinction in 1964, the Oregon growers might better have been challenged by the Governor to respond in a more positive manner to a labor market made up exclusively of domestic workers. One can be sure that other growers around the country, competing for the best and most experienced migrant workers, will not limit their response to the demise of Public Law 78 to such negative actions. For example, the growers of the San Joaquin Valley in California have already undertaken a four-point program:

first, to train domestic farmworkers; second, reschedule the time of farm operations—such as planting and harvesting—in order to spread out labor requirements as much as possible on a year-round basis; third, change crop patterns to help accomplish the same things—that is, reduce the labor peaks of highly seasonal crops and thereby extend employment; fourth, coordinate these activities among association members in the interest of diversity and efficiency. Vigorous and forward-looking leadership in Oregon might come up with a similar program adapted to the agricultural picture found there.

It is particularly disappointing that Oregon should be associated with a measure which is so retrogressive in nature. Oregon, after all, has a hard earned but justly merited reputation as one of the best States in the Union for protections, educational facilities, conditions for employment, and wages for migrant laborers. As an illustration of the responsible manner in which Oregon has heretofore met its obligations to provide certain basic services for those who reside within its borders, I would like to mention migrant education.

Poverty begets poverty and one of the most tragic examples of the consequences of poverty of opportunity is the lack of education of migrant children. We hear much about school dropouts, but far too many migrant children have hardly even had the chance to drop in to school. In an age which increasingly looks to the university bachelors degree as a minimum requirement for success, migrant children have been nonstarters in the competition of life.

Perhaps the most bitter wine from the grapes of wrath has been that the son must follow in the dusty track of the father because he is not qualified by education or training to do anything else. That this should be the case in a land with the opportunity and wealth of our great Nation is a travesty of our national hope and heritage, and Oregon has taken the lead in trying to break through this vicious circle by a comprehensive educational program for migrant children. To best illustrate what is being done in Oregon I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following excerpts from the "Report on the Education of Migrant Children in Oregon" prepared by Ronald G. Petrie, supervisor of Migrant Education for Oregon.

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

THE MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The migrant education program consists of a program during the regular school year and special summer school programs.

The programs during the regular school year are designed to improve the educational opportunities offered migrant children by reimbursing school districts for hiring extra teachers and purchasing additional books, materials, and supplies that are needed to carry out an adequate program.

The summer school programs are designed to supplement the program of the regular school year and to provide a special remedial

program in the basic skill subjects of language arts and health.

The approach to migrant education varies from district to district depending upon local conditions, facilities available, type of migrant (Anglo- or Spanish-speaking), length of the harvest season, and attitude of the community.

Chapter 502 Oregon laws, 1961, specifies that the department of education shall collect data on the operation of summer school programs for migrant children and make a report to the State board of education which shall include the department's evaluation of the summer programs and its recommendation relating to continuation of such programs. The information contained in this report is representative of data received from school administrators and teachers of migrant children.

LONG-RANGE PROBLEMS

It appears that educating migrant children will be a major problem until such time as the migrant labor force becomes somewhat stable and the children consequently can attend school regularly enough to enable them to acquire an education on a basis reasonably comparable to that of regular resident children.

There is an indication that migrant families are settling or establishing their home bases in the State of Oregon rather than in other States as has been their practice in the past. This is occurring primarily in Marion, Malheur, and Yamhill Counties. This particular trend is producing some temporary problems which can be overcome with a continued educational program designed to fit the needs of the migrant children.

The need for continued education becomes more apparent when consideration is given to the changes toward mechanization in harvesting of agricultural crops. The departments of labor and employment predict that within 15 years Oregon will be using only one-fourth of the migrant labor that is presently being used. If this trend continues, as appears likely, most of the migrants who are presently harvesting our crops will be available for other employment. If they do not receive an adequate education, they will probably fall on the welfare rolls and become lifetime burdens to the State. The average expense of maintaining an individual on welfare is \$1,000 per year. It costs approximately \$400 a year to provide an educational program for a child of elementary school age. It appears imperative that steps be taken at this time to overcome the educational deficiencies of migrant children so that they may profit from further education and make preparations to go into other fields of work. Adequate education is absolutely essential if they are to become contributing members of society.

OBJECTIVES OF SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

The objectives of the summer school programs have been:

1. To supplement the regular school program and provide instruction in those areas of the curriculum in which the migrant child needed special help.
2. To answer questions concerning effective methods, materials, and approaches for instruction.
3. To collect data and make a report relating to continuation of such programs.

FUND ALLOCATIONS

All current expenses incurred in the operation of a summer school program for migrants were reimbursed by the State. The district provided the building, books, and equipment necessary to operate a program. Special migrant education funds were used

for teachers' salaries, transportation, school lunches (partially paid for by the children), expendable supplies, materials, janitorial service, and other miscellaneous expenses.

AREAS IN WHICH THE MIGRANT CHILD NEEDS SPECIAL HELP

The summer schoolteachers and administrators found that migrant children needed special help in reading, writing, spelling, speaking, listening, vocabulary building, arithmetic, health, cultural background, readiness for instruction, and social adjustment. They found that the children were educationally retarded an average of 2 years because of these deficiencies.

CULTURAL BACKGROUND

The teachers found that it was necessary to develop culture patterns before they could give the migrant children the books which are used in a regular program. For example, teachers taught vocabulary from the children's experiences and developed new experiences by taking them on such field trips as to the supermarket, bank, fire department, and police department.

MATERIALS

The teachers discovered that migrant children had difficulty thinking in abstract terms. Consequently, they developed and used many manipulative materials which the children could see and feel, thereby developing concepts and relationships.

PUPIL PROGRESS

The teachers and administrators were asked to keep an account of the progress made by individual pupils in the summer school programs. In many cases this was difficult to do because the children left school without notice or were in school for only short periods of time. The teachers were able to substantiate pupil progress on those children who stayed in the summer schools for the whole session by keeping anecdotal records and using various reading tests.

SUMMER SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

Summer school administrators and teachers have expressed the opinion, which is substantiated by facts outlined in this report, that the summer school programs are generally more effective in helping migrant children overcome educational deficiencies than programs during the regular school year.

There are several reasons which tend to support this statement. They are as follows: (1) Summer programs are open only to migrants. Consequently, the teachers can gear the program specifically to their needs; (2) summer schools tend to be more effective because class loads are kept small, averaging 1 teacher to 15 pupils as opposed to 1 to 25 or 30 during the regular school year; (3) the success of summer schools is achieved by concentration on two or three areas of the curriculum such as language arts, arithmetic, and health, as opposed to covering all areas of the curriculum which is the practice during the regular school year.

GROWERS COMMENT

Growers and businessmen in the areas that have summer school programs report that they are able to communicate more successfully with migrants since the programs started; that the migrants do not destroy property as they had in the past; and that their personal cleanliness and the cleanliness of their camps have improved. In addition, growers in several communities have reported that they have a more stable class of migrants than they had before there were summer school programs.

CONTINUATION OF SUMMER SCHOOLS

The districts that have operated summer programs for migrant children have indicated that they should be continued. These districts have also indicated that without State support they would be unable to continue the programs.

The migrants have demonstrated support of the program by being attracted to districts that provide summer schools and by sending their children in increasing numbers each year (1959-60—434 children; 1961-62—950 children) to these schools.

CONCLUSIONS

It is evident, from the records of children's growth, that the summer school programs have been effective in overcoming educational deficiencies of migrant children and upgrading their achievement. In addition, the increase in attendance each year reveals that the migrants are interested in having their children acquire an education. It is, therefore, evident that the pilot programs have been effective. The continuation of these programs would be a desirable addition to Oregon education.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAMS

The following report is typical of many reports submitted concerning migrant summer schools. It represents the range of problems experienced by most teachers of migrant children. There are illustrations of children's achievement, methods and materials used, and the need for individual instruction.

MIGRANT SCHOOL

(By Mildred Weeks, teacher, North Plains summer school, 1962)

My class was composed of children between the ages of 8 and 13 whose reading ability ranged from zero through grade 5. Omitting those who attended less than 3 days, it included 20 Anglos and 15 Spanish-speaking children. All of the latter were able to speak fairly good English.

RETARDED IN READING

In third- and fourth-grade reading, the Spanish-speaking children were 2 years retarded, the Anglos about 1 year. The fifth grade, the largest group, showed great variation. One Spanish-speaking child and four Anglos were able to read stories on their actual grade level. However, due to inadequate background, most were unable to interpret material beyond the fourth grade. The rest of the fifth graders ranged in ability from a complete nonreader through the fourth grade.

COMPREHENSION

Throughout the whole reading program, the main emphasis was on comprehension. Although the pupils could read well, they did not understand the material. They were able to pick up enough of the meaning to get the general thread of the story but unable to interpret the ideas involved. This was especially true of the Spanish-speaking children. It required a great deal of discussion, of giving examples, and of relating the ideas to their own experience before they could really read.

WRITTEN WORK

Since the class disliked written work, I had to use an indirect approach to this phase of language arts. We wrote stories for our animal booklets, reports of the trip to the zoo, records of the day's work, an autobiography, stories of some of the films we saw, and facts about schoolroom pets. On days when attendance was low, they were happy to write stories on the board or on

large sheets of paper with felt pens. They did not object to writing in booklets, so we made several of these for keeping lists of books we had read, and for doing comprehension exercises and skill tests.

ARITHMETIC RETARDATION

In arithmetic the retardation was less apparent, averaging about 1 year. The most severe handicap of the whole class was in written language work, the only type of lesson they objected to doing.

In arithmetic, it was relatively easy to locate gaps in computation skills. In reasoning, the children were not too far below average. Though they could not do written story problems, because of reading difficulties, they did very well with oral problems based on their own experience. For the retarded, we had many manipulative devices such as counting blocks, illustrated charts, number cards, an abacus, self-teaching games, and number puzzles. A store with play money was popular and most of the children learned to make change. Many also learned to tell time, and to read and write large numbers.

SHORTCUTS

The children not only liked arithmetic, but regarded it as very important. For this reason, I tried to see that something new, however minor, was learned each day. Though they were below average in grade level, their greater maturity made it possible to use shortcuts that would not be advisable in a regular schoolroom. Most of the fifth graders needed to work on multiplication tables. This would have been a dreary business requiring the whole session, so I taught them to carry in multiplying while they were still learning their fours. I let them multiply by two and three figures before they had finished regular fourth-grade work.

When we discussed what summer school had done for them, they were sure that they had learned more in arithmetic than in anything else. It is hard to measure their progress, as they did not proceed step by step through a certain grade.

One girl who was better than average in computation learned to add and subtract unlike fractions.

A boy who had learned his tables learned to multiply by thousands, began long division, and was soon dividing by two figures with no carrying.

Two fifth-grade girls reviewed three-column addition, learned borrowing in subtraction, and learned the tables to 4 by 6, using them in multiplication by two digits.

A group who knew tables to six's finished the rest, learned to use them in multiplying by three figures with carrying, and were doing long division by one figure.

A group of third graders learned their addition and subtraction combinations to 20, learned to add and subtract money, wrote numbers to 1,000, and learned to make change.

DIFFERENCES IN SPANISH-SPEAKING CHILDREN

Although people have a tendency to class the Spanish-speaking together as a group, it was apparent in working with them that there is great variation among them. There is no typical Spanish-speaking child any more than there is a typical Anglo. Some in our group were so far above the others in refinement, in attitudes, and in ambition that there was no comparison. It is important to remember that the emphasis must be placed on the individual.

MONTAGUE ISLAND HIGH AND DRY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, west of Cordova, Alaska, at the entrance to

Prince William Sound, there lies Montague Island. It is little more than 25 miles south of the epicenter of the Good Friday earthquake which struck Alaska.

The astonishing, the almost incredible strength of the earthquake is clearly seen on Montague Island.

This 40-mile-long island has been raised as much as 33 feet above Prince William Sound.

The vertical lift was so violent that spruce trees 42 inches in diameter were snapped off and toppled like broken matchsticks.

The sea floor, once covered by as much as 20 feet of water, even at low tide, is now dry. The sea plants and animals now lie dead and shriveled far from the water's edge.

Apparently this great lift was accomplished without any lateral movement at all. Along the fault lines where once all was level, there are now sheer vertical cliffs as high as 16 feet.

This report comes to us from a geological survey team studying the effects of the earthquake in Prince William Sound. This party includes George Plasker, geologist; James Case, geophysicist; and G. Dallas Hanna, marine biologist.

DISASTER IN JAPAN

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Alaskans and all Americans read with dismay of the violent earthquakes which rocked central and northern Japan on June 16. The tremors, which read 7.25 on the Richter scale, left 23 dead and over 200 injured. The hardest hit city was Niigata, where giant oil tanks were set ablaze, thousands of homes were destroyed, and a third of the city was left under water. Highways, railroads and bridges were washed out. Forty of the city's 65 public schools were damaged. In Tsuruoka a school collapsed killing three. All over northern Japan the picture was one of destruction and desolation.

I was happy to read that the U.S. Air Force aided in firefighting efforts and that John K. Emmerson, U.S. chargé d'affaires, assured the Japanese Government that American forces in Japan were ready to assist victims.

The events of recent months have perhaps made us in Alaska particularly sensitive to the plight of victims of natural disaster. Certainly we remember with profound gratitude the gift of \$10,000 which the Japanese Government gave to Alaska to help in recovery operations following our Good Friday disaster.

On behalf of my State, let me express my sincere sympathy to the Japanese people in this their time of trouble, and wish for them success in their building efforts.

LET US STOP THIS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, this may surprise many people in our Nation. But it is a fact that in a way our Government is encouraging and subsidizing radical rightwing organizations such as the Minutemen who arm

their members. The Army's National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice distributes guns at cost and ammunition free to American civilians. This to encourage marksmanship. Under the existing law the Army gives the guns and ammunition only to civilians who are members of the National Rifle Association.

The National Rifle Association is a very fine organization. I am familiar with its work. I am very familiar with the national championship rifle shoot at Camp Perry in Ohio, near where I was born and reared. I have had the pleasure of attending some of the national rifle shoots.

At a skeet shoot recently, a radical—really a lunatic—rightwinger boasted that he had urged members of his group to join the National Rifle Association in order to obtain quantities of guns and ammunition for his "conservative group of patriots" as he termed it.

Here is a legal "loophole" which should be closed. The Department of Justice should take action against the Minutemen.

Whether this organization, the Minutemen, has many or few lunatic rightwingers as members is inconsequential. I assume that it is really a paper organization with very few active members. It is probably a moneymaking "patriotism" affair. I cannot believe that there are enough soft-headed people in the Nation for any large number to be members of the Minutemen. But the fact is that any organization which obtains automatic weapons, rifles, and a great deal of ammunition, or any other instruments usable in war, or in acts of violence or lawlessness, should be investigated by the proper law enforcement agencies.

I refer also to the so-called Paul Revere Associated Yeomen, Inc., of New Orleans. It is quite remarkable how some bright public relations men, for profit only, organize some organization, naming it as if it were a truly bona fide patriotic group.

N. S. Riecke, Jr., was the founder of the Paul Revere Associated Yeomen, Inc. He recently wrote:

All patriots and conservatives are urged to join the National Rifle Association * * * stock up on rifles, shotguns, pistols * * * join the Minutemen.

Remember—

Wrote this superduper self-appointed patriot, Riecke—the Communists cannot subdue an armed citizenry.

Unfortunately, last year the Army gave away to members of the National Rifle Association 60 million rounds of ammunition. This cost the taxpayers \$1.6 million.

This is a place to save some money.

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR TIP EMPLOYEES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this week, the Ways and Means Committee of

the House announced that they would report out a bill increasing social security payments, and making some revisions in the program. Among these revisions is one which I have sought to achieve for quite some time. It would allow tips to be counted as wages for purposes of social security.

Many millions of men and women work for very low wages but receive a large portion of their income from tips. These tips are considered income for purposes of the Internal Revenue Service—that is, income tax must be paid on them—but, until now, they were not considered wages for purposes of social security. This means that this group of workers qualified for very low social security payments after retirement.

Last year, I introduced legislation to correct this injustice, and recently, I met with workers from New York and officials of the Social Security Administration—in an effort to bring about this change by regulation. I believe this can and should be done by revision of existing regulations. But I am doubly gratified that the Congress has belatedly recognized the injustice of this situation and will take steps to correct it by legislation.

SENECA INDIANS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, earlier this week, the Senate passed the Interior Department Appropriations bill containing \$97,010,000 for the work of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This was an increase of \$100,000 over the budget estimate, and an increase of \$1,810,000 over the House allowance. The figure included funds for resources management, construction on reservations, roadbuilding, educational grants, a revolving loan fund, tribal funds, and general administrative services.

Certainly, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to make adequate provision for this important work, but it must not be forgotten that many Indian nations—particularly those in the East—are not under the supervision of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and receive none of this assistance. The Seneca Indians of Salamanca, N.Y., for example, receive no such help.

A few years ago, Congress authorized and appropriated funds for the construction of the Kinzua Dam. When this dam is completed and opened in October, the waters of the dam will flood Seneca lands, requiring the relocation of about 500 Indians. The Senecas have a treaty with the United States—signed in 1794—which provides that they should have their land in perpetuity. The treaty was unilaterally abrogated when it was decided to build the dam on this site.

In spite of the fact that we have had literally years to plan for and provide compensation to the Seneca Indians, and notwithstanding both House and Senate passage of compensation bills, the conferees have not agreed on a final bill. The lands, I repeat, are due to be flooded in a few short months. Until a compensation bill is passed, the Senecas can-

not even borrow money to begin relocation.

Mr. President, the Senecas are not asking for special treatment or for the permanent services of the Federal Government. All they want is compensation for their land, and for the breaking of the treaty. There is ample precedent for such compensation in Indian land cases.

I would like to take this opportunity, once more, to renew a plea for the conferees on this bill to exert every effort to devise a bill which is fair to the Senecas.

SENATOR FONG'S CIVIL RIGHTS ADDRESS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators who have commended in the highest terms the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] for his notable and outstanding civil rights address—an address which I believe will go down as one of the finest delivered on this subject in the Senate. It was a powerful message, filled with great insight, buttressed by sound logic, and infused with a great sense of reverence, justice, compassion, understanding and love for his fellow men.

I congratulate my good friend from Hawaii. I know that the people from his State are very proud and grateful for having so distinguished and able a representative in the Senate.

APPALACHIA AND ALASKA: THE WAR ON POVERTY SHOULD BE WAGED VIGOROUSLY IN BOTH THESE AREAS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Public Works has this week held informative hearings on S. 2782 the proposed Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964. As a member of the committee and cosponsor of the bill, I have been interested in contrasting the needs of the vast Appalachian area with the pressing developmental requirements in other parts of our Nation.

I have been impressed with the testimony of the witness appearing before the committee. In detail we have heard how the war on poverty in Appalachia is to be waged. It should be waged vigorously. Relief in Appalachia should be productive and not merely an action of providing sustenance at the minimal level or slightly more.

Appalachia can contribute to a healthy national economy as can other areas where poverty is found when programs of progress are initiated. I recommend to persons interested in learning more about the Appalachia approach the reading of the report of the President's 1964 Appalachian Regional Commission headed by its chairman, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.

The needs of Appalachia are neither peculiar nor unique to a single area. The new roads required, the new power required, the expansion of certain indus-

tries would benefit Alaska, too. The study of Appalachia is about over. Work is about to start. We must do the same for other areas as well.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my statement on behalf of S. 2782.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING, DEMOCRAT, OF ALASKA, IN SUPPORT OF THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1964 BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, JUNE 28, 1964

Mr. Chairman, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964 now before the Senate Committee on Public Works will, if approved, make dreams real for more than 15 million Americans living in 10 States in an area encompassing 165,000 square miles. Cost of the Appalachian development program submitted to the Congress by President Lyndon Johnson is an estimated \$262 million. I am a cosponsor of S. 2782, as are 34 other Members of the Senate. The bill has bipartisan support, as it should, for poverty knows no party lines.

I hope this committee will report S. 2782 favorably so that the development of a healthy Appalachian economy may begin soon. For 62 years the region has been studied and restudied. According to the report submitted by the President's 1964 Appalachian Regional Commission headed by its Chairman, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.: "The facts of the Appalachian condition presented here are not new; they have only been updated. In 1902 and again in 1935 the Federal Government published extensive reports of this region. * * * Over this 62-year span, the conditions described in each report are discouragingly similar; their recurrence in these studies is the chronicle of a region bypassed."

A region bypassed, be it Appalachia or Alaska, cannot contribute productively. When the Under Secretary of Commerce appeared before this committee on June 22, he used a positive brush to paint what the Appalachian picture should be and could be. Under Secretary of Commerce Roosevelt pointed to the \$12 billion increase in our gross national product possible when Appalachians have a purchasing power equal to the rest of the country, when their per capita income is equal to the average American, when their housing starts meet the national average. Perhaps his most penetrating single remark was: "In Appalachia, poverty is waiting in a surplus food line, instead of waiting in a supermarket checkout line." The proposed legislation would initiate programs fundamental to area development such as a 2,350-mile highway system, accelerated water facilities construction, pasture improvement, improved timber management, expanded uses of coal, improved mining practices, and land restoration.

If the war we wage against poverty in the United States is to be won decisively, it must have both short- and long-range objectives. We cannot disregard the chronically unemployed adults. Each year we pour billions of dollars abroad in our foreign economic aid program. We cannot afford to be less generous at home.

Much is written of our bounding affluence but this good life does not extend to what President Franklin Delano Roosevelt a generation ago referred to as "a third of the Nation, ill clad, ill fed, ill housed." The gap between the affluent and the poor is growing—even as we discuss the need for this particular bill.

Who are the poor, in whose behalf war should be waged? They are people who have been thrown out of work because of changes in industrial practice, changing demands, changing fashions, because in their former employment they are no longer needed. There are other people who have been thrown out of work by automation, which is steadily enlarging its role of disemploying able-bodied citizens ready and eager to work. They consist of the elderly, who have not been able to save enough for their retirement, whose meager social security funds are inadequate and who are faced by the steady rise in living costs. They are the Negroes and whites who, for lack of education, cannot qualify for jobs, if such jobs were available. They are the ill, who, through physical incapacity, cannot accept employment. There are still others.

Moreover, poverty is widely distributed throughout the United States. It is both urban and rural. It is widespread throughout Alaska, among our native population—Indians and Eskimos—whose chief handicap is their lack of educational opportunities in their youth. They have not been afforded these in the past by the Federal Government, which until 5 years ago, had complete jurisdiction over their education and their economic and social welfare, and now still, in large part, provides their education.

As I read the Commission report on Appalachia, the similarity of the problems of that undeveloped area and undeveloped Alaska became apparent.

Under Secretary Roosevelt has told us that were Appalachia equipped with the same purchasing power as the country as a whole more than \$12 billion would have been added to our gross national product. I wondered how Alaska compared. According to figures compiled by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress Alaska could do better, too.

In 1963 Alaska retail sales totaled \$258,599,000. According to its population of 240,000, that figure should have been \$340,619,836 or \$82,020,836 more. Statistically Alaska's retail sales fall short by more than 25 percent.

What about the private construction valuation last year in Alaska?

The Library of Congress has that answer, too. The total national valuation in 1963 was \$21.8 billion. According to its population Alaska should have a valuation of \$30.1 million rather than its actual valuation of \$22.5 million.

What of the unemployed?

Unemployment figures in Appalachia are high. More than 7 percent of the labor force in Appalachia, nearly 400,000 were jobless in 1960 because of severe declines in employment in mining and agriculture.

The National unemployment figure was 5.4 percent in April this year but that figure in Alaska was 13.2 percent. Had the Alaska figure been average, \$54.5 million in additional income could have bolstered the State's economy.

Appalachia and Alaska are many thousands of miles apart—yet their problems are similar. The Appalachia report found that "much of the wealth produced by coal and timber was seldom seen locally. It went downstream with the great hardwood logs; it rode out on rails with the coal cars; it was mailed between distant cities as royalty checks from nonresident operators." Later said the report:

"The Appalachian people are clearly striving to meet the challenge of deprivation. * * * The conversion and processing of its raw materials should be done locally to the fullest extent possible. New industries, dependent not only on the resources of the region but

on the strategic location and potential market which Appalachia represents, must be located in the region. The magnificent recreational resources must be developed with coordinated intensity if their employment potential is to be realized. Agricultural diversification should be accelerated and mining and timber employment and income expanded. Private enterprise will be the ultimate employer. * * * But before this can happen, public investment must create the foundation on which private enterprise can then build its own job-producing structure."

Let us consider the following Appalachia's needs—keeping in mind they are not unique to a single region:

1. New roads to overcome regional isolation.
2. Improved air service.
3. Controlled development of water resources to end flooding and bring in industry.
4. Expansion of the livestock industry to help meet the Nation's demand for beef.
5. Processing of timber locally.
6. New uses for coal deposits, development of minerals.
7. Production of low-cost power.
8. Utilization of recreational resources.
9. An expanded private business sector.

These nine needs apply in Alaska or wherever pockets of poverty exist because of absentee ownership and/or inept management by the Federal Government.

Like Appalachia, Alaska has been studied and restudied.

Happily the long study period in Appalachia is ending, and it must come to a halt in other parts of our great land for domestic aid at the Federal level such as is proposed in S. 2782 can bring an area into the 20th century with all of its challenges and rewards.

We must move ahead in Appalachia. And this program must be repeated wherever the ills of poverty have yet to be cured.

Let us do at least half as much for the people at home as we do for the people abroad.

TRIBUTE TO TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on this 150th anniversary year of his birth, by dedicating a statue to his memory and to the inspiration his works have provided for four generations of freedom fighters in the enslaved nations of the world, this capital city of the free world will honor Taras Shevchenko, a Ukrainian poet, 1814-61, on June 27.

Paradoxically, on June 10 of this year, a similar statue of Taras Shevchenko was unveiled in the capital city of the enslaved world—Moscow—and remarks were made hailing this man as a "poet of communism."

Let us not even consider here the philosophical or ideological inconsistencies which the two statues to Shevchenko seem to represent. Such inconsistencies, in instances like this, are not important. For, it does not matter what words a man sets down on paper, what does matter is the impact his words have on the minds of other men and the reactions that result.

To me, and apparently to millions of other human beings in enslaved nations throughout the world, Shevchenko's words represent hope for freedom, and the determination to achieve and hold it.

I know not, and care not what they mean to the leaders of the Communist hierarchy.

RACIAL UTOPIA IN HAWAII

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, the Sunday, June 7, 1964, issue of the New York Times included an article entitled "Hawaii Developing Into Racial Utopia," written by Max Frankel. I wish to share this observation by Mr. Frankel with my distinguished colleagues; so I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

HAWAII DEVELOPING INTO RACIAL UTOPIA (By Max Frankel)

HONOLULU, June 5.—Haoles have become the largest ethnic group in Hawaii. More of them are streaming in every day but no one seems to mind.

Haoles, or strangers, is the term applied to Caucasians.

The chamber of commerce tries to discourage their migration from the mainland because too many think that everything here is beaches and green. But the persistent ones come anyway, bringing professional and other employable skills.

No one in these islands of Asian and American minorities objects on racial grounds. Some were worried for a time that the migrants would bring racist attitudes from the mainland and spoil what is rapidly becoming one of the happiest interracial societies in the world. The islanders, however, are confident that Hawaii will change the haoles before they can change Hawaii.

In any case, the white predominance is only the skimpiest sort of statistical triumph. The islanders are becoming so interbred and mixed that the ethnic population figures suggest but no longer describe the situation.

Prof. Andrew W. Lind of the University of Hawaii, the foremost sociologist here, predicts that within a generation all racial and ethnic statistical categories will be "useless."

Nearly half of all marriages in Hawaii now mix ethnic bloods, joining whites, Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos, and the already mixed Hawaiians to each other or involving at least one mate of mixed ancestry.

The aboriginal Polynesian Hawaiians assimilated freely with past waves of haoles. Only a few thousand pure Hawaiians remain in the total population of 650,000.

INTERMARRIAGE RATE RISING

Six percent of the population is Chinese, but 4 of ever 10 now marries "out."

The Japanese, until recently the largest group with 32 percent as well as the most closely knit, are also beginning to lose their identity. One of every four Japanese women now marries across ethnic lines, half of them to Caucasians.

Less than 1 percent of the island's residents are Negro, although some descendants of the earliest Negro settlers are among the most influential families. About 35 percent of the population is pure white, about half being families temporarily stationed here on military duty.

The effect of all this has been startling, especially in the last decade of economic expansion, statehood, and jet travel. As Prof. Douglas S. Yamamura, also a sociologist, puts it: Hawaiians are more and more living up to the pretense of nondiscrimination that has long been the vogue.

Until 10 years ago, economic and social standing still tended to coincide with ethnic

lines, the whites at the top and the other groups arrayed roughly in the order in which they were brought here to work on the sugar and pineapple plantations.

LEADERS IN EVERY FIELD

But the sons and grandsons of the immigrants have now fought their way to the top of every field and status. Wealth, power, employment, housing, schooling and other opportunities can no longer be measured in ethnic terms.

During World War II many Hawaiian Orientals got their first glimpse of white men doing menial jobs. Today they laugh about this discovery.

As Tomi Knaefer related in a "typical" family account in the Star-Bulletin last week, the Japanese-American son of a cane-cutter, himself a member of the State legislature, worries most about the easy life of his son, a high school senior who drives the family's third car.

The Governor of Hawaii is Caucasian. The chief justice of the supreme court, the president of the senate and the president of the bar association are of Japanese ancestry. The speaker of the house comes from a line of Portuguese (whose ancestors were laborers and thus usually distinguished here from other "whites"), and the executive officers of the four counties of the State possess Chinese, Hawaiian, Negro, Caucasian, and Indian blood in various proportions.

The multiracial guest lists for important parties at "white" military installations are among the best indications that other groups are breaking down the last barriers.

There are still a few areas where housing is restricted, especially to Negroes. Some social clubs remain frankly ethnic, and in their private remarks, Hawaiians still reveal racial resentments often against the large and visibly energetic and successful group of Japanese-Americans.

But the preacher of racism who ventures a public lecture is pitied and ridiculed by all sides.

One of the major issues in the local chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is whether Hawaii needs such a group. The State's fair employment law is so rigid that it forbids help-wanted ads from mentioning sex as well as race.

Although bloodlines are being rapidly mixed, the host culture is decisively American. Children learn American, not Hawaiian, history and the universal aspiration is for the culture of the mainland.

Professor Yamamura has found, however, that the new confidence of nonwhites is beginning to revive interest and pride in national heritage and custom. Island youngsters studying at mainland colleges write home for information about their ancestors and antecedent cultures in a spirit of discovery.

The professor has discovered still another sign of leveling—the divorce rates of mixed and unmixed marriages are becoming alike. Until a few years ago mixed marriages fared poorly, especially those of white women and nonwhite men, but the rate is leveling at the national average of 25 to 30 percent, while the previously lowest divorce rate of unmixed Orientals is mounting to that average.

MANY YOUNG LEAVE

The group known ethnically as Hawaiian and which did much to foster equality and intermarriage here has had the most difficult time bringing itself up the economic and social ladder. A major reason for this seems to be that many of its most successful young members have left the islands and joined the 115,000 islanders living on the mainland.

Like many places, Hawaiian society was late in honoring its own. Strangers seemed

taller and brighter and more talented than even the best natives.

This problem is the last great hurdle in the path toward real equality. Students of the problem here say that when Hawaiians come to feel at home in Hawaii they will probably have ceased to be Hawaiians and by that time everyone will have ceased to be anyone except himself.

At the University of Hawaii Negro actresses are now used to portray Japanese mothers and English dowagers. A local drama critic said he would feel foolish to point this out in his review: The audiences do not notice, and the readers would be annoyed by an apparent irrelevancy.

All this suggests to him, a Caucasian with an Oriental wife, that this island, at least, has moved a long way toward its blissful reputation.

SOUND VALUES AND MORALS FOR OUR YOUTH—COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY THE GOVERNOR OF HAWAII

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, many of us today are concerned with the development of sound values and morals in our youth. Gov. John A. Burns, of Hawaii, recently plumbed the depths of this problem in a commencement address delivered at St. Benedict's College, in Atchison, Kans.

I wish to share these remarks with all Members of the Senate. Therefore, I ask that Governor Burns' address be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN A. BURNS, GOVERNOR OF HAWAII, COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, ST. BENEDICT'S COLLEGE, ATCHISON, KANS., MAY 27, 1964

President Hemmen, honorable faculty members, distinguished guests, and fellow graduates of the class of 1964, it is indeed a rare privilege and a singular honor for a member of the graduating class to deliver his own commencement address.

While the position I am in may be an awkward one for most people, I must say that as a politician I do feel somewhat at home in the ambiguous circumstances I find myself in today. As you know, politicians generally are extremely fond of speaking. As a matter of fact, most politicians are their own best audiences.

I do, however, seriously consider this a very great honor.

Some of you might also be concerned when our alma mater grants a doctorate to one who has met neither the entrance nor the residence requirements—the same alma mater that has denied the bachelor's degree to others with the same deficiencies.

Putting aside the question of justice for the moment, I want to assure you of my deep gratitude for this honor and my sincere interest in carrying out the ideals of St. Benedict's and the responsibility of membership in the class of 1964.

A doctor of laws is commissioned to teach. This afternoon, I would like to exercise this function just confided to me. I wish to share with you some of my convictions about values in public education—a conviction which I have thought about for many years and which has become a serious commitment since the day on which the citizens of Hawaii elected me to be their Governor.

About a year and a half ago, when I was honored to be inaugurated Governor of

Hawaii, I said to the people of my State, among other things: "My most important pledge to you is—to provide for our children the best possible education. We must insure that pressing current needs do not distract us from our basic need—to safeguard our children's future through education. As we move into our East-West role, our educational institutions must anticipate and play a leading part in the development of our evolving opportunities. We must insure that in the controversy of child versus money, the child comes first."

Now, at this midterm, I am more than ever convinced of and committed to this idea. At the same time, I am also aware of a crisis of values in modern public education.

The expenditure of more money does not of itself guarantee an adequate education. Quality and quantity, while both important, are not the same.

We need to consider, then, not only giving our children more education, but a better education; an education that has been made better because we have profited from the observable deficiencies of our own.

One of these deficiencies, it seems to me, may be in the area of values. That is, we speak often of the value of education; but what have we considered about the concept of values in education?

Much has been said about the relative pace of scientific and moral development in our country. It has frequently been noted that the scientific mentality of detachment—so commendable in the laboratory—has become almost a way of life—a detached way of life or a life uncommitted.

The symptoms of this are graphically portrayed in a paragraph from an editorial of some time ago by Norman Cousins, distinguished editor of the Saturday Review. Said Mr. Cousins then: "In traveling around the United States, I have been made aware of a melancholy tension. The questions people ask are not related to their personal incomes or the need to find better ways to amuse themselves. They want to know how to overcome a sense of personal futility on the big issues. They have a sense of peril; they know that the fuse points of a world nuclear explosion have multiplied; they know that the giant pieces of a seeming inevitability are falling into place; and they feel impotent. In sum, the malaise is helplessness. This is the American problem."

"The individual would like to become relevant, but doesn't know where to take hold or what to do even if he could take hold. Today this is the central issue to which all others are subordinate. Yet even the individuals who recognize it as the central issue are uncertain about their own ability to become relevant, to help. The means are now at hand for purging the earth of life in human form, or falling that, to lacerate it so severely that joy will be separated from the human heart; but the individual who wants to do something about it feels cut off and paralyzed."

If Mr. Cousins is correct in his diagnosis of this generation's most basic fault, it would seem to indicate that our schools might indulge in some profitable introspection.

Someone might add: "Hadh't our homes, too, to look at themselves? And our churches?"

Indeed, they might. In fact, every institution of our society could well pose this question of themselves. Today, however, we are concerned particularly about values in our public schools.

Dr. Philip Phenix, of Teachers College, Columbia University, had some rather sharp things to say on this subject in a statement

made 2 or 3 years ago to Time magazine. Said he: "The most important product of education is a constructive, consistent, and compelling system of values around which personal and social life may be organized. Unless teaching and learning provide such a focus, all the particular knowledge and skills acquired are worse than useless. An educated person whose information and ability are directed to no personally appropriated worthy ends is a menace to himself and to society. A highly sophisticated society educated to no coherent way of life is, likewise, by its very learning made the more prone to disease and degeneration."

The article went on to point out that most U.S. schools firmly believe that they do provide the values he demands. On the premise that happy men create a healthy society, they teach and beseech children to use their abilities.

By thus stressing self-realization, the schools in theory promote "the greatest good to the greatest number."

However, it is Philosopher Phenix's jarring argument that all this is morally shallow—that our schools in fact promote selfishness.

Phenix advocates a curriculum with a moral skeleton the backbone of which is the idea of worth. His aim is the moral application of knowledge. In short, his students would be taught to uphold worth in every area of life.

The article went on to spell out what this concept of worth would be like in curricular terms:

"To build conscience, Phenix would teach respect for all forms of life. Geography, for example, would go far beyond maps and place names to the responsible use of air, earth, and water. Lessons in health would illustrate abuses in everything from alcohol to industrial waste. Since sex 'provides the crucial case of desire at odds with devotion,' Phenix would encourage 'a fresh acceptance of the ideal of sexual purity' as one method of fostering 'dedication to standards of worth.'

"Phenix's ideal school would shun all social stratification, from numbered grades to skin color. It would emphasize learning as 'preparation for the good life,' not 'the case value of more education.' It would stress the rule of law in national and world affairs, and forcefully analyze 'the extreme destructiveness of modern weapons of war.' From the consequences of protective tariffs to the advantages of foreign languages, it would always presuppose 'universality and world outlook.'"

"In sum," Phenix says, "schools should emphasize and demonstrate that the world, man and his culture are neither self-sufficient nor self-explanatory, but are derived from given sources of being, meaning, and value."

"That the supremely worthwhile is not finite or limited but transcends all human comprehension and every human achievement."

"That the life of selfish ambition, the struggle for autonomy, acquisition and success, and attachment to finite goods, lead in the end to misery, conflict, guilt, despair, boredom and frustration."

"That every individual has a personal calling to turn from, following after desire, to a life of loving and grateful dedication to what is of ultimate worth."

Thus did Dr. Phenix put his finger on this very critical problem of values in our public education, or in all of our education, for that matter. I would observe, however, that the values Dr. Phenix would inject into the curriculum are rooted in a faith, a faith to which he is committed and which gives skeleton and flesh to the body of values,

and generates vital force to make it live and move, and nerves connected to conscience.

If the whole curriculum were his responsibility, then a comprehensive value structure would be relatively simple matter. But in public education in a pluralistic society these decisions never rest in the hands of one man, and seldom even a homogeneous group of men.

Dr. Phenix may have put his hand on the greatest problem in modern public education, but it is also the most controversial.

Here is the dilemma of the need for unity and the fact of plurality; of academic freedom versus philosophical coherence.

When our forefathers said: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," they dogmatically declared a basis of unity and coherence for our way of life.

It would provide a sufficient reference point for the kind of value determinations indicated by Dr. Phenix in his value-oriented curriculum.

But when many of these same men wrote into the Constitution the provisos of dissent, including the currently contested first amendment that "Congress should make no law regarding the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise of the same," they opened the door to plurality and left the Nation in a tension that has plagued and prodded it, facilitated and frustrated it from that day to this.

For some, this indicated parochial education in which unity and coherence of the curriculum could be assured, and the tension removed to a place where it could be controlled. And while many of us owe a great deal of the parochial movement, we note that it is being reassessed today by some of its most ardent proponents.

This might seem to lead by a process of oversimplification to the corollary that parochial education being religious, public education is therefore secular. Some have followed this line with great zeal, and the vibration and tension has been felt in court and Congress. But secularism is a kind of religion, or a religious commitment, and simply a reverse attempt to remove the tension to a safe distance.

Nevertheless, the fact of the matter is that in the kind of democratic structure bequeathed to us by our forefathers, the development of values and ideals must be distilled out of dialog participated in by men of a variety of commitments—out of the discovery of their agreements and the sharp clash of their differences.

In the transmutation of the resultant values into the educational curriculum, this fact should never be disguised.

What is being offered here is not an alternative faith—an alternative to the church—but an authentic reflection of the dialog, a frank recognition of the differences, and the consequent impression of the importance of values.

And it would seem desirable that the production should be in stereo; that is, with some indication of the relative depth and magnitude of the voices in our society.

That this kind of question can be boldly asked, that this kind of discussion is taking place in many quarters is a healthy sign.

In Hawaii our State Commission on Children and Youth is developing its own approach to this question. I quote from the minutes of a recent session of that commission: "Our concern is with moral and spiritual values. The question is: What is it that needs to be done to develop sound values and ideals in our children and youth? Our premise and point of departure is that values

and ideals are rooted in, and permeate every activity and sphere of life, both individual and social. It follows that a sound approach to values and ideals must be based upon a sense of involvement and responsibility on the part of the whole community. It also follows that we cannot address ourselves effectively to the needs of our youth as long as we are inclined to shunt responsibility to particular agencies or institutions and fail to recognize that values and ideals are everybody's business.

"Our proposal is * * * the formation in each county of a permanent, continuing, representative citizens' group, including representatives of church and school, and youth, whose concern would be to engage in a deep-level study of the integral relationship between church and school in the development of values and ideals.

"We feel that the proper function of these citizens' groups involves regular meetings to clarify in their own minds the extremely complex web of life out of which values and ideals emerge. At the same time this group should issue statements of concern, publicize information about significant programs and developments, commend worthwhile activities, suggest possible or necessary implementations, and engage in a continuing process of evaluation and reevaluation from the standpoint of communitywide responsibility."

I pass this on to you for what it is worth and for your future reference.

I would offer you this thought also: Let us throw aside the stultifying fears of participating in a dialog that we cannot dominate, of tackling a problem that we cannot neatly resolve, and let us get on with it.

Your education at St. Benedict's has prepared you for this dialog. You have developed the skills and attitudes needed for dialog during 4 years of community life in the Benedictine tradition.

You have learned to live with men from all parts of the world and to appreciate these men and their cultures.

You have learned to emphasize the positive values that make community life possible; and you have learned to tolerate and eliminate the negative attitudes that divide men.

Although you may have experienced some crises in this dialog, you did not find it too difficult to discuss basic issues with students who share with you the same Christian values, the values that have been reinforced in your theology, philosophy, and other humanistic courses.

As one engaged daily in the art of the possible, as politics has been frequently defined, I can assure you that dialog will become increasingly difficult for you. But in the face of this strain, you cannot retreat to any kind of ghetto complex.

If you recall the great Benedictine tradition, you will understand the dimension of your responsibility for dialog following graduation.

The Benedictines were always great educators.

The Benedictine monasteries were the centers of learning in Western civilization.

The Benedictine monks engaged in a dialog that involved men committed to Christian principles and men from barbarian peoples.

The history of Benedictine success shows that dialog among such diverse peoples was not only possible but also fruitful.

The culture that we enjoy today is the product of that dialog.

You graduates, as you commence a new life beyond college, you move out into the arena where this dialog is taking place and

needs to take place in broader and deeper dimensions.

You will face the immediate and persistent temptation to withdraw into the shell of the limited interests of your family, your home, your job.

If you are so inclined, I pose to you this question: to whom shall we assign the question of values in our public education?

Let there be no mistake about this: the answer to the questions posed by Mr. Cousins, and Dr. Phenix and others like them will be forged out of your insight, your faith, your courage—and most important of all, your participation.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, each generation of mankind produces a few men fired with a spiritual genius destined to inspire the minds and hearts of his fellow man. Such a man was Taras Shevchenko, who was born into serfdom in the Ukraine a century and one-half ago.

His written words lighted a torch for freedom in a dark land—a torch which still burns brightly today.

Today we pay tribute to Taras Shevchenko with the unveiling of a monument to him in our National Capital.

It is fitting that we free Americans, including many of Ukrainian descent, memorialize Taras Shevchenko, so that his name will live forever in the sacred annals of those who dedicated their lives in the greatest of all causes—the fight for human freedom and dignity.

WINNING ESSAYS IN 1964 MCGEE SENATE INTERNSHIP CONTEST

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, in order that the Members of this body may share with me the excellence of thought and the depth of understanding shown by the Wyoming young people who were honorable-mention winners in the 1964 MCGEE Senate Internship Contest, I ask unanimous consent that two of these essays, by Sharon Coates, of Rawlins, and Richard L. Vonburg, of Basin, be printed in the RECORD.

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

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER

(By Sharon Coates)

Thomas Jefferson once said, "If you expect a nation to be ignorant and free, you expect what never was and never will be." America stands for freedom, our national purpose is freedom, the American dream is freedom. Democracy and freedom must exist together in order for each and both to be secure. History and reason dictates that for a democracy to exist and function, freedom must be enjoyed by the people. By the same token, if freedom is to be secure, the people must control their government. It therefore follows that a country which is dependent on the will and wisdom of its citizens must have each citizen educated to the fullest extent of his capacity.

To make democracy work better we must cultivate American minds to the maximum degree of excellence which each can absorb regardless of income, race, color, or religion, for the human mind is our fundamental resource. "We must strive to acquire knowl-

edge and apply it with wisdom." These were the words of the late President Kennedy. No better slogan could be more fitting for the 20th century American than this.

To make democracy work better we must elect leaders and legislators who are dedicated to American ideals. They must be freedom loving, wise, courageous, and have high ethical standards. We must elect officials who do not lose sight of the national interest in order to serve a wide group of interests not related to, and often opposed to, the national interest. We must elect men to office who understand that economics are not divorced from political or ethical consideration. We Americans must be educated, mentally, and morally, if we are to know what is in the national interest and what men will best serve that interest.

To make democracy work better we must have leaders who will strive to expand educational facilities and inspire citizens to take advantage of these facilities. Such leaders could do much to encourage students to continue their education to the highest degree. Such leaders could also give incentive to adults so that they would develop latent talents, expand their knowledge through self-education and through adult education courses.

To make a democracy work better we must develop our greatest resource, our people. This is a "nation of the people, by the people, and for the people." This is not a nation of bombs and missiles, nor a nation of big cars and split-level homes, neither is it a nation of labor unions and big business. These are only the byproducts of a nation. The United States is a nation of people dedicated to the cause of freedom. Freedom for ourselves and all others of the world who would pursue freedom. Properly developed and educated, we could and should be the force that will set off an explosion of enlightened minds that will light the world and move it to peace and freedom.

Many scholars and writers say that we need to recapture our own freedom-loving, transforming and creative spirit if we are to succeed in making democracy work. They point out that, "The Communists wait for the coming of another disastrous depression. They batten on every national prejudice. They try to poison every potential conflict between East and West. They preach about the decline of Western ideals. They talk about the false pretensions of Western society and the myth of Western religion, the hypocrisy of Western freedom, and the certainty of Western collapse." They say that Western survival depends on us to be stable, reliable, prosperous, share our prosperity, rebuild our defenses, be patient allies and good friends, restore our vision and moral purpose, drive out fatalism and finally, restore the "glorious liberty of sons of God." If we must do, and continue to do, all these things, we must train our minds and hearts and souls to the utmost so that our Western World remains a world of freedom in which we can freely choose and freely act. We can keep it that way only if we know what is good, true, and humane.

To make a democracy better we need the fruit of the highest degree of intellect which is the result of education. Such an intellect acquires a comprehension and vision of all things in its own place and characteristics, calmly, clearly, and accurately as far as the human mind can enfold them. From its knowledge of history it becomes almost prophetic and is heart probing from its knowledge of human nature. Such an intellect is freed of littleness and prejudice and has nearly super-human charity. Nothing can startle it, it has beauty and harmony be-

cause it is so attuned to the eternal order of things.

To make a democracy work better we need to relearn what the components of our Western civilization are and educate ourselves so that we may enrich our lives and those of all the world not only by future breakthroughs in knowledge, but by the knowledge handed down to us by history and tradition. From the Greek civilization we can learn how to be harmoniously developed human beings having a sense of the true, the good, and the beautiful. From the Roman civilization we can learn how to be good citizens having a sense of justice, a sense of duty, and a sense of civic concord. From our religious faith we can regain our sense of dignity as children of God. Finally from our own beginnings as Americans we can learn what freedom really means and why it is necessary to have freedom to be a harmoniously developed human being, a good citizen, and retain a true sense of the dignity of man.

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK BETTER

(By Richard Vonburg)

Through my experience as a young American citizen, I find that you cannot make democracy work better. This would be violating the very basic rule which democracy is based upon. Therefore, when I use the word "make," the meaning is extremely liberal.

In early history democracy was synonymous with mob rule. Essentially it is a mob rule, because the crowd—the mass—the people all unite together to make democracy. Democracy is much like love, continually growing, going through many changes, and new doors are opened. As stated by Justice William Hastie, "Democracy is a process, not a static condition. It is becoming rather than being. It can easily be lost, but is never fully won. Its essence is eternal struggle." We can see that it is the very nature of democracy which seeks the need for betterment and improvement. Never should we be satisfied with its present state. Changes are necessary, and as Alfred Smith states, "All the ills of democracy can be cured by more democracy."

When we think of democracy we immediately picture something in our minds to do with our government. John Dewey once wrote, "Democracy is much broader than a special political form, a method of conducting government, of making laws, and carrying on governmental administration by means of popular suffrage and elected officers. The political and governmental phase of democracy is a means, the best means so far found, for realizing ends that lie in the wide domain of human relationships and the development of human personality. It is a way of life, social, and individual.

This briefly is my interpretation of democracy. People seldom stop to think of the power they have in themselves through democracy. One way to make democracy work better is to realize that ordinary people have extraordinary possibilities. No matter what political party one belongs to—Democrats, Republicans, Progressives, Greenbacks, Independents—all have been successful because they fulfilled the needs and wants of the people. No man is elected to an office unless the people feel he will pass legislation they want. The strength of the people killed the prohibition amendment, the strength of the people provided woman suffrage, the will of the people created income tax, the people elect a person as President of the United States every 4 years—all of these things and countless more have been accomplished because the people wanted them. This is what the citizen should realize—the great possibility within himself individually.

The strength of the people lies in their deep spiritual and moral self-consciousness. If every American could realize the importance of a deep-rooted faith in God, and in himself, democracy would have a stronger base. Every person does realize to a certain extent his possibilities, but due to the increasing population growth, automation, and our fast pace of living, this realization is stifled.

As an American we have certain duties that, if done patriotically and sincerely, would strengthen democracy. Since democracy is more than a government, including people, we can make democracy work better through people. A citizen has a duty to his home. Whether he be a father, mother, sister, or brother, a responsibility of fellowship, love, understanding, faith, hope, compassion, etc., is born in the family relationship. The strength of our Republic Nation is the intelligent and well-ordered homes of the people. After the experience of our home we make certain friends with people from other homes. Wherever we are, no matter what we are doing, it is an American's duty to defend any remarks uttered against our country, exercise advantageously the right of freedom of speech, and always be alert about the responsibility of citizenship through proper education.

It has been said that people usually pay little attention to the things which serve them best. Many times how we forget America. The problems we encounter in our daily lives tend to shadow any feelings we have for our country. Each person is a component of democracy, for democracy is of the people; any improvement in it must begin with the people. Democracy can thrive and improve only when it enlists the devotion of those whom Abraham Lincoln called the common people. Democracy can hold that devotion only when it respects their dignity through their efforts. People cannot seem to realize this important role they play. There is an amazing strength in the expression of the will of a whole people; and when it declares itself, even the imagination of those trying to contest it is overawed. All energies of the inner American can be released through democracy. In our daily lives, during elections, and on national holidays we have the opportunity to put forth this feeling.

Our way of living in America is a strong but delicate fabric, made up of many threads. It has been woven over many centuries by the patience and sacrifice of countless liberty-loving men and women. It serves as a cloak for the protection of poor and rich, of black and white, of Jew and Gentile, of foreign and native born. The ideal of democracy is the highest humanity ever developed. It is well known that when something stops being better, it stops being good. Let us not tear the ideals we have asunder with lack of improvements. For no man knows, once it is destroyed, where or when man will find this same protective warmth again.

We can see it is possible to make democracy work better through looking at a statement made by the old philosopher, Aristotle. He said: "If liberty and equality, as is thought by some, are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be best attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost." How can we do this today? I think every American should take to heart the following poem. If we believe in the things the poet mentions we cannot help but become better Americans, thus improving democracy. This poem, entitled "Credo," was written by Elias Lieberman.

I believe
That there are greater things in life
Than life itself;
I believe
In climbing upward

Even when the spent and broken thing
I call my body
Cries "Halt!"
I believe
To the last breath
In the truths
Which God permits me to see.
I believe
In fighting for them;
In drawing,
If need be,
Not the bloody sword of man
Brutal with conquest
And drunk with power,
But the white sword of God,
Flaming with His truth
And healing while it slays.
I believe
In my country and her destiny,
In the great dream of her founders,
In her place among the nations,
In her ideals;
I believe
That her democracy must be protected,
Her privileges cherished,
Her freedom defended.
I believe
That, humbly before the Almighty,
But proudly before all mankind,
We must safeguard her standard,
The vision of her Washington,
The martyrdom of her Lincoln and Kennedy,
With the patriotic ardor
Of the Minute Men
And the boys in blue
Of her glorious past.
I believe
In loyalty to my country,
Utter, irrevocable, inviolate.
Thou, in whose sight
A thousand years are but as yesterday
And as a watch in the night,
Help me
In my frailty
To make real
What I believe.

ACTION TAKEN BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION REQUIRING LABEL- ING OF TOBACCO AS POISONOUS

Mr. WALTERS. Mr. President, I was surprised and shocked at the action taken by the Federal Trade Commission requiring the labeling of tobacco as poisonous. This regulatory agency, with limited powers, has usurped its authority in assuming it can require the tobacco industry to mark their product as harmful and dangerous. This action would better be taken by competent medical authority, either public or private, not by an agency which has never been accredited to render medical opinions. Thus far neither the American Medical Association nor the Public Health Service has been able to conclusively link the use of tobacco with the incidence of cancer and other lung diseases. The tobacco industry means a great deal to my State, and any curtailment could seriously affect the economy of many localities. All of us, of course are as concerned with the health and welfare of our people as are the members of the Federal Trade Commission, but I do have enough faith in the judgment of the public and the tobacco industry itself to know that they will exercise self-imposed restraints without the need for "scare" labeling.

WATER POLLUTION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, water is a natural resource of inestimable worth. Every level of government, and industry, agriculture, and private citizens share a duty to assure to this generation and to the Americans who come after us a plentiful supply of water of reasonable purity to meet a wide range of human needs. Critical to that end is the vigorous pursuit of the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution.

My interest in clean water is not new; but the gravity of the water pollution problem in the United States, the real progress being made in many areas to come to grips with it, and the size of the job yet to be done, have been most strongly impressed on me during my service during the past 14 months as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, of the Committee on Public Works. Our deliberations, the constructive action of the full committee, and the overwhelming approval by the Senate resulted in the passage by this body of a bill, S. 649, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to give further impetus to the national effort to raise the quality of America's waters. This bill and a similar House measure now await the action of the other body.

The Federal act properly recognizes the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in the field, and gives to the Federal Government a significant supporting role—technical assistance, financial assistance, research, comprehensive river basin programs for water quality control, encouragement of interstate cooperation, and, finally, the abatement of the pollution of interstate and navigable waters. "Enforcement lies at the very heart of any effective program in the elimination, prevention, and control of pollution," in the words of the justification statement for the program's budget. The law itself sets wise limitations on the use of the Federal authority. On the judicious use of this tool depends in no small measure the ultimate effectiveness of other needed efforts to halt pollution. A tribute to its success is the fact that in the 30 instances in which the Federal enforcement power has been invoked, in only 4 has it gone beyond the initial stage set out in the act—the conference—to the more formal public hearing proceeding; and in only a single case has it gone to the third, and final, stage for which the law provides—court action. The conference is not an adversary proceeding. It is a meeting of the Federal and State conferees, and of those of any interstate agencies which may be concerned, with the participation of other interested persons whom they may invite to the conference. Its object is to set a timetable for remedial action, preferably under State and local law, to raise the quality of the waters involved, to permit their use for the maximum number of legitimate purposes.

In my own New England, with some of the oldest industries in the United States, are some of the Nation's oldest and most

persistent pollution problems. The region's greatest stream, the Connecticut River, has for generations received the wastes of city and factory. It was at the urging of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, that the present Secretary called a conference on the matter of the interstate waters of the Connecticut and its tributaries in Massachusetts and Connecticut. The conference convened in Hartford, last December 2. The State and interstate authorities did not at first welcome the action. They had an understandable desire to pursue the problem without the intervention of the Federal Government. But the conference was a success. The conferees approved a timetable which should mean that in a few years, long-standing sources of pollution will be under control. That conference, like others, should encourage a speed-up in pollution abatement on waters not actually within the conference area. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the State and interstate authorities, and the Senator from Connecticut may take pride in this splendid result.

The short history of Federal enforcement in water pollution control includes other cases, which I shall not here recite, in which the State and local authorities and, above all, the people, have had reason to thank the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for helping them restore the waters of their areas to reasonable purity, for the use and enjoyment of their citizens.

A few weeks ago, public attention was focused on the conference, held in New Orleans, on the matter of the pollution of the interstate waters of the lower Mississippi and its tributaries in Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee. Every year since 1960, massive fish kills took place in the fall and winter months in the lower Mississippi and Atchafalaya Rivers and the Gulf of Mexico. The kills were particularly heavy in the winter of 1963-64. Their size was roughly estimated at 3.6 million in 1960; 275,000 in 1961; 275,000 in 1962; and 5.2 million in 1963. At the request of the Louisiana authorities, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare investigated the cause of the kills. I am informed that Public Health Service scientists conducted rigorous examinations. Their findings were embodied in the technical report of the PHS, together with conclusions, which was presented at the New Orleans conference held on May 5 and 6 of this year. The conclusions of the scientific investigators stated first, that the pesticide endrin was responsible for the fish kill observed in the Mississippi and Atchafalaya during the fall and winter of 1963-64; second, that industrial wastes and drainage from contaminated areas in the Memphis, Tenn., area are sources of endrin pollution in the Mississippi River; third, that other sources, which must be identified through further study, contribute to the endrin found in the lower Mississippi drainage area; fourth, that

sewage and industrial waste discharges may cause interstate pollution, and will require further study; fifth, that the presence of minute endrin concentrations in the treated water of the Vicksburg, Miss., and New Orleans water supplies is a matter for concern, for while acute effects on humans of endrin in water have not been detected, the effects of continued ingestion of even these minute quantities must be evaluated; and, sixth, that it is obvious that endrin discharges in the Memphis area, with other identified discharges endanger the health or welfare of persons in a State or States other than those in which the discharges originate, and that such discharges are subject to abatement under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

It is not surprising that the conference engendered controversy. It is not surprising that the industry most concerned took vigorous exception to the conclusions of the technical report. I am told that the Velsicol Chemical Corp. sent to the conference an articulate witness who made a strong statement of the corporation's contention that endrin from its Memphis plant was not the causative factor in the fish kills. To review the whole matter is certainly within the purview of a Senate committee charged with the broad oversight of Government activities. It is my privilege to serve as a member of the Committee on Government Operations, and as chairman of its Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. The Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations has been exploring the relatively new area of governmental policy respecting pesticides. Its hearings, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Connecticut, have resulted in better interagency procedures for pesticide regulation, and have been constructive in the development of new legislation in the field, for action by the cognizant committees of Congress. I hope, therefore, that the subcommittee hearings, due to resume next Monday, for the purpose of considering charges that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare mishandled its investigation of the recent Mississippi River fish kill, will also contribute to greater effectiveness of the role of Government in pesticide use, regulation, and research. In his remarks in the Senate on June 18, announcing the hearings, the Senator from Connecticut set out points at issue between the Government and the industry, as follows:

First. That the industry has disputed the Public Health Service conclusion that endrin was responsible for the fish kill.

I am advised that, after exhaustive investigation, the Public Health Service scientists came to their conclusion that endrin was responsible for the fish kill in the Mississippi and Atchafalaya Rivers last fall and winter. A variety of fish were analyzed; and the investigators found that all died with the same symptoms at the same time. Careful field and laboratory work led to the elimination of disease and other possible causes as factors in the kill. Endrin was found in

every dying fish examined. To establish endrin concentration in blood after a lethal exposure, laboratory tests were conducted on channel catfish, a freshwater variety selected for the purpose, because its blood content is relatively high. The salt water menhaden, for instance, has too little blood to permit its ready use for such tests. The studies showed a clear difference between the blood concentration of endrin in living and dying channel catfish. Those found dying in the Mississippi had concentrations as high or higher than those killed in laboratory exposures to endrin. The dying river fish and those used in the laboratory tests had identical symptoms. Kidney damage was similar. The findings supported the conclusion that the fish kill was the result of endrin poisoning.

Second. That the endrin manufacturer whose Memphis plant was found by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Agriculture to be a major source of the pollution which killed the fish, has denied the charge.

Experts of the Public Health Service, I am told, made four field trips to the Memphis area, in the weeks immediately preceding the conference. Their investigations were hampered by a series of difficulties: smoke bombs were detonated by a city public works crew checking for sewerline leaks, making sampling impossible. They received confusing information about the location and functions of sewers carrying industrial and sanitary wastes. There were signs of construction work on the sewer system between their visits. Despite these obstacles, the investigations were made, and led to conclusions presented at the conference. Among other conclusions was the finding that endrin concentrations in the water and underlying mud in the ditches and natural surface waters in the Memphis area far exceeded all previously recorded data for a variety of pesticides of the same classification. Not all, but generally the worst, of the contamination was noted at sites known to be downstream from present or past waste discharge or disposal points used by the manufacturer in question.

Third. That industry disputes the PHS findings, which measured and identified various pesticides. Industry claims that what PHS identified as dieldrin sludge and mud near the Memphis plant is actually an alcohol known as 237 chlorhydrin.

Chemistry is a field in which I do not purport to be an expert; but I am informed that dieldrin, manufactured only in Denver, Colo., and endrin, manufactured there and in Memphis, are the assigned common names for two closely related compounds. The PHS identified dieldrin in the sewage sludge of the endrin manufacturer, and found that the Memphis complex, and particularly that manufacturer, is a significant source of both endrin and dieldrin contamination in the Mississippi River. As yet, I am not informed as to what 237 chlorhydrin is. I have been advised that the Public

Health Service made the statement that it found dieldrin in the Memphis area, but made no statement as to how it got there. Just what 237 chlorhydrin is, I have not learned.

Fourth. That the question was raised as to whether the Government exaggerated the extent of the fish kill in the first place that first reports referred to millions of dead fish whereas the New Orleans conference seemed to concentrate on only 175,000.

Two different sets of figures are involved in this purported discrepancy. The Louisiana official who sought PHS help in investigating the fish kills gave, as his best estimate of the number of fish killed during the 4 years, these figures:

Year	Mississippi River		Atchafalaya River, fresh water
	Fresh water	Salt water	
1960.....	100,000	1,000,000	2,500,000
1961.....	25,000	200,000	50,000
1962.....	25,000	200,000	50,000
1963.....	75,000	5,000,000	100,000

He said there was reason to believe that only a small portion of the die-off had actually been observed, and that it was therefore extremely difficult to estimate the number of fish killed. It is possible that many, many more fish died in the massive kills of the 4-year period. The figure 175,000 refers only to the estimated number of fresh water fish killed in the year 1963.

Fifth. Question has been raised as to whether the Federal agencies conduct their regulatory proceedings in a manner that is fair to both the public and the industry. The enforcement conference in New Orleans was held under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Industry was effectively represented there. The conclusions which appear on the last page of the 119-page PHS report prepared for the conference were the conclusions of the technical investigators. As the transcript of the conference clearly shows, they were not intended to be used, nor were they used, in fact, as conclusions of the conferees. They were written in Washington, D.C., before the enforcement conference convened. Because the investigators' conclusions were so comprehensive, covering all points, they were used as a checklist of points by the conferees, in arriving at conclusions.

The Department of Agriculture announced on June 1 that none of the evidence presented at its public hearings held in April in Washington, Memphis, and Baton Rouge, nor at the HEW conference was scientifically adequate, in the Department's judgment, to justify withdrawal of endrin, aldin, or dieldrin from farm use. The conduct of the USDA hearings, the absence of findings by the examiner, and the method of the announcement of the Department's general conclusion are also to be examined in the forthcoming hearings of the Senate subcommittee.

Because the objections of industry to the actions of the Government have been laid before the Senate in recent days, I feel constrained to make these remarks for the further information of Senators and others who read the RECORD. The subcommittee hearing to be held beginning June 29 should afford an opportunity for clarification of the issues. I trust that they will have that salutary result.

THE 13TH ANNUAL BOSTON ARTS FESTIVAL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, all of us who come from Massachusetts are proud of the central role our State has played as one of the oldest and most outstanding cultural and educational centers of our country. We are proud, too, of the national and international recognition which has been accorded the city of Boston for its leadership in the arts. Massachusetts citizens combine an awareness and appreciation of our State's historical past with a determination to maintain the high standards which made that past so glorious. The 13th annual Boston Arts Festival which opened last week in the public garden is in this fine tradition.

Unpretentious in character, the arts festival offers cultural enjoyment not only to thousands of Massachusetts residents, but also to the many tourists who visit Boston each summer. Its lively, informal atmosphere provides the viewer with an important educational experience, a firsthand impression of an important facet of Boston life.

Characteristic interest in this annual event was displayed by the numerous public officials and dignitaries and the crowd of more than 25,000 people who attended the festive opening celebration last week. Because the festival will last for 8 weeks, hundreds of thousands of people will be able to enjoy this regional exhibition of the fine and visual arts. Works of art in a variety of media, including painting, sculpture, architecture, photography, music and drama, attest to the impressive talent which exists among contemporary New England artists.

The Boston Arts Festival has made a significant contribution to the cultural heritage of Massachusetts, and has, itself, become a part of Boston life. Those who have worked to make it the success it is are to be congratulated.

SENATOR FONG'S CIVIL RIGHTS SPEECH

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] for his most eloquent, moving, erudite, and scholarly address to the Senate on civil rights.

I regret very much that I was not able to hear all of his speech when Senator FONG delivered it on June 18. I have read it carefully, however, and there is no doubt in my mind that it is

a powerful speech deserving of the highest praise and the widest possible distribution.

It is my understanding that this address has already attracted nationwide and indeed worldwide attention. I am not at all surprised. For I believe it was an historic speech, delivered on an historic occasion.

SENATOR ERVIN'S BILL ON THE MENTALLY ILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is a well-known and distressing fact that present social attitudes and existing laws have not kept up to date with medical knowledge about the mentally ill. We have too long allowed mental illness to suspend an individual's legal rights; we have too long forgotten that it is a patient's right to receive continuous treatment and supervision while hospitalized. We have too long shaded our eyes to the gross injustice permitted when any person armed with a doctor's certificate may launch a relative on the road to involuntary commitment.

Mr. President, the mentally ill person is trapped in a web of redtape, without any opportunity to appeal, and without a commission to hear his plea.

Many Americans have been aware of this problem. The medical profession has done its best to work under the handicap of archaic laws governing the mentally ill. But more needs to be done.

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] had the foresight and the sensitivity to the problems of the mentally ill to lead the way in formulating legislation. Adding to his already acknowledged excellence in the legal field, he has sponsored, and the Senate has recently passed, a bill which protects the unprotected and defends the defenseless.

This bill, applicable to the District of Columbia, avoids the pitfalls of previous laws.

It breaks the illogical equation of mental illness with incompetency.

It assures periodic recertification of mental illness, thus overcoming bureaucratic inertia in the release of mental patients.

It enacts into law the principles of continuous treatment and constant supervision.

It surrounds proposed involuntary commitment with the traditional safeguard of trial by jury—a historic advance in this field.

Senator ERVIN'S proposal makes it easier for persons voluntarily seeking hospital care to receive these services. It thus promotes early detection and quicker restoration to a productive, normal life.

I have recited only some of the significant achievements of this legislation. Indeed, the much needed pioneer work has now been done, and we hope it will serve as a model for all of the States, in our attempt to bring the mentally ill back from the periphery of American life.

Mr. President, our job is to encourage rehabilitation, not to expedite obscurity, for these citizens. It is to this end that all Americans owe a debt of gratitude to the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina.

NO NONSENSE ADMIRAL: ULYSSES SIMPSON GRANT SHARP, JR.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, next Wednesday, July 1, a change of command which will take place in Hawaii will elevate a veteran Navy officer in the Pacific—Ulysses Simpson Grant Sharp, Jr.—to the high post of commander in chief, Pacific. As commander in chief, Pacific, Admiral Sharp will be in command of the largest U.S. military command in the world, covering more than 40 percent of the surface of the earth. The U.S. Army Pacific, the Pacific Air Forces, and the Pacific Fleet are component commands serving under CINCPAC.

On September 30, 1963, Admiral Sharp assumed duty as the commander in chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet. It was recalled recently that at the time when he became Pacific Fleet chief, he said he "expected his job would get hotter long before it got any easier." That is precisely what happened, for in the past 9 months Admiral Sharp has had to face the grim and unrelenting realities of the southeast Asian situation. His task has been to direct our farflung naval forces in the vast Pacific and to keep open the lifeline of supplies and men to embattled areas. His promotion now to commander in chief of the Pacific is a fitting tribute and a recognition of a difficult assignment well done.

Admiral Sharp is well known in Hawaii, from having spent a good part of his long and outstanding naval career in that region. The people of Hawaii welcome him as an old friend to his new command. I join them in expressing our highest respect to Admiral Sharp.

On this occasion, I wish again to salute Adm. Harry Donald Felt, who will relinquish his command to Admiral Sharp, next week, upon reaching the retirement age of 62. It was my privilege to pay a tribute in the Senate to Admiral Felt on Armed Forces Day last May 16.

I ask unanimous consent that two articles referring to the appointment of Admiral Sharp as commander in chief of the Pacific—"No Nonsense Admiral," from the New York Times of February 28, 1964; and "Navy Holds Key to Defense," from the San Diego Union of March 4, 1964—be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1964]
NO-NONSENSE ADMIRAL: ULYSSES SIMPSON GRANT SHARP, JR.

One of the most keen-eyed golfers who played at the Army and Navy Country Club outside Washington a few years ago was a short, silver-haired Pentagon admiral with the formidable name of Ulysses Simpson Grant Sharp, Jr. Admiral Sharp, a stocky

soft-spoken man who covered the golf course in less than leisurely fashion, regularly shot in the low 80's, but he had a reputation as the man who could come through with a 50-foot putt if his team was in trouble and the chips were down.

In his long naval career, Admiral Sharp has displayed many of the same qualities that make him a tough customer on the golf course. He is known as an extremely able but not spectacular officer. He is regarded as a man who does not need to shout to have his orders carried out, and as a thinker who can zip through the complexities of a complicated problem in policy or planning and come up with a clear, precise answer.

CAUGHT M'NAMARA'S EYE

He began his career in the traditional way—by serving in and commanding destroyers. The first major command he held was that of Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Policy and Planning, a post he assumed in August 1960.

His pragmatic, no-nonsense work at the Pentagon brought him to the attention of many highly ranked military figures, as well as Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. Only last September he was appointed commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, and promoted to a full admiral. He now succeeds Adm. Harry D. Felt as head of the Far East Command.

As with many other military and naval officers, Admiral Sharp's career seemed to move into high gear only after he had spent a long time in the service.

He was born in Fort Benton, Mont., April 2, 1906, the son of a non-Navy man who had been named after his aunt's husband, Gen. Ulysses S. Grant.

TWENTY YEARS IN THE PACIFIC

Young Sharp's husky, blond and blue-eyed appearance won him the nickname of "Oley," a name given locally to those who resemble Swedes.

In 1923, he was appointed to the Naval Academy. Upon receiving his commission as an ensign at graduation, he went to sea aboard destroyers, cruisers and other ships of the line.

After winning a letter of commendation for participating in the Allied landings at Casablanca in 1943, Admiral Sharp was transferred to the Pacific, where he has spent most of the last 20 years, except for the tour in Washington.

While commanding a destroyer off of Nauru in the South Pacific on a mission to rescue a downed flier, Admiral Sharp won a bronze star for maneuvering his ship under pointblank enemy fire.

In the Pacific campaign, Admiral Sharp won a second Bronze Star, two Silver Stars and other decorations. He then spent a few years ashore, as commander of the fleet's sonar school in San Diego, Calif.

After attending the Naval War College, Admiral Sharp commanded a squad of destroyers operating off Korea in 1950, and was the fleet planning officer for the Inchon invasion.

Before his appointment to the Pentagon in 1960, he held a number of staff jobs with the Pacific Fleet, including that of assistant director of strategic planning and, commander of the combined cruiser-destroyer force.

Admiral Sharp is married to the former Patricia O'Connor, who is also an ardent golfer. They have two children, Mrs. Russell F. Milham of Los Angeles, and a son, Lt. (j.g.) Grant A. Sharp.

On the job, Admiral Sharp is a long and tireless worker, often spending 10 to 12 hours a day at his desk. This may be one explanation of his quickstep on the links. In his spare time he likes to read mostly history and current affairs.

[From the San Diego Union, Mar. 24, 1964]
EXPERIENCE GUARDS PACIFIC: NAVY HOLDS KEY TO DEFENSE

That a Navy man is to take command of a Navy job would not seem to come as a surprise. But the selection of Adm. Ulysses S. Grant Sharp, Jr., as commander in chief of U.S. operations in the Pacific, signifies nullification of a proposed plan to rotate the command among the military services.

The Pacific Command is the largest military one on earth. It covers 85 million square miles of land and sea, almost half of the world's surface.

The Pacific is essentially a sea command. The area is so vast that airplanes cannot span its distances with men and supplies and only by ships can aid be gotten to the outer rims where atheistic communism day by day pushes against the line which the free world has drawn for its security and existence.

The logistics of patrol, protection, and action in the Pacific are all sea oriented. That it was even considered that such an operation should be passed to a land- or air-oriented commander reflects the change in military concepts that at times seems to overwhelm judgment in defense planning.

Military decisions are too often based on balancing organizational charts and weighing costs of various delivery systems. But strategy is human evaluation. It is not just counting the number of soldiers and missiles on the other side but understanding their motives and anticipating and countering their moves.

In World War II the Navy swept the Pacific clear of all enemies, actual and potential, and has commanded its waters, right up to the edge of the Asian Continent, ever since.

The Navy keeps the road open to Korea, South Vietnam, Quemoy, and Matsu. These are the doors against which communism is beating, or pushing. President Johnson's selection of Admiral Sharp to command this theater of operations is fresh assurance, and a badly needed one, that the United States has no intention of pulling back from the forward strategy inherent in naval strategy.

We are going to keep vital defense hardware at the front, not just at home.

Admiral Sharp, like so many of our outstanding military leaders, has spent a good part of his life on the Pacific and in learning and living with its vast challenges.

Under his command will be a combined force—Navy, Marine, Army, and Air Force—numbering more than 400,000 men. The appointment of a tested admiral as commander in chief means this force will be wisely deployed and used in the way it should be used, and when and where it should be used.

WINNER OF NEWPORT-TO-BERMUDA RACE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as a Senator from Rhode Island, I point out that our State can take particular pride in the fact that the Newport-to-Bermuda race was won by the *Burgoo*, which made the trip in a corrected time of 80 hours 50 minutes 7 seconds. Although this comparatively small 37-foot yawl was the smallest of the vessels entered, and hence had the largest handicap, she was handled so skillfully by her skipper, Milton Ernstof, of Providence, that she managed to avoid the calms that plagued so many of her competitors.

We from Rhode Island take pride, not only because she was sailed and skippered by Rhode Islanders, and because of the fact that six of her crew of seven

were from Rhode Island, but also because this stock fiber glass vessel was built by the Pearson Corp., of Bristol, R.I. Speaking as a sailor, too, I know full well the stamina and the will that were necessary on the part of her crew in order to win, and I salute them for this outstanding performance.

We in my State are indeed proud of this all-Rhode Island yacht and her crew of seven, all but one from Rhode Island, too. The other crew members are: Dr. Ernest McVay, of East Providence; Russell Hunt, Jr., of Cranston; Robert Read, of Seekonk; Jorj Levy, of Tiverton; Alden Walls, of Barrington; and Geoffrey Spranger, an instructor at St. George's School, in Middletown.

SOUTH DAKOTA EDITOR SUPPORTS MILITARY CONVERSION PLANNING

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, permit me to call to the attention of the Senate an editorial which appeared in the Tuesday, June 23, issue of the *Pierre, S. Dak., Daily Capital Journal*, edited and published by Mr. Robert Hipple.

The editorial refers to my recent newsletter regarding the inadvisability of maintaining military installations no longer needed for the defense of the Nation.

The editor states that while we must maintain a fully adequate defense, we must also recognize that a military item contributes nothing to the general standard of living of the people of this country. The same money spent for education does make a continuing contribution.

The Commerce Committee has resumed hearings on my bill, S. 2274, to create a National Economic Conversion Commission to deal with matters referred to in this editorial. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

QUALITY REQUIRES WORK

The defense budget of this country supports the economy of hundreds of communities. It is responsible for almost 10 percent of all the jobs in the country. But instead of trying to maintain military installations no longer needed for defense, we ought to plan constructive alternative uses for this labor and capital.

The paragraph is taken from a newsletter issued from Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN's office; and it is one with which the *Daily Capital Journal* agrees. It can be argued that the man who pours concrete into a silo to house a missile does exactly the same work as the man who pours concrete into the wall of a new schoolhouse; but there is a vast difference. The missile site contributes nothing to the general standard of living of the people of this country. The schoolhouse does.

Certainly nobody would advocate abolishing the entire Defense Establishment of this country, just as nobody would advocate putting 10 percent of all workers in the country out of work. Yet the fact remains that it should be possible to provide employment for a lot of people who now are employed

primarily in defense work, at jobs which would result in producing something for the people of this country to consume and enjoy.

Incidentally we suspect that one important contribution to this end could be made by adopting the philosophy that quality is important in goods and services. Maybe it would provide more jobs and more opportunity for employment if a lot of goods and services in this country were of higher standard than they are. There is an awful lot of shoddy junk sold in this country every day, and an awful lot of shoddy workmanship on the part of people who have found jobs in service industries.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY
MORTIMER CAPLIN AT ST.
MICHAEL'S COLLEGE

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, a few days ago, Mortimer M. Caplin, U.S. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, delivered the commencement address at St. Michael's College, in Winooski, Vt.

The very thought-provoking statement he made consisted of an appraisal of the challenges which confront today's college graduates and a consideration of the inspirational legacy stemming from the life and works of two great world leaders—Pope John XXIII and the late President John F. Kennedy—which the graduates have to aid them in facing these challenges.

Mr. Caplin's very eloquent remarks on the subjects of brotherhood, integrity, and leadership, although directed primarily toward college graduates, have relevance to all citizens; and I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

PROMISES TO KEEP

(Remarks by Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mortimer M. Caplin, at Commencement exercises, St. Michael's College, Winooski, Vt.)

It is a privilege to participate in these graduation ceremonies. I wish to extend my appreciation to Father Dupont and the board of trustees, not only for having me here, but also for honoring me with a St. Michael's degree. I only hope the members of the graduating class join in the choice of a Commissioner of Internal Revenue as commencement speaker.

For hundreds of years now, speakers from other walks of life have been sending graduates out into society apparently with equal success. There's no reason to believe a Revenue man would achieve any lesser results. Indeed, some might feel that he brings a special sense of poignancy to the cutting of the academic umbilical cord—for the presence of the tax collector signifies the student's entrance into the world, as perhaps nothing else.

But, I have little enthusiasm for the kind of final separation between student and college that often follows graduation. Your ties which are so close today should become closer in years to come. So I don't intend to perform my duties too decisively.

VALUES AT COLLEGE

I remember well my own graduation from the University of Virginia in 1940. Italy had just sent troops into France and President Franklin D. Roosevelt had just delivered his "dagger-in-the-back" speech at our law school graduation. With diploma in hand, I drove off to my first law job and literally

shouted with joy at the thought of having completed my formal schooling. But in the years ahead I soon realized that it was only the beginning, and that I never really wanted to put behind the values we stress at Virginia—the high sense of honor and integrity that permeates all its activities.

The spirit and total environment at St. Michael's have evoked, I'm sure, a deep response in you, a response that calls forth your best efforts—your truest scholarship, your highest personal ideals, your warmest human relationships. The intellectual excitement, the fermentation of ideas, and the ethical standards which prevail here all create a unique climate for enlarging these characteristics.

Implanted here, too, is the concept of an honorable fruitful life, among honorable men. Your years here, shaped by strong religious training, promise that you will carry that concept on into the world. As you leave these beautiful grounds today, I'm sure you'll make such promises not only to yourself, but for your children and for the generations to come.

You are taking off from a solid foundation—based on the best of educations and a way of life which is engrained in your daily existence, and which has become a permanent part of you. Now, lying before you, waiting to be reached for, is a still richer and fuller life which maturity, experience and future knowledge all make possible. This will not come automatically to you who merely stand and wait. Rather it is the reward of the individual who lifts his eyes upward, who continues his pursuit of excellence, who seeks learning and understanding and compassion. Whether you grow and develop to the fullest of your potential depends upon the effort and sacrifice you are willing to make, and upon your devotion to your ideals and personal goals.

But this is only one aspect of the challenge you face. What about your relationships with others—your family, your church, your community, your Nation?

I see you embarking on these relations in times which are more complex than those of my own graduating class. In the 1940's, there was danger, to be sure—the imminence of war and only partial recovery from the great depression of the 1930's. But the path of duty was clear then and, if jobs were not easy to get, the young were unfailingly optimistic.

In 1964, you face conflicts that were not present two decades ago—conflicts that typically call for a high degree of personal choice and personal commitment. The times demand a sense of individual involvement rather than a passive drifting with national events. And the need for decision and leadership has never been greater, if we are to meet the challenges facing us as individuals as well as those facing the Nation and the world.

BROTHERHOOD

One challenge we face in America, dwarfing all others, is the need for a nationwide moral commitment to brotherhood, among all races and religions. At St. Michael's this creates no conflict, and the answers come forth loud and clear. But not so beyond the confines of this campus. Not so in many sections of this country—north, south, east, and west.

Happily, the ecumenical movement set in motion by Pope John XXIII offers hope of bridging the gaps between faiths, and drawing all men closer together under the Fatherhood of God.

Pope John, that great and gentle good man, in his brief tenure as pontiff, left a legacy of love that has moved the world. As Franziskus Cardinal Koenig, of Vienna, said at Catholic University last April:

"Only once in many centuries such a pope was granted to the church. Basically he did not say or do anything that other popes did

not do or say before him, but while their voice did not penetrate into the world, the world understood John and believed him."

Cardinal Koenig told how "a worldwide ecumenical movement is in progress, drawing all races and continents." That there will be bridges built joining Rome to all other religions seems inevitable, in light of the spirit and attitude emanating today from the Holy See.

As a Jew, I am heartened by Cardinal Bea's statement to the Vatican Council that "we affirm that the church must certainly imitate Christ's example of gentle charity toward the people through whom it received so many great benefits from God." It was Pope John who met a delegation of Jews in St. Peter's with the greeting: "I am Joseph, your brother." It was Pope Paul who later prayed in the Holy Land for a world of "true, profound concord among all men and all peoples."

Where theologians have pointed the way, our political leaders are following close behind. In our own country, at the secular level, the striving for racial understanding is spotlighted by the civil rights movement and the demands for equal rights and equal opportunity. Decisions must be made; sides must be chosen; voices must be heard.

To some, the religious way, the democratic way—the right way—is clear. Not so to others. And at times the division seems uncomfortably close.

Responsible leadership and personal participation are called for from all elements of our society.

INTEGRITY

Another key challenge of the day is the threat to our sense of personal and business integrity. This is the era of the fast buck, the heyday of the influence peddler, the kickback-merchant, and the fixer. On many sides, we see evidences of corruption—from seduction of college athletes to commercial payola and bribery of public officials.

It is disturbing in my own work to see the attitudes of some people in meeting their obligations to their Government, whether through paying taxes or personally serving their country. A case in point is the excesses of expense account living—claiming as business tax deductions such things as vacations, social entertainment, and other family expenses. Attempts to bring these improper practices under control evoked the cries of many that we are undermining the American way of life.

Equally bad is the frequent rationalization of action of this type almost to the point of acceptable behavior. Alexander Pope said it well:

"Vice is a monster, of so frightful mien
As, to be hated, needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."

There is a need, then, to hold fast to high ethics and morality; to place principle above expediency, honor above gain—to strive, in other words, "to keep one's self unspotted from this world." There is need for individuals and leaders who will help set standards and raise levels of conduct—who will not turn their backs on what they see, but who will personally involve themselves to root out that which is dishonorable or dishonest in their towns, in their communities, in their businesses.

TENSION AND BIGOTRY

Another sharp challenge of the day arises from the tensions in our society—the many pressures created by our international relations, economic and political, and the conflicts among nations in a nuclear age. These tensions place a special premium on the ancient virtues: charity, patience, and reason. We have seen how even love of country and

hatred of communism can be confused, and can combine to produce extremes of behavior which add virulence to the Nation's bloodstream and abrasiveness to our American communities.

Let us resist the temptation to find scapegoats for all the world's ills, to look for the mote in our brother's eye. Let us encourage open discussion, airing of ideas, tolerance and a rule of reason. Let us beware of bigotry and extremism, of the right as well as of the left. Let our voices sound in support of reasoned democratic views.

These then are the challenges of our day—the ecumenical spirit with its call to brotherhood, racial understanding, preserving personal integrity, avoiding bigotry, joining in the free airing of ideas. As President Johnson expressed it the other day, we are face to face with the opportunity to move "upward to the great society"—a society which "rests on abundance and liberty for all. It demands an end to poverty and racial injustice—to which we are totally committed in our time." This is the "challenge of the next half century," and we must have the "wisdom to enrich and elevate our national life—and to advance the quality of American civilization."

As individuals, we must meet each of these challenges and give the best in us to find solutions. But needed, too, is the help of great leaders at home as well as abroad.

LEADERSHIP AND PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Within a brief span of time, the Catholic religion provided two such leaders—Pope John and President Kennedy.

Pope John's enormous contribution, which I touched on before, has been felt throughout the world by men and women of all races and creeds. To paraphrase Cardinal Koenig, only once in many centuries is such a Pope granted to the church.

In our own country, for a few short years, we found such leadership in a remarkably talented young man, President John F. Kennedy. His untimely death last November darkened all our lives, and snatched from the world a unique feeling of hope and expectation that had spread during his term in office.

John F. Kennedy was the first President of the United States to participate actively in breaking down major barriers of religion, color and national origin. He was the first President of the United States, as his brother Ted recently pointed out, "to state publicly that segregation was morally wrong"—long a position of the Catholic Church. "If his life and death had a meaning," Senator TED KENNEDY went on to say, "it was that we should not hate but love one another; we should use our powers not to create conditions of oppression that lead to violence, but conditions of freedom that lead to peace."

We remember him fondly for many things, many qualities. He did bring a new style and grace to the Presidency. Ilario Fiori, an Italian newspaper correspondent to the White House, described him as "a Renaissance man." I can testify that he was a warm, vibrant man, with extraordinary intelligence and vitality. His friend, Ben Bradlee of Newsweek, described him as also "a restless, exuberant man, always looking forward to the next challenge."

At the same time, Ben Bradlee made it clear that President Kennedy was "a wonderfully funny man, always gay and cheerful, never mean. * * * You could see a laugh coming to his eyes before you could hear it from his lips." His respect for learning and education was laced with this great humor when—on receiving an honorary degree from Yale University—he remarked: "It might be said now that I have the best of both worlds. A Harvard education and a Yale degree."

John Kennedy was an astute student of government and its various institutions. He possessed an unusual sensitivity to the close link between sound government and the aspirations of a free democracy. Legislation was not an abstraction to him. Each proposal must be weighed, not only from the standpoint of its specific purposes, but also in terms of its overall impact on society.

Thus, in calling for an end to expense account abuses, he stated unequivocally: "This is a matter of national concern, affecting not only our public revenues, our sense of fairness, and our respect for the tax system, but our moral and business practices as well." Corrective measures, he believed, would "strengthen both our tax structure and the moral fiber of our society."

PUBLIC SERVICE AND PRESIDENT KENNEDY

President Kennedy brought a new spirit of dedication to Federal service. His vision for the public service was far reaching, going back to the ideals of classical times. He saw in it the quintessence of the best in American life—a calling with a sense of purpose, conducted with integrity, offering the full development of one's powers; a calling, in short, dedicated to the pursuit of excellence.

As the author of "Profiles in Courage," it's not surprising that he regarded integrity as the sine qua non of government. His words speak for themselves. In a special message to Congress shortly after assuming office, he said:

"No responsibility of government is more fundamental than the responsibility of maintaining the highest standards of ethical behavior by those who conduct the public business.

"There can be no dissent from the principle that all officials must act with unwavering integrity, absolute impartiality, and complete devotion to the public interest."

No President has articulated so well the special place of the public service in a democracy. In his first State of the Union Message, you will recall his inspiring challenge:

"Let the public service be a proud and lively career. And let every man and woman who works in any area of our National Government, in any branch, at any level, be able to say with pride and honor in future years: 'I served the U.S. Government in that hour of our Nation's need.'"

John Kennedy helped Government employees walk tall, with honor and with pride. He presented a clear challenge to the youth of America—and especially to the veterans of World War II, who had shared with him the shattering experiences of armed conflict—to join him in dedication to duty and service to country. He inspired them all to follow his lead in a bold march to the New Frontier.

His own service to country must convey a special message to graduating students everywhere, particularly to those who share his rich religious heritage. He proved conclusively how well a Catholic can serve in the highest office without conflict between church and state.

CONCLUSION

Tomorrow you'll set forth on a new course of your own. You will come face to face with the challenges we've discussed, and I trust you'll meet them well.

I urge you to remain alert to the stirrings of leadership—the desire to reach for broader goals and to move beyond your immediate personal sphere of activity. As these aspirations evidence themselves, don't let them be submerged.

Your background and education at St. Michael's have fitted you for an active role in the affairs of your college and your parish; in your local community and in local politics.

Don't place any limits on your continuous search for learning and understanding. Be heard on the big issues of the day; and use your knowledge and ability to inform and to help mold public opinion, and to suggest sound courses of action to others.

I hope you will give careful thought, too—somewhere during your career—to serving your local, State or National Government. John Kennedy emphasized at Vanderbilt University that through public service "you will have the unequalled satisfaction of knowing that your character and talent are contributing to the direction and success of this free society."

It is perhaps fitting that I close with a quotation from New England's own poet, who was so close to President Kennedy. The President's favorite poem was said to be Robert Frost's "Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening." It closes with these lines:

"The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep,
And miles to go before I sleep,
And miles to go before I sleep."

John Kennedy's journey was cut short. But he kept his promises to us, and to a generation of Americans. Let us hope that the graduates of 1964 will have the vision and sense of personal commitment to make promises for the generations ahead, and the courage and stamina to see that they are fulfilled.

PERSECUTION OF JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION—RESOLUTION OF VERMONT JEWISH YOUTH COUNCIL

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, more and more evidence is being brought to light regarding the ill treatment of the Jews in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Soviet officials have made Jewish citizens the victims of a vicious social and economic discrimination, and have denied Jews the right to worship God according to the traditions of their faith.

The Vermont Jewish Youth Council has adopted a resolution condemning the Soviet Government for its unjust acts, and has urged all peoples and governments to do everything possible to right these wrongs.

I applaud the council for its action. In order that all Senators may have an opportunity to read the resolution, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

Whereas the religious rights of the Jews of the U.S.S.R. have been significantly denied by the Soviet Government, and

Whereas the cultural activities of the Jews of the U.S.S.R. have been stifled by the Soviet Government, and

Whereas there has been abundant evidence that the Jews of the U.S.S.R. have been placed in an inferior social and economic position by the Soviet Government; be it

Resolved, That we, the Vermont Jewish Youth Council, do strongly condemn these actions by the Soviet Government and urge all responsible peoples and governments to do everything possible to right these injustices.

Presented and passed unanimously at the semiannual business meeting of the Vermont Jewish Youth Council, May 31, 1964.

NAOMI WALL,
Secretary.

MRS. WILLIAM HASEBROOCK, NEW PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in the three-quarters of a century since its founding in the Madison Square Theater, in New York, the General Federation of Women's Clubs has been headed by a distinguished list of American women.

The new president, installed at the Federation's annual convention in Atlantic City on June 11, is Mrs. William Hasebroock, of West Point, the first Nebraskan to assume leadership over this international organization with 11 million members in 15,000 clubs located in 53 countries.

Mrs. Hasebroock comes to her new duties with a brilliant background of service as a teacher, musician, civic leader, mother, and grandmother. The 2 years of her term promise to be among the brightest chapters in the long and remarkable history of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Shortly before her inauguration, Mrs. Hasebroock told an interviewer:

It is better to do a few things well, than many things poorly; and it is better to help others help themselves, than to do it for them.

I suggest, Mr. President, that those of us in government could well heed those words.

Mrs. Hasebroock has been in club work for 36 years, since the night in 1928 when—almost by accident—she became a charter member of the Woman's Club of Scribner, Nebraska. Her husband was called away from home, to attend a meeting, leaving his young bride alone. When a neighbor invited her to attend the organizational meeting of the women's club, she accepted, thus beginning a career of selfless service which has been climaxed by her election as president of the general federation.

In the 74 years since the federation was established, and in the 63 years since it was granted a Federal charter by Congress, voluntary, private organizations—fraternal and community groups, trade associations, and labor unions—have become a spectacular and significant segment of the American scene.

In 1910, when the general federation was founded, government played a limited role in the individual lives of Americans. Today, it reaches deep into the lives of all of us. However, if individual citizens, banded together in a workable community organization, had not accepted the obligation of voluntarily meeting social and economic needs, government would inevitably have grown larger, to fill the vacuum.

It is the Margaret Hasebroocks of this country who, through unselfish service and care, best typify this spirit of individual acceptance of community responsibility, through group action.

The amount of time the citizens of America give to community service is incalculable. Hundreds of thousands of men and women donate as much energy to nonofficial, unpaid, voluntary activities as they do to their workaday jobs; and this extracurricular work has a deep, lasting influence on the community and on society as a whole.

The principles of work, thrift, responsibility, and initiative, which are embraced by Mrs. Hasebroock and her thousands of clubwomen, are the natural spiritual products of a rich community life.

The democratic process, practiced in women's club work, is the best framework for the exchange of ideas and enrichment of the human spirit. I like to believe that this country of ours is a natural proving ground for such qualities.

It was in this general atmosphere of community life and activity that the American tradition first emerged, and, in it, grew and thrived, and today helps to secure our freedoms.

Democracy in the American tradition will persevere only when it functions within the local community. Democracy in this tradition can be a vigorous and dynamic force, nationally and internationally, but only if it possesses those qualities at the hometown level.

It is in this spirit that Margaret Hasebroock has assumed the presidency of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. She seeks to serve. Her own words are:

I believe that I can do more for my grandchildren and others by working for a secure world through the federation, than I can by remaining on my corner in West Point.

Mrs. Hasebroock was unopposed for election to her new office—a splendid recognition by her associates of her brilliant record, which includes the presidency of the National Association of Parliamentarians, a State office in Eastern Star, and membership in State-level activities of the Heart Fund, civil defense, the Society for Crippled Children, and the Safety Council. She has received the coveted Good Neighbor Award from the Omaha World-Herald and the Knights of Ak-Sar-Ben.

Margaret Hasebroock is the perfect answer to the question, so often asked:

What can I, an individual citizen, do about peace and taxes and disarmament, about civil rights, the national debt, and foreign aid?

From the time when she signed the charter of the Scribner, Nebr., Woman's Club, Mrs. Hasebroock has been doing something about these problems. Meanwhile, she has enjoyed a full and rich family life. Her husband, Senator William H. Hasebroock, is a successful businessman and a leader in the Nebraska Legislature. Their son, Robert, is active in Omaha banking and in politics. They have three fine grandchildren.

Margaret Hasebroock typifies the best in American womanhood—a deliberate and unflustered outlook reminiscent of the pioneer women who preceded her to the Nebraska prairies.

We cannot—nor do we want to—recreate the old frontier, with all its challenges and opportunities. But we can combine, as Margaret Hasebroock has, all the fine traditions of our past and the advantages of this space age with the best qualities of living and the deep pleasures of family and home which are a part of our American heritage.

Mr. President, I have a sampling of the newspaper articles and editorials concerning Mrs. Hasebroock's election to

head the National Federation of Women's Clubs. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star, June 11, 1964]

MRS. HASEBROOCK TO LEAD GFWC

ATLANTIC CITY, N.J.—Delegates to the 73d annual convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs elected Mrs. William H. Hasebroock of West Point, Nebr., to a 2-year term Wednesday as president of the organization which represents 11 million women in 54 countries.

They also adopted, with little or no discussion, 10 of 15 resolutions submitted by federation departments and State organizations.

Among the resolutions adopted were measures urging club members to support and promote the establishment of 2-year or junior colleges; to create interest in and seek to make provision for local parks, playgrounds, and other recreational facilities, and to continue their interest in and support of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, D.C.

The women also called on club members to strive for higher levels of morality and integrity in public and private life; to cooperate with public and private agencies in their States making an evaluation study of the foster care program and work for legislation when necessary to control and prohibit littering of public and private landscape, waterfront, and water.

In addition to Mrs. Hasebroock, who succeeds Mrs. Dexter Otis Arnold, of Concord, N.H., and Saugerties, N.Y., officers named were Mrs. E. D. Pierce, of Miami, Fla., first vice president; Mrs. Earle A. Brown, of Pittsburgh, Pa., third vice president; and Mrs. Kermit V. Haughan, Minneapolis, Minn., recording secretary. All won uncontested races.

Mrs. Walter V. Magee, of Lakewood, Ohio, defeated Mrs. Thomas H. Denman, of Callipatria, Calif., in a contest for the post of second vice president.

Mrs. Chester E. Martin, of Atlanta, Ga., won the treasurer's spot in a victory over Mrs. William S. Shary, of Baldwin, Long Island, N.Y.

[From the Hastings (Nebr.) Tribune, June 12, 1964]

WOMEN IN POLITICS: MRS. HASEBROOCK'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

"Women can be expected to take a stronger role in government and politics," Mrs. William Hasebroock of West Point said Thursday night at Atlantic City, N.J., at the national convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mrs. Hasebroock, the new president of the general federation, said, "When legislation is required to serve freedom's causes, we shall make our voices heard at every level of government and particularly when we can better the legal, social, economic, and political status of women.

"We shall urge our members to informed participation in the affairs of the political parties of their choice, and especially in the exercise of their vote. We have the womanpower in this organization to raise the voting participation of women to a level commensurate with our numerical strength. It's a challenge, but we can do it."

Mrs. Hasebroock made her remarks in an address after she was installed as president of the federation. At the ceremony closing the 73d annual convention of the federation were Gov. and Mrs. Frank Morrison, Senator and Mrs. Roman Hruska, and

Representative and Mrs. Ralph L. Beermann, of Nebraska.

Mrs. Hasebroock told the clubwomen, "Our mandate is clear. We must become still more knowledgeable in the many fields necessary to discharge our role as citizens in a free world, foster continued progress, and build on our heritage of freedom.

"To accomplish this goal we shall give special emphasis to those existing study programs which not only enrich the minds of our members but provide the tools of active citizenship."

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star Journal, June 14, 1964]

TOP JOB FOR NEBRASKAN

Representing 11 million women in 54 countries is no small task. And any woman elected to such a responsibility must be extremely capable, energetic, and respected.

These attributes obviously fit Mrs. William Hasebroock of West Point who has just been elected to the huge job of president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

The federated women's clubs are a tremendous force for good in the United States and the other countries where they are active.

Mrs. Hasebroock and her husband, a member of the Nebraska Legislature, have devoted their efforts to the good of the State of Nebraska.

So the election of Mrs. Hasebroock as head of the General Federation of Women's Clubs is well deserved. Nebraskans can be proud to have a fellow Cornhusker leading such a large and important organization.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, June 14, 1964]

A NEBRASKAN ELECTED

The General Federation of Women's Clubs, which represents 11 million women in 54 countries, last week elected as its president for 2 years Mrs. William H. Hasebroock of West Point.

Mrs. Hasebroock said recently:

"I believe that I can do more for my grandchildren and others by working for a secure world through the federation than I can by remaining on my corner in West Point."

Mrs. Hasebroock has done much for her corner in West Point, too, and her friends and neighbors would agree that her new laurels are richly deserved.

[From the Nebraska City (Nebr.) News-Press, June 14, 1964]

BETTER COMMUNITIES

A Nebraskan, Mrs. William H. Hasebroock, of West Point, now heads the largest women's organization in the world, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, representing 11 million women in 54 countries.

The Federation has joined with other organizations for 5 years to analyze community programs and then to organize to solve them.

How do you make a better community? The Federation adopted 10 resolutions at its recent national convention, including measures urging members to support the establishment of junior colleges, to work for more local parks, playgrounds, and other recreational facilities and to work for legislation to control and prohibit littering the countryside.

There were other resolutions calling on members to continue their support of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, to strive for higher levels of morality and integrity in public and private life, to support the foster care program.

Any or all of these objectives will make better communities, and better communities promote better citizenship, something that is needed in every city and village in the

land. If anyone can make these improvements, the 11 million ladies in the Federation can.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, May 31, 1964]

NEBRASKAN TO LEAD 9 MILLION CLUBWOMEN (By Mary McGrath)

Thirty-six years ago a young bride sat in her Scribner, Nebr., home and frowned with self-pity. She'd been left alone for the evening while her husband attended a meeting.

The bride, Mrs. William H. Hasebroock, is now the grandmother of three. That busy husband is now the State senator from West Port. And because of that long ago evening, Mrs. Hasebroock soon will become the first Nebraskan to head the General Federation of Women's Clubs—the world's largest women's organization.

The Council Bluffs native recounted the incident during a recent visit at the Omaha home of the Hasebroocks' son and only child, Robert, and his family.

"A neighbor asked me if I would like to go to a meeting that evening," recalled Margaret Hasebroock. "I didn't even ask the name of the club. I just went." It was an organizational session for the Scribner Woman's Club and—by accident—Mrs. Hasebroock was the first to sign the charter. Since that time, the coloratura soprano, who holds degrees from Grinnell (Iowa) College and Midland College at Fremont, literally has sung her way up the general federation ladder.

UNOPPOSED

A past State president, Mrs. Hasebroock was appointed chairman of the music division and fine arts and public affairs departments. She won elections as recording secretary and as third, second and first vice presidents. Now the former schoolteacher is the unopposed candidate for president of an organization with 11 million members in the United States and 54 other countries. Installation on June 11 will climax the convention in Atlantic City, N.J.

To this post she brings a litany of accomplishments, including service as past president of the National Association of Parliamentarians, former State officer of the Nebraska Chapter of the Order of the Eastern Star and membership in State level groups of the heart fund, civil defense, crippled children and safety council.

In 1950 Mrs. Hasebroock received a good neighbor award from the World-Herald and the Knights of Ak-Sar-Ben.

I CAN DO MORE

The opportunity for service has prompted Mrs. Hasebroock to work for and accept the 2-year term as president. (She made up her mind to try for the post while serving as recording secretary.)

"I believe that I can do more for my grandchildren and others by working for a secure world through the federation than I can by remaining on my corner in West Point," she explained. (Incidentally, the grandchildren, Linda, Julie and Mark Hasebroock, already have been invited to visit grandmother at general federation headquarters in Washington, D.C., in August. Their parents and State Senator Hasebroock will be present for the election and installation.)

What of the future?

"In general my program will evolve around a national, an international and a health project, all aimed at promoting a greater awareness of America and fulfilling the dual object of the federation: community improvement and adult education," Mrs. Hasebroock said.

The months ahead will find the Nebraskan moving into a five-room apartment at federation headquarters, attending both political conventions and planning such projects as

a 35-day tour of Europe and the 75th anniversary of the organization.

Whatever the undertaking, this midwesterner will base her work on a two-pronged philosophy:

"It is better to do a few things well than many things poorly, and it is better to help others help themselves than to do it for them."

To illustrate her thinking, Mrs. Hasebroock points to the 50 clubwomen in Indianapolis, Ind., who 2 years ago became concerned with the school dropout problem.

Today they've involved 30,000 citizens in a project which has sent almost 400 students back to school and produced such byproducts as adequate street lighting and recreational facilities.

With all of her background and experience, plus support from her husband, Mrs. Hasebroock approaches the next 2 years—in her own words—"with more butterflies in my stomach every day."

But the froon is gone.

SOVIET JEWS FACE INTELLECTUAL AND CULTURAL ANNIHILATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one by one, the churches in the Soviet Union are being forced to close their doors. Freedom of religious worship has disappeared. Behind the Iron Curtain, every religion exists in an atmosphere shrouded with hostility. Its existence is precarious in the face of the officially antireligious policy pursued by the Communist regime. Yet, while all religious denominations suffer, the Jews are the chief victims of a long history of religious persecution.

The violations of the basic human rights of the Jewish people by the Soviet Government have reached a stage where they cannot be met with the silence of indifference. It is incumbent upon free countries throughout the world to register their stern protests against further discriminatory practices.

In Russia, the Jews are considered a nationality, although they are denied the basic cultural rights accorded to all other nationalities in the U.S.S.R. Jews are not permitted any sort of national or provincial organization, secular or religious, such as other nationality groups and recognized religious sects have.

Synagogues are shut down, and traditional Jewish religious practices are publicly derided. Only 70 synagogues remain open in the Soviet Union to serve the nearly 1 million Jewish faithful—or, approximately one synagogue and one rabbi for every 15,000 or 16,000 Jewish believers. Consequently, the Jews have taken to gathering in private homes, for prayers. But such gatherings are illegal, and have often been dispersed by the police. The Jew is denied burial in the consecrated ground of Jewish cemeteries.

He is not allowed to carry on his own business, to pursue the professions, or to occupy positions of cultural, political, or social leadership in Soviet society.

No publication facilities and publications are permitted the Jews. They are not allowed to purchase religious articles. The study of Hebrew has been outlawed, even for religious purposes. No Hebrew Bible has been published in Russia since 1917, and not a single Jewish religious book has appeared in print there since the early 1920's.

The Jew in the Soviet Union has no Jewish books or periodicals. He has no theater, although the Yiddish theater was once considered a matter of Soviet pride. He is villified in the rigidly controlled Soviet press; anti-Jewish sentiments and stereotypes have been built up, especially in the provincial press.

Soviet Jews are not permitted to have contact with Jewish institutions abroad. They are not free to correspond with Jews in the free world; and when financial and material aid is mailed to them, it is seldom allowed by the Soviet authorities to reach the Jews.

Thus, the Jews are not permitted to improve their lot, nor does the Soviet Government allow their friends abroad to help the Jews in the Soviet Union. They are not allowed to assimilate, to live a full Jewish life, or to emigrate, as many would wish, to Israel, or to any other country where they could live freely as Jews. In short, the Jews in the Soviet Union lead an unhealthy, uncertain, and unhappy existence.

These are shocking facts. Added together, they mean that 3 million Russian Jews are facing intellectual and cultural annihilation. They are being slaughtered, not in the ovens of Nazi concentration camps, but in the pogroms of prejudice erected by the Soviet Government. Men of small minds who oppose free religious expression because they fear its consequences have embarked on a concentrated campaign to eliminate Judaism from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government is attempting to banish men of faith, because it has no faith in men.

The disease of anti-Semitism must not be allowed to spread. It infects and destroys the hearts of freemen. Like an acid, anti-Semitism corrodes the conscience of men until they are numbered into indifference. It is time for public attention to be focused on the persecution of individuals solely because of their religious beliefs. It is time for the free people in the world to raise their voices in protest against a government which seeks to deprive men of their dignity. I hope the Senate will add its voice to those which already have made clear that freedom and the rights of conscience are incompatible with religious bigotry and intolerance.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any further morning business? If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11375) to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1965, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11375) to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1965, a temporary increase in the public debt limit

set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate is H.R. 11375. It is a bill to increase the statutory limit on the Federal debt to \$324 billion through June 30, 1965.

This is the largest increase in the Federal debt limit in 19 years. Under it the debt will rise to its highest point of all time. I shall vote against it today as I did in Finance Committee yesterday.

My votes are in constructive protest against the hazards of needless Federal spending, deficits, and debt. In lieu of this bill, I propose their elimination and I am prepared to suggest where and how such action can be taken.

In short, I recommend reduction in 1965 Federal expenditures of at least \$6.5 billion, and I recommend other action to avoid deficits and piling up debt, such as appropriate sale of nonessentials in the \$8.5 billion strategic and critical materials stockpile.

In combination such prudence could and should convert the forthcoming fifth consecutive deficit into a surplus, without impairment of any essential Federal function. And the debt could be reduced, instead of increased.

My recommendations on where such budgetary action could and should be taken are available. They are to be found in reasonable summary in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 3, beginning on page 12601.

Working paper detail, with back-up, is available on official request for constructive use. It is based on careful analysis of every expenditure item in the budget and 31 years experience in the Senate.

As the means for proper and sagacious authorization and control of Federal expenditures, I recommend Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, which is now pending before the Senate Rules Committee.

Companion bills are available in the House of Representatives. They have been introduced there by Congressmen JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin, and JOE SKUBERTZ, of Kansas.

Under these proposals the whole budget would be considered all together, and all expenditures would be subject to annual limitation in the appropriation process, with less dependence on executive control.

Expenditures out of unexpended balances, now totaling more than \$90 billion—including those through the backdoor—would be limited as well as those out of new appropriations.

And appropriations would be made—as expenditures would be controlled—in clear view of current revenue estimates to be provided by the Treasury at each step in the appropriation process.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 has been studied and perfected by the best fiscal experts in the Government. I have introduced it nine times in the Senate since 1947. The Senate has passed it twice.

At times, nearly half of the Members of the Senate have been patrons on the bill. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], in the Finance Com-

mittee yesterday, expressed desire for its adoption.

The proposals I am making are in accord with the policy statement in the tax reduction bill of this year, which called for "all reasonable means to restrain Government spending," and urged the President "to declare his accord with this objective."

It is also in accord with the November 30, 1963, statement of President Johnson. In a memorandum of that date to all heads of Federal departments, the President said:

I have pledged that the executive branch will be administered with the utmost thrift and frugality; that the Government will get a dollar's value for a dollar spent; and that the Government will set an example of prudence and economy.

I regard passing this bill, raising the debt limit, increasing the debt, and continuing operation of the Federal Government on a planned deficit basis as a breach of the policy enacted by Congress and declared by the President.

I am aware that obligations have to be met, but unnecessary obligations do not have to be made. If effective effort to get off of the deficit-debt binge were indicated, I would approve meaningful temporary provision for debt already contracted.

In the absence of such an effort, I am voting against the bill. I have seriously considered this step. It is justified. My attitude against the excesses which have produced the current debt situation and my efforts to control them over the years are proof.

The \$324 billion debt limit provided in the pending bill would raise the ceiling \$15 billion over the yearend limit of \$309 billion on June 30, and add \$9 billion to the limit which has been in effect since last November.

By either measurement, it will be the largest increase in the statutory limit on the Federal debt since it was necessary to sell war bonds to finance the global conflict of World War II.

This \$15 billion increase is for only the coming year. The Secretary of the Treasury says another increase of at least \$6 billion will be asked next year, and another increase is likely after that.

We needed a debt limit of only \$300 billion to finance World War II. That was reduced to \$275 billion when the war was over. Now a limit of \$330-billion-plus is in clear prospect.

And under this towering ceiling, with present planned deficits, the Secretary of the Treasury now foresees an actual debt close to \$325 billion, 2 years hence. He says \$312 billion will be actually outstanding on June 30—next week.

Of this \$312 billion of outstanding Federal debt, \$25.7 billion has been added in the past 4 consecutive years since the budget was balanced; and another \$12 billion is planned.

This will be \$38 billion of debt added in 6 consecutive years of deficit financing. The average is \$6 billion a year. Deficits now planned contemplate neither recession at home nor emergency abroad.

Such needless use of deficit-and-debt financing is reckless and dangerous. It has become chronic. The end is not in

sight. We have got to stop at some point. I am voting against this bill in the belief that now is better than later.

If constructive reductions in Federal spending, deficits, and debt are not undertaken now in relative peace and prosperity, what time would be appropriate? The Secretary of the Treasury says it will not be next year, or the year after. He is not sure about the year after that.

He says it would be proper to balance the Federal budget, eliminate deficits, and reduce the debt when we reach what he calls "full employment." We have not had what Government advisers now call the "interim full employment goal" in 11 years.

Meanwhile, the Secretary of the Treasury and his so-called economists rely on the theory that all will be well if the Federal Government continues to spend enough, to go in debt enough, to keep the so-called gross national product rising.

If this is a valid theory, it should have worked before now. In the past 15 years there have been 11 Federal deficits, and the debt has been increased by \$59 billion. And in this period interest on the Federal debt has doubled.

Interest alone is now costing the people of this country \$11 billion a year. This is the equivalent of more than 12 cents out of every dollar to be assessed on Federal taxpayers.

Interest on the Federal debt is now second only to national defense among the expenditure items in the Federal budget. I raise the question as to how long will it be before this interest item doubles again under present fiscal practices.

We have a congressional policy for "restrained Government spending," and we have a Presidential pledge for "prudence and economy," but we are confronted with—

First, a deficit of \$8.8 billion this year. Second, a planned deficit approaching \$6 billion next year.

Third, a planned deficit of undetermined amount for the year after that.

Fourth, a Federal debt of \$312 billion now.

Fifth, a planned debt approaching \$325 billion 2 years from now.

Sixth, no plans for either balanced budgets or debt reduction.

Conforming with the congressional policy to "restrain" expenditures and the Presidential pledge for "prudence and economy", the January budget estimated that expenditures in the coming year will be \$500 million, or about one-half of 1 percent, less than this year's total.

But to arrive at this overall reduction the budget counts nearly \$1 billion in so-called expenditure deductions which are actually not reductions in the level of expenditures at all. Reference to them may be found on pages 85, 110, 125, and 319 of the budget document.

These references are to the spending estimates for Federal National Mortgage Association, Veterans' Administration, and Export-Import Bank. They show a so-called reduction in expenditures by deducting funds to be received from the proceeds of borrowing.

The budget proposes to pool Government-held housing mortgages and foreign loans held by these agencies, sell to

the public "certificates of participation" in the pools to be redeemed in the future, and to pay interest meanwhile on the certificates.

The \$1 billion of budgeted proceeds expected from these loans by the public to the Government agencies—which would not be counted in the Federal debt—are counted as a "reduction" in expenditures by these agencies.

I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD, at the end of my remarks, correspondence on this subject with the Director of the Budget.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, under all the circumstances, I cannot justify a vote for this bill providing for the greatest increase in the debt limit since World War II. On the contrary, I am compelled to propose conformance to the policy fixed by Congress and the President's pledge.

I back up my proposal with suggested places where action may be taken to eliminate the deficit and reduce the debt without impairment of essential functions, and I suggest the means to facilitate this action.

I voted against the \$12 billion tax reduction, and I am consistent in voting against this proposed increase in the debt limitation.

EXHIBIT 1

JANUARY 21, 1964.

HON. KERMIT GORDON,
Director of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. GORDON: Thank you for your telephone call yesterday offering to explain sections of the budget where I might have questions. A question has arisen today.

On pages 85, 110, 125, and 319 of the budget I note references to sales of certificates of participation in pools of loans owned by Export-Import Bank, Federal National Mortgage Association and Veterans' Administration. I understand such an operation is being practiced by the Bank under interpretation of its charter powers, and that legislation is to be proposed for FNMA and VA. It would be appreciated if you would explain this operation in each of the agencies where it is used and proposed in general and in detail.

In particular, advice would be appreciated as to:

The difference between the direct and outright sale of agency loans to the public and the proposed certificate sale;

What would be the nature of so-called assets of the pool; if mortgages are included could they be sold directly to the public with better return to the Government; if not, why;

Would the sale of certificates be in the nature of loans from the public to the respective agencies; if so

Would they be backed by the full faith and credit of the Government or carry any other Federal guarantee;

What would be their duration;

Would they be negotiable;

Would the proceeds of the loans go to agency revolving funds, and if so for what purposes could and would they be used; would they be used to pay off agency debt to the Treasury;

Would the agency pay interest on the loans, and if so from what funds, and how would the rate be determined;

Could the agency sell or redeem these certificates at a discount or premium;

Would the loans be in the nature of agency debt to the public, and if so would it be outside the statutory debt limit;

Would such loans compete with Treasury operations;

Would, or could, such operations affect interest rates, etc.;

By what amount is it proposed that expenditures in fiscal year 1965 would be reduced by the pool operation in all agencies involved; and

In view of the fact that proceeds from the sale of such certificates would show in the budget as a reduction in expenditures, would it follow that expenditures for redemption of the certificates at maturity would show as an increase in expenditures at that time?

With my very best wishes,

Faithfully yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,

Washington, D.C., February 1, 1964.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In your letter of January 21, 1964, you have asked for an explanation of the operations now being carried on by the Export-Import Bank in selling certificates of participation in pools of loans and of the proposed operations of a somewhat similar nature to be carried out by the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Veterans' Administration under new legislative authority. In addition, you have asked several specific questions.

The Export-Import Bank expects to follow the general procedure used in earlier years. In April 1962 and April 1963, the Bank offered to U.S. commercial banks (and in 1963 also to European financial institutions) the opportunity to purchase certificates of participation in a pool comprising certain maturities and payments of interest on notes issued by borrowers to the Bank. These certificates were payable in semiannual installments over a 10-year and a 7-year period, respectively, together with interest at specified rates (4½ percent and 4 percent, respectively) on the unpaid principal balance. The Bank unconditionally guaranteed principal and interest payments in the event of default on notes in the pool. It agreed to repurchase, on the holder's demand (i.e., provide a put) on each semiannual date after 2½ years, any certificates of participation; it also retained the right to purchase (i.e., exercise a call) on similar occasions.

Under the proposed legislation, the Federal National Mortgage Association, as a trustee, would create, administer, and sell certificates of participation in a pool consisting of rights to interest and principal payments in blocks of FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages and other loans now owned by FNMA and VA (excluding loans owned by FNMA under its secondary market operations). FNMA would be authorized to guarantee payment of the interest and principal on the certificates of participation. VA would be authorized to make available rights to principal and interest payments on loans owned by it arising from the direct loan and the loan guarantee programs for inclusion in one or more of the pools in which FNMA, as trustee, would sell certificates of participation.

Assuming enactment of the legislation, FNMA and VA would assign to FNMA, as trustee, the rights to interest and principal payments from specific blocks of loans. The outstanding balance of these loans would be large enough to provide coverage equal to at least 125 percent of the principal amounts

of the outstanding certificates of participation. Investors would be given the opportunity to buy participations in principal repayments payable in one or more years and would receive interest payments on the principal amounts until the principal payments fell due.

The VA and the FNMA would continue to service and collect payments on the individual loans and would remit the necessary principal and interest to FNMA as trustee for distribution to the holders of the certificates. The investors would be protected not only by the coverage amounting to at least 125 percent of the principal amounts of the certificates issued, but also by an explicit FNMA guarantee and by its authority to borrow from the Treasury to meet any temporary cash requirements.

The answers to your specific questions are contained in the enclosure attached to this letter.

I hope that this letter and the enclosure will provide the information which you need on this topic.

Sincerely,

KERMIT GORDON,
Director.

Enclosure.

ANSWERS TO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ON SALES OF CERTIFICATES OF PARTICIPATION BY THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK, FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION, AND VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The following information is provided in answer to questions received from Senator BYRD, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance:

1. The difference between the direct and outright sale of agency loans to the public and the proposed certificate sale.

In the case of direct and outright sales of agency loans by the FNMA and the VA, title to the individual loan and the servicing of the loan are taken over by the buyer and the Federal agency has no continuing responsibility; as a general rule, however, the Export-Import Bank continues to service the individual loans or portions of loans sold by it. In the case of sales of certificates of participation, the buyer purchases an interest in a block of loans; Federal agencies continue to collect the interest and principal payments on the loans and otherwise service them, remitting to the holder of the certificate of participation his share of the payments received.

2. What would be the nature of so-called assets of the pool; if mortgages are included, could they be sold directly to the public with better return to the Government; if not, why?

In all cases, the assets in the pool are or would be loans which had previously been made or acquired by the Federal agency. In the case of the Export-Import Bank, they are relatively long-term loans to borrowers in foreign countries and in the case of the certificates issued by FNMA, they are loans, mainly mortgage loans, insured by the Federal Housing Administration or owned or guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration.

As a general rule, the loans included could not now be sold directly to the public in the same volume with a better—or even an equal—return to the Federal Government. By including them in a pool and issuing participations, however, investors who are either ineligible or who are not equipped to hold and service mortgages would be able to participate in this market, adding to the total volume and/or improving the sales prices received.

3. Would the sale of certificates be in the nature of loans from the public to the respective agencies?

The sale would not constitute loans from the public to the agencies. Rather, the buyers would obtain certain specified ownership rights in a portion of the assets in the pool.

4. Would they be backed by the full faith and credit of the Government or carry any other Federal guarantee?

They would not be backed by the full faith and credit of the Federal Government, but, are, or would be, guaranteed by Export-Import Bank in the one case and by the Federal National Mortgage Association in the other.

5. What would be their duration?

In the case of the Export-Import Bank, the certificates issued in May 1962 were payable in 20 semiannual principal installments beginning November 1, 1962, and those issued on May 1, 1963, were payable in 14 semiannual principal installments beginning November 1, 1963.

The certificates issued by FNMA would be serial participations with the principal payments coming at a variety of maturity dates. The range of maturities to be offered is a matter for future decision, but the amounts sold for each maturity would be determined by the expected inflow of collections from the mortgages held in the pool.

6. Would they be negotiable?

The certificates of participation issued by FNMA would be negotiable, since they would be issued in registered form and would be transferable on the books of FNMA. The participation certificates issued by the Export-Import Bank, however, have not been transferable, except to a limited extent for the 1962 certificates.

7. Would the proceeds of the loans go to agency revolving funds, and if so for what purposes could and would they be used; would they be used to pay off agency debt to the Treasury?

The proceeds from the sale of the certificates of participation by FNMA would go to the revolving funds of the agencies setting aside the specific mortgages for the pool; e.g., to the management and liquidating functions and the special assistance functions of the FNMA and to the revolving fund for direct loans and loan guarantee revolving fund for VA to the extent that loans from these agencies were included in pools. In the first three cases, the proceeds would either be used to pay off agency debt to the Treasury, to avoid creation of additional agency debt to the Treasury, or, in one instance, possibly be held as a reserve available for future disbursements on loans by the agency. In the case of the VA loan guarantee fund, which is financed from appropriated funds, the receipts not required for future operations would go to miscellaneous receipts.

The proceeds from the sale of participation certificates by the Export-Import Bank are used to pay off the Bank's debt to the Treasury and/or to avoid further borrowings from the Treasury.

8. Would the agency pay interest on the loans, and if so from what funds, and how would the rate be determined?

Under present plans, the FNMA as the trustee would pay interest semiannually on the certificates of participation from the proceeds of the collections on the loans in the pool. The rate of interest would be set at the time the original certificates of participations were issued in the light of the prospective market for the certificates. The Bank likewise pays interest on the certificates it issues from the proceeds of collections on the loan at a rate determined by the prevailing market rates of interest at the time of sale.

9. Could the agency sell or redeem these certificates at a discount or premium?

Under present plans, the FNMA would sell the certificates at a price equal in the aggregate to the face amount; that is, at par. However, it may be necessary to use small premiums and discounts to adjust the net yield for particular maturities to the market prices. It would pay them off at maturity at the face amount.

The Bank both sells and redeems its certificates at the face amount; that is, at par.

10. Would the loans be in the nature of agency debt to the public, and if so would it be outside the statutory debt limit?

Neither the certificates issued by the Bank nor those proposed to be issued by FNMA would be debt obligations of the agencies. The statutory debt limit would not be applicable. The Bank and the FNMA are selling participations in assets, not incurring debt.

11. Would such loans compete with Treasury operations?

The certificates have some characteristics which would appeal to the same investor groups now interested in Treasury bonds. Thus, they would, in some measure, compete with direct obligations of the Treasury, but they do not and would not sell on the same yield basis as Treasury obligations. Decisions as to terms and timing of participation certificates would, of course, be coordinated with Treasury debt management operations.

12. Would, or could, such operations affect interest rates, etc.?

In the volume anticipated, these operations could not have a significant effect on the market level of interest rates. They would make a corresponding amount of borrowing by Treasury unnecessary. The net effect on interest rates, therefore, should be almost neutral.

13. By what amount is it proposed that expenditures in fiscal year 1965 would be reduced by the pool operations in all agencies involved?

The total reduction in 1965 expenditures resulting from the 1965 pool operations of the Export-Import Bank, FNMA, and VA is estimated to amount to \$1 billion, including \$700 million for Export-Import Bank, \$200 million for FNMA, and \$100 million for VA.

14. In view of the fact that proceeds from the sale of such certificates would show in the budget as a reduction in expenditures, would it follow that expenditures for redemption of the certificates at maturity would show as an increase in expenditures at that time?

No. Expenditures for redemption of the certificates will be offset by receipts from repayments on the loans in the pool and, therefore, on balance no net expenditures would result during the fiscal years in which the certificates mature. However, it is true that, just as in the case of other financial asset sales, the expenditure credits which otherwise would have been reflected in the budgets of future years would no longer be available and budget expenditures in those years, as a whole, will be higher than would have been the case if the assets or participations had not been sold in earlier years.

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

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia for his excellent presentation of the very serious fiscal problems that confront us. I wish to emphasize his statement that "I am aware that obligations have to be met, but unnecessary obligations do not have to be made."

The distinguished senior Senator from Virginia called attention to that fact

when he enumerated \$6½ billion of unnecessary obligations that could be postponed or completely eliminated.

With due deference, I should like to add that the junior Senator from Virginia, in a speech last March, indicated at least \$4 billion of current spending that could be either eliminated or postponed.

The senior Senator from Virginia went on to say:

If effective effort to get off of the deficit-debt binge were indicated, I would approve meaningful temporary provision for debt already contracted.

In the absence of such an effort, I am voting against the bill.

I congratulate him for that statement. I intend to join him in that position, because it is my definite conclusion that we are being committed to a program of deficit financing and that the proposed \$324 billion debt limit would be only one more step in the direction we are headed, with no ceiling whatever on the ultimate amount of debt, which will be inflationary in effect and which will go far to undermine our traditional system of private enterprise within the framework of American constitutional liberty.

I commend my senior colleague not only for his work and position on this bill, but also for his 31 years of distinguished service in the Senate and for his sound fiscal policies, which the people of Virginia, and of the Nation generally, recognize and for which they applaud him.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, present law provides a temporary public debt limit, or ceiling, of \$315 billion through June 29—4 days from today. On the following day, June 30, unless we take necessary action, this ceiling will drop to \$309 billion. The day after that, on July 1, the public debt limit is scheduled to drop to its permanent level of \$285 billion.

If debts could be erased or reduced simply by lowering the ceiling on them, there would be no problem. But we should all understand by now that this cannot be done. It will not work with our own personal, private, or family debts. It will not work with the public debt.

Insofar as the public debt is concerned, the Treasury Department projections of the debt, subject to limit, show that it will total about \$312 billion on June 30. That is \$3 billion above the statutory limit for that 1 day and \$27 billion higher than the permanent level that will take effect on July 1, the start of fiscal 1965.

If we fail to increase the existing debt limit to a reasonable and realistic level, one that meets not only the outstanding debt but also the inevitable additions to that debt that will be incurred during fiscal 1965, we are inviting fiscal and financial chaos. Surely, Mr. President, I do not need to dwell on the grave consequences that would swiftly befall us if the United States suddenly had to default on its obligations.

To avoid such a calamity, the administration is requesting, in the bill before us, an increase in the temporary public debt ceiling to \$324 billion, to take effect

from the date of enactment through June 30, 1965, or the last day of fiscal 1965.

The House of Representatives has already passed this bill. Your Finance Committee has reported it favorably. It is now up to this body to face its responsibilities—to understand that, when its bills come due, the United States must be in a position to pay them. And in this connection, let none of us forget that these bills are for Federal expenditures duly authorized by this and previous Congresses. We have not only authorized the expenditures, we have appropriated the funds for them.

It is totally irresponsible, with the bills for these expenditures coming due, to pretend they are somebody else's obligations. They are ours, Mr. President, and we must make certain that the Secretary of the Treasury is in a position to pay them.

As in the case of our individual, private debts, or as is the case with a business or corporate debt, the Secretary of the Treasury meets the public debt by borrowing the funds necessary to pay the bills.

Clearly, the temporary, 1-day ceiling of \$309 billion on June 30 will not cover these needs—which are already well in excess of that figure. Looking ahead, we know also that the present \$315 billion ceiling will not be sufficient to cover the borrowing needs that will arise in fiscal 1965.

In establishing a new, fully adequate, and wholly responsible debt limit, there are several factors that must be taken into consideration. These are: the needs during the few remaining days of this fiscal year, the deficit projected for fiscal 1965, the seasonal variation in Federal receipts which requires a temporary increase in borrowing even when the budget is in balance or surplus and, finally, the need for a margin of flexibility to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to finance the outstanding public debt efficiently and economically and also to be prepared for any unforeseen emergencies.

With these factors in mind, the administration has requested that the public debt limit be increased to \$324 billion.

By itself, isolated and completely out of context, that is indeed a large sum, Mr. President. But it is neither necessary nor appropriate to fasten our sights on this one figure, to freeze and fix our attention solely on it. We must keep this sum in perspective. Viewed realistically, it is by no means out of line.

It is possible, indeed necessary, to put this matter into proper perspective by considering how our public debt stacks up against our ability to carry it. The best means of measuring this is to compare the debt figure with our gross national product—the sum total of all the goods and services produced in the United States.

Let us, for example, take a look at how we stood just after World War II. In June 1946, our public debt amounted to \$269.9 billion. Our gross national product at that time was \$211.7 billion. In other words, Mr. President, our outstanding debt exceeded our GNP by more

than \$50 billion. The ratio of public debt to GNP was a staggering 127.5 percent.

That was almost 20 years ago—just after the tremendous costs of borrowing of World War II.

What has happened since then? Balance sheet readers who concentrate only on the debit side of the ledger will pounce on the fact that our outstanding debt has increased—from \$269.9 billion in 1946 to about \$312 billion today.

But the other side of the ledger shows an even larger growth. Our economy has expanded to the point where our GNP today stands at about \$623 billion compared to a national debt of \$312 billion.

This means the ratio of debt to GNP has been more than cut in half since 1946. The ratio today is just 50 percent, compared to 127 percent in 1946.

I am not suggesting, Mr. President, that these comparisons mean we can be indifferent to our increased public debt. But I am calling attention to the fact that it has not been growing out of proportion to the growth in our assets, to the growth in our credits, to the overall growth of our economy. As a matter of fact, it has actually been declining in proportion to the tremendous growth that has been registered in our GNP.

The same is true when we compare the public debt to personal income. Back in June 1946, outstanding public debt was \$269 billion more than the total personal income in the United States, which was then only \$180.8 billion. The ratio of debt to personal income at that time was 149.3 percent.

Today, with the debt standing at \$312 billion, personal income has climbed to \$491.5 billion, and the ratio of debt to annual personal income has shrunk to 63.3 percent.

I repeat, Mr. President, our overall performance, as mirrored on this balance sheet, is most reassuring. Our debt has not been growing disproportionately.

We are not, in short, over our heads.

Actually, our outstanding public debt has been declining in proportion to other outstanding debt. As of December 1946, the total estimated debt in the United States, public and private, was \$446.5 billion. The Federal debt, at \$259.5 billion, represented 58 percent of this total. Corporate debt at that time amounted to \$110.5 billion or 25 percent of the total. Individual private debt totaled \$60.5 billion or 13 percent of the total.

By December of 1963, these totals and the percentages had changed dramatically. Federal debt, at \$310 billion, accounted for only 25 percent of the total debt outstanding—\$1,236.5 billion—compared to 58 percent of the 1946 total. Corporate debt, on the other hand, climbed to \$459.5 billion or 37 percent of the total. Individual private debt rose to \$378 billion in this same period to account for 31 percent of the total.

While one may complain about debt, no matter who owes it, particularly if he owes it himself, he can go into the Marble Room behind the Chamber and read the Wall Street Journal or any of the other great daily newspapers and see

how the stocks of the major corporations are selling on the big board, the New York Stock Exchange, or on the American Stock Exchange. He will notice that, although these corporations owe more than twice as much as they owed in 1946, their stocks are selling today at much higher prices and that buyers are grabbing them up. The prices of these stocks continue to go up day by day because the corporations listed on the big board are sound financially. They may owe large sums of money, but they also have huge assets.

If one were to hear that the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. were retiring its debt today, he might run to sell his stock because he feared that A.T. & T. was getting ready to liquidate. Instead, that great corporation is expanding, and other great corporations are expanding, too. The fact that they owe debt oftentimes means that they are in a sound operating condition, just as the Government is sound in the way it operates. In my opinion, the Government is in as sound a financial position as it has been in for a long time.

The Federal Government's share of the total outstanding debt in the United States has, as these figures make clear, declined. Debt taken on by other sources, individuals and corporations, has increased far more rapidly.

Consumer indebtedness has risen sharply, from \$8.3 billion outstanding in 1946 to \$69.7 billion at the end of last year, an increase of 740 percent. Mortgage debt soared from \$41.8 billion in 1946 to \$281.3 billion last year, an increase of 573 percent. The Federal debt, in contrast, is up less than 20 percent in the same period.

From the point of view of an economist, I raise this question: Could the United States have experienced the fantastic growth of its gross national product in the last 20 years, a growth to the extent that we are today producing more than twice as much in terms of goods and services as we were producing at the end of World War II, without the expansion of our credit and money supply? I do not think it would have been possible.

I have asked that figures be prepared to show how the increase in the money supply, which I regard as an increase in credit generally, has necessarily expanded as the income and production of the people have increased. When one makes that comparison, he will reach the conclusion that most modern-day economists have reached—namely, that an expansion of credit and money supply must take place even more rapidly than an expansion of production in a capitalistic society.

It might be possible to operate differently in a Communist society or a Socialist economy; but in a capitalistic economy, credit and money supply must increase more rapidly than production. It must increase somewhere. It must increase either in Government or in the private sector.

The great increases in mortgage debt and personal debt do not represent any great danger. What they mean is that the people want more homes, more prop-

erty, more of the luxuries and conveniences of life. So they have incurred debt in financing the distribution and sharing of the fantastic gross national product that almost staggers the imagination of anyone when he considers the large amount of goods and services produced in America today, far more than other nations have dreamed was possible.

If our economy were not sound all these outstandings, private and public, would be a matter of genuine concern. But our economy is sound, Mr. President. Its rate of growth is increasing.

Let us, by all means, consider this request for a debt-limit increase carefully. But let us by all means keep the request itself, the sum involved and the factors accounting for it, in perspective. This is no time for panic or pretense.

I support this bill as reported by the committee as essential, sound, fiscally responsible legislation. I urge that it be passed promptly.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on the passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the pending bill proposes to increase the ceiling on the national debt from \$315 billion to \$324 billion. To a large extent this increase is necessary to permit the Federal Treasury proper leeway to finance the tax reduction enacted by Congress earlier this year.

Secretary Dillon in his testimony before the Committee on Finance said that the 1964 tax reduction, approved earlier this year, will pump an additional \$7 billion into our economy in the next fiscal year; therefore, it can be said that \$7 billion of the proposed \$9 billion increase will go to finance that tax reduction.

The other \$2 billion increase requested is to provide the Treasury with authority to borrow money to finance the proposed increase in salaries for Members of Congress and other leading executives of the Government, who have created this financial chaos, as well as to provide funds to finance some of the many political-year pork-barrel schemes which are designed primarily to buy votes in the 1964 election.

In my opinion this is a fiscally irresponsible method of operating the Government.

I opposed the tax reduction, which admittedly could be financed only with borrowed money. The deficit this year is around \$9 billion, and next year's deficit will approach the same figure.

To reduce taxes and increase spending, all at the same time, and then to finance both extremes with borrowed money may well be the spark that can touch off another serious round of inflation.

Under the fiscally irresponsible financing administration of this administration, the foundation is being laid for a serious depression. Our luxuries of today are being charged to tomorrow's taxpayers.

Election year prosperity financed with borrowed money may get votes this year, but I shudder to think of the reaction when the effects of these artificial stimulants wear off.

I shall vote against the proposed increase in the debt ceiling as a protest against the unsound fiscal policies of this administration. If the Government of the United States cannot live within its income today, at a time when we are enjoying the highest level of prosperity ever attained, the question may well be asked: When are we going to balance our budget and start reducing our debt?

The budget requests of the Johnson administration for the next fiscal year are \$5.5 billion higher than that appropriated for the current fiscal year.

The cumulative deficits of the 4 years of the Kennedy-Johnson administration exceeds \$25 billion.

REPORT COMPARING FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE TWO POLITICAL PARTIES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware subsequently said: Mr. President, at the conclusion of my earlier remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report comparing the financial responsibility of the two political parties over the past 60 years.

This report shows that the Democratic Party has always operated on the theory of "spend, tax, and elect."

Over 95 percent of our national debt today was created under the 30 years of Democratic control. Sure, a part of this can be attributed to the cost of wars, but even in peacetime they boast of their "planned deficit."

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

	Republican	Democrat
1900 to 1964—64 years.....	34 years.....	30 years.
Balanced budgets.....	22.....	3.
Unbalanced budgets.....	12.....	27.
Cumulative deficits or national debt:		
Amount.....	\$13,400,000,000.....	\$293,000,000,000.
Percent.....	4.4 percent.....	95.6 percent.
Average unemployment.....	5.6 percent.....	8.5 percent.
Tax reductions.....	8.....	2.
Tax increases.....	2.....	13.
Depressions.....	1.....	None.
Wars.....	None.....	3.

Year	Administrative budget ¹ (in millions of dollars)				Civilian labor force ² (in millions)			Percent of total labor force unemployed	Individual tax ³		1st bracket rates ³ (percent)	National debt ⁴	Gross national products ⁴ in current dollars		
	Re-ceipts	Ex-pen-ditures	Republicans		Democrats		Total		Em-ployed	Unem-ployed				Increase	Decrease
			Sur-plus	Deficit	Sur-plus	Deficit									
Republican:												Billions	Billions		
1901	\$588	\$525	\$63					0.7	2.4				\$1.2		
1902	562	485	77					.8	2.7				1.1		
1903	562	517	45					.8	2.6				1.1		
1904	541	584		\$43				1.4	4.8				1.1		
1905	544	567		23				2.0	3.1				1.1		
1906	595	570	25					.6	.8				1.1		
1907	666	579	87					.6	1.8				1.1		
1908	602	659		57				2.9	8.5				1.1		
1909	604	694		89				1.8	5.2				1.1		
1910	676	694		18				2.1	5.9				1.1		
1911	702	691	11					2.2	6.2				1.1		
1912	693	690	3					1.9	5.2				1.1		
Democrat:													\$36.2		
1913	714	715			(⁵)			1.6	4.4	(⁷)	(⁷)	1.0	1.1		
1914	725	725			(⁵)			3.1	8.0			1.0	1.1		
1915	683	746			\$63			3.8	9.7			1.0	1.1		
1916	762	713				\$48		1.9	4.8	Increase		2.0	1.2		
1917	1,100	1,954						1.9	4.8	do		2.0	2.9		
1918	3,630	12,662			853			.5	1.4	do		6.0	12.4		
1919	5,085	18,448			9,032			.9	2.3	Decrease		4.0	25.4		
1920	6,649	6,357			291			1.6	4.0			4.0	24.2		
Republican:													39.8		
1921	5,563	5,058	509					5.0	11.9	Decrease		4.0	23.9		
1922	4,021	3,285	736					3.2	7.6			4.0	22.9		
1923	3,849	3,137	713					1.3	3.2	Decrease		3.0	22.3		
1924	3,853	2,890	963					2.4	5.5	do		2.0	21.2		
1925	3,598	2,881	717					1.8	4.0			1.5	20.5		
1926	3,753	2,888	865					.8	1.9	Decrease		1.5	19.6		
1927	3,922	2,837	1,155					1.8	4.1			1.5	18.5		
1928	3,872	2,933	939					2.0	4.4	Decrease		1.5	17.6		
1929	3,861	3,127	734					3.2	8.7	do		.5	16.9		
1930	4,058	3,320	738					4.3	8.7	Increase		1.5	16.1		
1931	3,116	3,577		462				42.4	8.0			1.5	16.8		
1932	1,924	4,659		2,735				38.9	12.0	Increase		4.0	19.4		
Democrat:													56.0		
1933	1,997	4,598			2,602		51.5	38.7	12.8			4.0	22.5		
1934	3,015	6,645			3,630		52.2	40.8	11.3	Increase		4.0	27.0		
1935	3,706	6,497			2,791		52.8	42.2	10.6	do		4.0	28.7		
1936	3,997	8,422			4,425		53.4	44.4	9.0			4.0	33.7		
1937	4,956	7,733			2,777		54.0	46.3	7.7			4.0	36.4		
1938	5,588	6,765			1,177		54.6	44.2	10.3			4.0	37.1		
1939	4,979	8,841			3,862		55.2	45.7	9.4			4.0	40.4		
1940	5,137	9,055			3,918		55.6	47.5	8.1	Increase		4.4	42.9		
1941	7,096	13,255			6,159		55.9	50.3	5.5	do		10.0	48.9		
1942	12,547	34,037			21,490		56.4	53.7	2.6	do		19.0	72.4		
1943	21,947	79,368			57,420		55.5	54.4	1.0	do		19.0	136.6		
1944	43,563	94,986			51,423		54.6	53.9	.6	do		23.0	201.0		
1945	44,362	98,303			53,941		53.8	52.8	1.0			23.0	258.6		
1946	39,650	60,326			20,676		57.5	55.2	2.2	Decrease		19.0	269.4		
Republican (80th Cong.):													210.7		
1947	39,677	38,923	754				60.1	57.8	2.3			19.0	258.2		
1948	41,375	32,955	8,419				61.4	59.1	2.3	Decrease		16.6	252.2		
Democrat:													259.4		
1949	37,663	39,474			1,811		62.1	58.4	3.6			16.6	252.7		
1950	36,422	39,544			3,122		63.0	59.7	3.3	Increase		17.4	257.3		
1951	47,480	43,970			3,510		62.8	60.7	2.0	do		20.4	255.2		
1952	61,287	65,303			4,017		62.9	61.0	1.9	do		22.2	259.1		
Republican:													347.0		
1953	64,671	74,120		9,449			63.8	61.9	1.8			22.2	266.0		
1954	64,420	67,537		3,117			64.4	60.8	3.5	Decrease		20.0	271.2		
1955	60,209	64,389		4,180			65.8	62.9	2.9			20.0	274.3		
1956	67,850	66,224	1,626				67.5	64.7	2.8			20.0	272.7		
1957	70,562	68,966	1,596				67.9	65.0	2.9			20.0	270.5		
1958	68,550	71,389		2,839			68.6	63.9	4.6			20.0	276.3		
1959	67,915	80,342		12,427			69.3	65.5	3.8			20.0	284.7		
1960	77,763	76,639	1,124				70.6	66.6	3.9			20.0	286.3		
Democrat:													503.4		
1961	77,659	81,515			3,856		71.6	66.7	4.8			20.0	288.9		
1962	81,409	87,787			6,378		71.8	67.8	4.0			20.0	298.2		
1963	86,400	92,600			6,200		75.1	70.8	4.3			20.0	304.8		
1964	86,900	98,802			11,902				5.7			20.0	315.6		
Total			21,999	35,419	3,849	296,888									
Less surpluses				21,999	3,849										
Cumulative deficits each party.			13,420		293,039										

¹ Source: Budget, fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, p. 422.
² Source: 1901 through 1928—p. 215 of "The Measurement and Behavior of Unemployment," by National Bureau of Economic Research, Princeton University Press; 1929 through 1946—p. 206 of "Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1959." 1947 through 1963—U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.
³ Source: Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.
⁴ Source: Budget, fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, p. 422.
⁵ Source: "Facts and Figures on Government Expense, 1962-63," Tax Foundation, p. 49.
⁶ Less than one-half million dollars.
⁷ First enacted.
⁸ Estimate.
⁹ July 1963.
 NOTE.—Variations in totals result from rounded figures.
 Statistics assembled by JOHN J. WILLIAMS, U.S. Senator, September 1963.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, despite the number of times this body has discussed, at length, the public debt question, there is still plenty of evidence to indicate that the question itself remains wrapped in some confusion. I shall, in these remarks, address myself

to the facts of the matter in a hopeful attempt to remove some of the misunderstandings that invariably surface whenever we turn our attention to this important subject. The administration has requested, and the House has now passed a bill to increase the temporary public debt limit

to \$324 billion, effective from the date of enactment through June 30, 1965. I believe that all responsible legislators will support this essential, fiscally necessary measure. As we know, existing law provides a temporary debt ceiling of \$315 billion through June 29. That ceiling will drop

to \$309 billion on the following day, June 30. On the next day, July 1, the start of a new fiscal year, the debt ceiling is scheduled to revert to its so-called "permanent" level of \$285 billion.

Against this legislative backdrop we have the cold facts, assembled by the Treasury Department, on what the debt, subject to limit will actually amount to on June 30. This will come to approximately \$312 billion—about \$3 billion above the statutory limit for that day, and about \$27 billion above the permanent ceiling that will take effect on July 1, unless we act favorably on the measure before us.

We must act promptly to increase the limit to a reasonable and realistic level, one that will enable the Secretary of the Treasury to finance the public debt economically. Failure to do so would put the United States in a position of having to default on its obligations. I do not have to dwell on the seriousness of such a situation.

The debt outstanding now, the extent to which it will rise during fiscal 1965, cannot be erased or altered by any arbitrary reduction in the \$324 billion debt ceiling that is being sought by the administration.

The debt itself ultimately reflects the relationship between Government revenues and the authorizations and appropriations, approved by the Congress, for Government expenditures.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would it not be patently ridiculous for this great Nation, with the entire free world depending on us, to find ourselves in a position where we could not pay our obligations, even though we are the wealthiest Nation on the face of the earth and by our own motion tie our own hands to the point where we seek to pay off our own obligations?

Mr. SMATHERS. I totally agree with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, that it would be the height of folly.

As I have just stated to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], it would be the sheerest folly to pretend that Government expenditures can be reduced or controlled by a restrictive debt limit. When the bills come due for expenses, duly authorized by the Congress, the United States must be in a position to pay them.

A new debt limit must be based on: our financial needs during the balance of this fiscal year, the deficit projected for fiscal year 1965, the seasonal variation in receipts which requires a temporary rise in borrowing even when the budget is in balance or surplus, and, finally, the need for a margin of flexibility.

Let me digress a moment to state that I asked the Secretary of the Treasury, when he was testifying before the committee, whether, even if we had a balanced budget in 1965, it would be necessary still to raise the debt ceiling. He said absolutely, that even with a balanced budget the Government, to operate and

meet its obligations, would still have to have an increased debt ceiling.

The issue is not, in short, Government spending. The spending decisions have already been made by the Congress. We must now provide the means to finance these authorized expenditures in the most fiscally responsible way.

By voting to provide an adequate debt limit, we are not voting to increase the debt—this was decided when this and past Congresses voted the authorizations and appropriations that are now becoming expenditures.

An inadequate debt limit will not reduce Government expenditure. It will only force the Secretary of the Treasury to resort to costly expedients to finance the public debt.

In 1954 and 1955, for example, \$2,326 billion was raised through the expedient of having the Commodity Credit Corporation issue and sell nonguaranteed interest-bearing certificates in the open market so that this money could be paid over to the Treasury, thus reducing the Commodity Credit Corporation's use of the revolving fund which it was authorized to use. Because they were not guaranteed, the interest rate on these certificates was three-eighths to five-eighths of a percent higher than on comparable Government securities. The extra cost of having to finance the Government in this way, rather than through normal channels, was \$7 million.

Another question I asked the Secretary of the Treasury was, "If the Secretary of the Treasury, in meeting Government obligations, were forced to operate under the restricted debt ceiling, would it not cost the taxpayers more money?"

The Secretary of the Treasury replied, "There is no question about it." As an illustration, I referred to the years 1954 and 1955.

In 1955 and again in 1958, Federal National Mortgage Association certificates were issued and sold in the market to raise \$2,169 million. The interest rate on these certificates was from one-half to three-quarters of a percent higher than on direct Government obligations, and the extra cost—which again had to be met by the taxpayers of this country—was \$25.5 million higher than if the Government had been allowed to borrow this money itself in the normal manner.

By providing an inadequate debt limit and making the Secretary of the Treasury adopt these expedients, we did not hold down the real amount of the Federal debt. Rather, we increased the cost of Government operations. The amount of the real Federal debt is determined simply by the relationship between expenditures and revenues.

The Treasury, with an adequate debt limit, will be able to take advantage of favorable opportunities in the market to raise new money and to refund outstanding debt to improve the structure of the debt.

An adequate debt limit will allow the Secretary of the Treasury the necessary flexibility to deal with our balance-of-payments problems. This flexibility permits prompt response to money mar-

ket developments affecting our balance-of-payments position.

If Congress does not act promptly, the temporary limit will drop to \$309 billion on June 30. The debt subject to limit will be about \$312 billion on that date. If the Congress does not act, therefore, all borrowing will have to cease on June 30. Savings bonds sales would have to cease immediately. Inasmuch as the savings bonds program is a keystone to the sound management of the public debt, suspending sales of these bonds or payroll deductions for their purchase, even for a brief period, would be disastrous to the program for years ahead.

If we fail to act, the normal investment of trust fund receipts in special obligations would be impossible. The Secretary of the Treasury would then have the choice of leaving these funds uninvested, depriving the trust funds of income, or buying outstanding marketable issues in the market. This would deplete the Treasury's cash and have a severe effect on the Government securities market.

If we permit the debt limit to fall to its permanent level of \$285 billion on July 1, the Treasury's position will become even more acute. Regular weekly bills maturing on July 2 would have to be paid off in cash, seriously disturbing the market. The Treasury would also have to cancel its normal issue of \$1 billion of 1-year bills. By July 9, the next issue of regular bills would also have to be paid off in cash. By July 15, when the next maturity came due, the Treasury would be out of cash and would have to default, for the first time in history, on a direct Treasury obligation.

Such a course of action does not seem to responsible legislators to be fiscally responsible.

We must provide funds needed for the operations of the Government. The fiscal chaos that would result without them would be our responsibility.

It may be argued that the Treasury does not need a debt limit of \$324 billion. But let us not forget this fact: a lower debt limit will not hold down spending. The only excuse for a lower limit would be based on the possibility that the Treasury has underestimated its receipts. It is possible that they will be higher than expected. But it should be noted that the previous projections of debt furnished by the Treasury have been very accurate. The Treasury has had a great deal of experience in this, and I would rather trust its projections than take a chance on having to return again and again, as was the case last year, to vote new ceilings—good for a month or 2 months, or 6 months at a time. Let us hope that the Treasury has not overestimated its receipts. Let us hope that the margin for flexibility provided in the bill is fully adequate.

Let us remember that we have incurred the bills. It is now up to us to provide the means to pay them. An adequate debt limit grants the Secretary of the Treasury the necessary authority to manage the fiscal affairs of the Federal

Government in a responsible and economical manner. This is the real issue on which we are voting.

I support the bill, and I hope that it will be passed overwhelmingly and without delay.

THE DEBT IN PERSPECTIVE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, every year about this time Congress is called upon to raise the temporary ceiling on the public debt. Some years it is not only done once, but twice or three times. The Ways and Means Committee plays a cat-and-mouse game with the Treasury and keeps it on tenterhooks. We are told that the country is going to the dogs. Some people have the fear that we are being deluged by inflation. I believe that it is about time to put this entire situation of the debt in its proper perspective.

WHERE DID WE GET THE DEBT?

Today, the debt is approximately \$308 billion.

Where did it come from?

When Franklin Roosevelt was first elected President, the debt was \$24 billion. In 1939, it had risen to \$47 billion—by \$23 billion. That was the price which America paid to halt the great depression, to save millions of people from starvation, and possibly to save the country from revolution.

Although some mistakes were made in the expenditure of that money, on the whole that was a sound investment, and a correct series of expenditures. We began to rearm at the end of 1939, and particularly in the spring of 1940, when Hitler swept through the Low Countries and France, and attacked England. At the end of World War II, the debt was \$278 billion, or an increase, due to World War II, of \$230 billion.

That was money that was expended to prevent Hitler from taking over the United States and taking over the world. Therefore, it was money well spent.

We added another \$19 billion during the Korean conflict to prevent the North Korean Communists, supported by the Chinese Communists and the Russian Communists, from taking over South Korea. Such a loss would have in all probability meant the loss of southeast Asia, and would have menaced our position in Japan, as well.

Thus, the bulk of the present debt was brought about because of our willingness, and, I believe, our desire, to protect ourselves and our allies against both Hitler and the Communist threat—\$249 billion of the debt was expended as a direct result of war.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not good that we have about \$34 billion of that debt which the Federal Reserve Board holds, and the Government owns the Federal Reserve Board?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not correct that the United States holds \$60 billion in Government trust funds?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So if we were to disallow the part of the public debt which the Government owes to the Government, the entire remaining debt is in effect a debt that was incurred in war?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

GOVERNMENT ASSETS EXCEED GOVERNMENT DEBT

Now let us see what the assets of the Federal Government are, in comparison with the debt. If we were a business corporation the assets would be stated as well as the debts. It is very fortunate that each year the House Committee on Government Operations publishes a survey of the property owned by the Federal Government, both real estate and so-called personal property.

The real estate is valued at the cost of acquisition. Of course, the cost of acquisition of the western lands was, and is listed as almost nothing. But on the basis of cost of acquisition of real estate, and the value of personal property held, the assets owned by the Federal Government as of the 30th of June, 1963, amounted to \$315.2 billion; and the debt at that time was \$306.5 billion. In other words, the real and personal property assets of the Federal Government, valued at acquisition cost, exceeded the debt by \$8,700 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator not aware of the fact that almost one-fourth of the entire mainland of the United States, plus about 90 percent of all Alaska, is federally owned land. Does the statement that the Senator is giving reflect an acquisition cost which is almost zero for that land?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

The actual assets, on the basis of market value, of course are greatly in excess of \$315 billion. Therefore, if anyone were to appraise the financial position of the United States, he would have to say that it was in as sound a position as General Motors, Du Pont, Ford, United States Steel, or the A.T. & T.

ASSETS PRODUCE INCOME

As the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, many of the Federal assets actually produce income. The Tennessee Valley Authority pays back not only the principal, but interest as well. Royalty rights to the Federal tideland oil reserves return revenues to the Federal Government.

Parenthetically, I hope that Louisiana will not be able to move its shorelines out so far that they will completely take over these tidelands, on the pretext that they are beyond three leagues or three miles from the shoreline.

The Federal Reserve Board pays into the Treasury 90 percent of the interest it earns on Federal bonds. I believe it returned something like \$600 million last year. The Rural Electrification Administration pays back the principal and 2 percent interest on the funds which are loaned to it. Thus, the assets of the Federal Government, if anything, are understated. But even if the income-producing properties are not included, the as-

sets of the Federal Government exceed its debts.

If any financier were to look at the balance sheet of General Motors, Du Pont, Ford, or United States Steel, and were to find that the assets of the company exceeded its liabilities by \$8.7 billion, he would be more than willing to make loans to the company, to buy stock in the company, or to certify that its financial condition was absolutely sound. That is the situation with the U.S. Government, because its assets of \$315.2 billion, made up of \$225 billion in personal property and of \$90 billion in real estate, exceeded its debt by \$8.7 billion as of June 30, 1963. Today the situation is even better than it was last June.

RATIO OF DEBT TO GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT GREATLY REDUCED

Another way to look at the debt is to compare it with the gross national product. The gross national product is the sum of the goods and services produced in the country in a given year. As of 1946, the national debt was 28 percent more than the gross national product. The national debt was about \$260 billion average for the year, as compared to a gross national product of only \$204 billion. Stated another way, the national debt was 128 percent of the gross national product.

By 1952, the national debt was only 75 percent of the gross national product. While the economy was growing during this period of time, President Truman reduced the debt by approximately \$11 billion during his almost 8 years in office. As of the spring of 1964, the present time, the national debt is only slightly more than 50 percent of the gross national product, or a \$308 billion debt as compared with a \$608 billion gross national product.

If we were to translate this into family terms, the situation would be as follows: If, in 1946, a man had an income of \$10,000 a year, and a debt of \$12,800 a year, he would have been in the same position as the Federal Government in that year. We all know that this is not an uncommon situation, for ordinarily a mortgage company will make a loan of from 2½ to 3 times a person's annual income for a house.

If, in 1964, following this analogy, the same man had an income of \$20,000, but a debt of only \$10,000, we would consider that he was much better off, and that his debt, compared with his income, was not excessively high. This is what has happened to the debt and income of the United States since 1946.

GROWTH OF OTHER DEBT MORE THAN NATIONAL DEBT

Let us compare what has happened to the national debt in relation to personal debt, mortgage debt, corporate debt, and State and local debt. In 1946, the national debt, as I have said, averaged about \$260 billion. As of the spring of 1964, it was \$308 billion. This is an increase of 19 percent. But what has happened during this period to other debt?

CONSUMER CREDIT OR DEBT

Consumer credit, in which I am deeply interested, was \$8.4 billion in 1946, but it

was \$69 billion in the spring of 1964. Thus, while the national debt increased by 19 percent, consumer debt—the debt that individuals owe for washing machines, refrigerators, automobiles, and personal loans—went up to 8 times this amount, or to a relative of 800.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Has the Senator noticed the extent to which the corporate debt has increased?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Has the Senator also noticed that as to the increase in the corporate debt, those great companies that have had faith in themselves and faith in America are the ones that have incurred the greatest debt? They have expanded more rapidly, and they are the ones whose stock is selling best in the market.

CORPORATE DEBT

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Louisiana has raised the question of corporate debt. We all know that many of those who complain most vehemently about the national debt are the owners of the great bulk of stocks and bonds, or the agents of those owners. At the end of 1946, corporate debt was \$93½ billion. At the end of 1963, this had increased to \$371.6 billion, or almost four times. Thus again while the national debt had increased by only 19 percent, the corporate debt had increased to a relative of 400.

MORTGAGE DEBT

Mortgage debt in 1946 was \$41.8 billion. At the end of 1963 it was \$281.3 billion. It had increased 6.7 times, or by 670 percent. Thus, while the national debt went up by 19 percent, mortgage debt increased to a figure of 670 percent.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not correct that without that increase in mortgage debt we could never have built all the fine new homes that have sprung up all over America?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not true that the value of those homes greatly exceeds the total of the mortgage debt?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true. If I may get in a word on one of my favorite subjects, I believe that those who lend to consumers and homeowners should tell the buyers and borrowers the truth about what the finance charges will amount to in terms of dollars and what they will amount to as a true annual rate on the amounts actually owed. There seems to be a great deal of resistance to that idea, but I think that it is fundamentally sound.

PRIVATE DEBT

Now if we look at the total private debt in the country, we find that in 1946 private debt amounted to \$154.1 billion and that by the end of 1963 it was \$753 billion. All private debt had increased by almost five times. Thus, again, while the national debt had increased by 19

percent, total private debt had increased to a relative of 500.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator believe that it would have been possible to have increased our gross national product by about 200 percent since World War II had private debt not expanded sufficiently to make it possible for people to buy the great amount of goods and services which our industries are pouring out?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. It has helped speed up the rate of economic growth.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So as a practical question, our great increase and growth in production and income could hardly have been achieved without the expansion of private debt?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to say that debt is a blessing. There can be such a thing as an excess of debt. I am inclined to think that in certain branches of national activity the debt has increased too rapidly. What I am trying to say is that it is extraordinary how some people take pleasure in the increase in consumer debt, mortgage debt, corporate debt, and private debt, and do not object to an increase in State and local debt, but yet they become panic stricken when there is an increase in 18 years of only 19 percent in the national debt. That is what I am really trying to say.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as an economist, the Senator knows that from the point of view of an economist, money and credit are generally viewed as the same thing in that

they are all money. They are a part of the money supply.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would say that it is the assets which lie behind the debt which are important. In some cases the rate of acquisition of the assets has been speeded up by the ability to borrow. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not correct to say that credit, particularly liquid credit, is a part of the money supply, and that the money supply must increase as production and business activity increase?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. Let us consider State and local debt.

STATE AND LOCAL DEBT

Many of those who most vigorously decry the Federal debt continue to say that State and local governments should handle the Federal functions because the Federal Government is in a very difficult financial situation. But the true answer is that the Federal Government has had to take on a number of needed activities because the State and local governments were unable to do them due to their very difficult financial situation.

In 1946, State and local debt amounted to \$13.6 billion. By the end of 1963 this had increased to \$82.1 billion, or by six times. Thus, again, while the national debt increased by 19 percent, State and local debt increased to a relative of 600 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table which I have prepared which summarizes the figures I have stated.

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

Growth of national debt compared with other debt, 1946-64

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Kind of debt	1946	Latest figure	Relative index (1946=100)
National debt.....	\$260.0	\$308 (1st 10 months fiscal year 1964).....	119
Consumer credit.....	8.4	\$69 (spring 1964).....	800
Mortgage debt.....	41.8	\$281.3 (Dec. 31, 1963).....	670
Corporate debt.....	93.5	\$371.6 (Dec. 31, 1963).....	400
All private debt.....	154.1	\$753 (Dec. 31, 1963).....	489
State-local debt.....	13.6	\$82.1 (Dec. 31, 1963).....	600

OTHER MEASUREMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are a number of other ways to measure these matters. If we compare the amount of money the Federal Government spends each year as a percentage of the gross national product, we find that this has decreased slightly from 17.4 percent fiscal year 1946 to 16.3 percent as of May 30, 1964. If we compare the amount of the Federal debt which each person in the country would owe, or the per capita national debt, we find that this has gone down from \$1,908.79 as of June 30, 1946, to \$1,627.83 as of May 31, 1964, or a decrease of \$280.96 per person.

It should also be pointed out here that, unlike a private corporation, when the Federal Government invests in a long-term asset—that is to say, when it builds a road, constructs a building, buys a com-

puter, or loans money to TVA or to the REA's, the outlay of funds in a particular year is considered as an operating expense and not a capital expenditure. But in private business a distinction is made between operating expenses and long-term capital investments. The long-term investment is paid for over a long period of years. If an outlay is made in a particular year for a piece of machinery or a new building, the asset is depreciated over its lifetime and only the yearly cost is counted as an expenditure. But when the Federal Government does this, the total amount is counted as an operating expense in the year it is made. Unfortunately, the Federal Government has no capital budget.

I am told that if American Telephone & Telegraph Co., which has the highest capitalization of any company in the

United States, were to treat its capital investments as does the Federal Government—the money it puts out for new wires, offices, telephones, new digit dialing machinery, and so forth—it would operate in the red every year. If we applied the same standard to them that is applied to the Federal Government they would always be losing money.

If those who are most critical of the national debt applied the same standard to A.T. & T. as they do to the Federal Government, they would not be willing to lend A.T. & T. a single dollar; they would pronounce it bankrupt; and the financiers of Wall Street would demand that A.T. & T. come to them, hat in hand, when they wanted a loan or desired to issue stock. But the truth is that A.T. & T. can command tremendous amounts of capital from the money markets because it can pay interest on the capital it has borrowed and because it pays large dividends on its stock.

To put it another way, if the Federal Government were to treat its capital investments in the same way as private industry, the Federal Government would have shown a huge surplus in every year since 1946.

STABLE PRICE LEVEL

There is one further point to make in all this: There are many who say that the country is going to the dogs because of inflation. But, if we look at the wholesale price levels in the country which I asked Secretary Dillon to furnish for the record of our hearings, Senators will find that, since 1958, there has been no increase whatsoever. The wholesale price level has remained constant. In

1958, using the period 1957-59 as 100, the index was 100.4. As of April 1964, the wholesale price index was 100.3. For more than 6 years we have had a constant wholesale price level.

We have had no inflation in commodities. There has been an increase in the cost of living, due to the increase in the price of services, most notably health services, medical expenses and drugs, but in commodities, no. There has probably never been a period in our history when prices have been so constant and when we have had such a remarkable achievement. To my knowledge, no other country in the free world has done as well.

The facts which I asked Secretary Dillon to furnish appear on page 39 of the hearings in a table giving a comparison of the wholesale price indexes for the United States with those for other countries. Our wholesale price index in May of this year was 100, the same as it was in 1958. In Canada it was 8 percent higher in early 1964 than in 1958. In Belgium it was 8 percent higher. In France, it was 18 percent higher. In Germany it was 5 percent higher. In Italy it was 10 percent higher. In Japan it was 3 percent higher. In The Netherlands it was 6 percent higher. In Switzerland it was 9 percent higher. In the United Kingdom it was 10 percent higher.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table to which I have referred printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Wholesale price indexes

[1958=100]

	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
United States.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100 (May).
Canada.....	100	101	101	102	105	107	108 (April).
Belgium.....	100	100	101	100	101	104	108 (March).
France ¹	100	105	107	110	113	116	118 (March).
Germany ²	100	99	100	102	103	104	105 (March).
Italy.....	100	97	98	98	101	106	110 (March).
Japan.....	100	101	102	103	101	103	103 (April).
Netherlands ¹	100	101	99	98	99	101	106 (February).
Switzerland ¹	100	98	99	99	102	106	109 (April).
United Kingdom ³	100	100	102	104	107	108	110 (March).

¹ Prices of home and import goods.

² Industrial wholesale prices.

³ Prices of industrial output.

Source: International Monetary Fund, "International Financial Statistics," June 1964.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Our real problem has been excessive unemployment and an economic growth rate which has been, until recently, much too slow.

I hope very much that these facts will help to put the fiscal position of the United States into some realistic perspective. The country is not going to the dogs. Our assets are greater than our debts. Compared with private debt, corporate debt, and State and local debt, the Federal situation is vastly superior.

While we must continue to be on our guard against the dangers from abroad, the American people need not have fear for our domestic financial situation and the soundness of our Government.

I hope the political fury of the next few months will not obscure these simple facts.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I merely want to state, in a very few moments, the reason why I shall vote against the debt increase. There is no question that there probably will have to be a debt increase if we are ever to pay our bills. I agree with the statement of the Senator from Delaware made a moment ago when he said that a great deal of this debt is to fill the vacuum caused by the ill-advised tax reduction, which has increased the deficit. It is a means of filling the hole that was artificially created by the tax reduction bill some months ago.

There have been a great many other programs and activities created that, in my judgment, have been created, stimulated, and voted for solely for the purpose of garnering votes for next November. We see areas being told they are distressed areas that did not know they were distressed areas until someone came up with a Government check. If the check was big enough, they suddenly realized they were distressed. So they take money and enjoy being distressed.

There are many other programs that have great appeal at the ballot box because a Federal check comes to certain groups. But all of that makes for much of the increasing irresponsibility, in my judgment, in Federal fiscal policies.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has just completed a very comprehensive address, which time and research, on my part, at least, do not permit me to canvass. But there is a great deal of difference between private financing and borrowing programs and repayment and refinancing for State debts—which are based upon liens on real property and other assets of the State for repayment, and are based upon sound financial background—and the Federal debt, which has a nebulous, theoretical, or speculative value behind it.

We have not paid any of the national debt for years. We have increased it, and we go on our merry way, developing new programs, new expenditures, new deficits, and new and increasing invasions of the income of the property of the people of this country.

I do not know where the end is going to be. I can only say that the only method of protest I have is by voting against this proposal. I have protested a number of these programs in the same way, but to no avail when it came to counting the votes. I can only protest against what I believe to be the irresponsible and ill-advised constant expansion of Federal extravagance and Federal squandering by voting against the proposed debt increase. In spite of the fact that some increase may be necessary, I am not persuaded that the increase asked for, or any substantial portion of it, is necessary.

I shall vote against it as the only gesture I have, weak as it is, in protest against policies which I think are invading the private economy more and more.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is always a refreshing experience to secure basic orientation by going back to the Constitution of the United States. After all, it is the organic charter which is the foundation of our Government. I like to go back to that section of article I which provides:

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.

It does not read "a few powers." It does not read "limited powers." It reads "all powers." And this is the sole agency, this is the sole body, in Government that is invested with legislative power. So that whatever is done in the legislative field must necessarily emanate from the Congress.

In that same article there is the following provision in section 7:

All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

By implication, if the Congress can raise revenues, it has the authority also to diminish revenues, if it so desires.

Finally, there is the section in the same article which reads:

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.

If this is the exclusive law-making body in this Government, and if no funds can be gotten from the Treasury except in pursuance of law, the primary and almost exclusive responsibility for whatever happens by way of expenditure must rest on the doorstep of Congress.

That is just as simple, just as complete, and just as self-evident as anything I know of. It gives force to the observation that the document known as the Constitution has conferred upon the President, by virtue of the fact that he is Commander in Chief, the power of the sword; but at the same time it has conferred upon this body the exclusive power over the purse of the United States.

So today, as we think in terms of the deficit, and think in terms of debt ceiling, we need not look beyond the Congress for responsibility and for its duty, because we passed a tax bill which, as everybody knew, would tend to incur a deficit. There was some testimony before the Senate Finance Committee from rather well-informed sources that we may run a deficit as far into the future as 1972. However, the Secretary of the Treasury when he appeared before the Finance Committee this week, expressed the hope that perhaps we would get out of that deficit stage by 1967. In any event, the deficit exists, wholly through the creation of Congress.

In addition, depending, of course, on what we do with the appropriation bills and expenditures—which are again the exclusive domain of the Congress—when we incur a deficit, Congress has the responsibility to protect the fiscal integrity of the United States. And if this bill should not pass, conceivably it could damage the credit of the country; and that would not add to its integrity, its responsibility, or the image that would be created in every chancellery and every exchequer in every corner of the earth.

Therefore, Mr. President, we are dealing today with the result of a deficit. That deficit is the responsibility of Congress, as are the actions that have been taken. When we think about these appropriation bills we often forget the commitments that are made with respect to the future. Often the bills begin with a very modest amount of money. However, as we look down the road and see what has been committed for the future, we should remember that we are the ones who are making that commitment.

Therefore, today there is nothing to do, in my judgment, except to approve the bill that is before us. If we fail to do so, and if we continue to fail, it will mean that it will become our responsi-

bility with respect to the integrity of our fiscal affairs. It is as simple as that. The authority and the duty lodge in the Constitution of the United States.

I shall vote today for the bill before the Senate, because there is nothing else that we can reasonably do, other than by a negative vote to utter a protest. If the bill fails of enactment, we shall begin to project ourselves into a zone of jeopardy. I shall never do that with my vote.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say on the subject. The issue is simple and practical. I am ready to conclude my remarks; and, if no other Senator wishes to speak, there can be a vote on the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask some Senator who has the information as to whether the proposed pay raise is included in the budget which was submitted by the President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator can be assured that the proposed pay raise has been included in the budget estimates that were presented by the President in January of this year. The budget estimate included a larger amount than the total of either the bill reported by the House or that reported by the Senate committee.

Mr. COOPER. That is interesting and helpful information. Of course the Senate and the Congress will still have to make the decision as to whether, with the budget in the shape it is, and the deficit as it is, and with millions of people out of work, we can justify voting a pay raise for Federal employees and Members of Congress in this situation. That is a matter which will come up later.

I shall vote, although reluctantly, for the increase in the debt limit to \$324 billion. I believe it is necessary. If the limit is not raised, the Federal Government will not be able, as my leader has said, to pay its obligations and to finance its obligations.

The situation arises from the fact that there have been deficits of approximately \$15 billion in the last 2 years. I believe a part of the deficit is the result of the tax bill which Congress passed earlier this year.

I agree with my leader, the Senator from Illinois, that Congress itself had a part in the deficit which has occurred. By voting for the tax bill, we assumed the responsibility to provide the funds to pay for it.

I suggest two courses for the future. I do not believe that these deficits can continue indefinitely. They are coming to the point where the confidence of our people will be so diminished and affected that it can have its effect upon their willingness to invest and their willingness to spend money in consumption.

I suggest that the President and the administration make every effort in this year and in its future proposals to hold spending, or at least spending proposals, to some limit which could lead to a balance between revenue and spending.

I think also all of us, whatever our desires may be, must show greater restraint and a greater desire to reduce proposals that have been made. That was done last year by Congress.

If the tax bill results in increased revenues, which it was hoped it would, growing out of increased investment and consumption, perhaps at some time, some administration will say, "We will apply a part of that increased revenue toward reducing our debt."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Kentucky made that last point, as to how far we can go on the public debt. I recall that many years ago, when I was a member of the House Banking Committee, an unnamed spokesman made inquiry as to how far we could go with our public debt, and one of the witnesses said:

The limit cannot be expressed in terms of dollars. It is that psychological point where the confidence of the people begins to ebb. Then you will be in trouble.

A part of this trouble certainly has been occasioned by the action taken in this Chamber and in the Chamber at the other end of the Capitol. I am willing to face my responsibility.

I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this may be a good opportunity to ask the acting majority leader what the program will be for Monday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In response to the question of the minority leader, it is our hope that the Senate may be able to take up the pay bill, either Monday or Tuesday. This will depend on the views of the majority leader. I have not had an opportunity to consult with him today, but we should look forward not later than Tuesday to taking up the pay bill. On Monday we hope also to take up some minor bills.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I take this occasion to ask the chairman of the Committee on Finance a question regarding the suggestion or recommendation I made with relation to the total debt of the U.S. Government, and the opportunity for a public periodic information statement that we could get and that the people could get on this subject.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The resolution is before the Finance Committee. It will be on the schedule at the next meeting.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator. I hope we can use the language that I recommended or some other pertinent language. It is very important that we know the total obligations of our country.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. As chairman of the committee, I am very much in favor of the resolution.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11375) to provide, for

the period ending June 30, 1965, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I contemplate voting against the measure which would authorize the Treasury Department to increase the debt of our Government. I shall do so because I believe that this practically annual lifting of the limit renders completely nugatory the law which imposes a limit on the extent to which the Government can go into debt.

The State of Ohio has a constitutional provision which limits the right of the legislature to throw the State into indebtedness. That limitation can be removed only by a vote of the people.

It is my belief that Congress felt it ought to establish a debt limitation. I also infer that when it did so, it contemplated that the debt limitation should have a purpose and a definite meaning.

What is the practical application that has been given to the debt limitation? The debt is increased without thought of the limits that are contained in the law; and after the increase in the debt has exceeded, or prospectively will exceed, the debt limitation, the law is changed. Therefore, in my opinion, the existence of the law is a mockery in the way the debt is being handled.

We are paying approximately \$11 billion a year interest on the indebtedness. I believe that figure will show that the payment of the interest alone on the Federal debt by the citizens of the United States amounts to about \$1 for every \$10 of expenditure.

What the burden is upon the individual, I cannot say. The burden upon each family to provide the money merely to pay the interest on the debt is more than it should be.

The most alarming aspect of all is that there is no consciousness of the responsibility of reducing the debt. If anything, we are indifferent; we are clouding the danger of the debt; we are indicating that we will not concern ourselves with it.

The debt is now practically \$50 billion more than it was after World War II. Prior to World War II, 20 years after every war in which this country had engaged, we had paid off the debt created by the war. But 19 years after World War II, instead of having the debt liquidated, we learn that it is \$50 billion more than it was.

It is my understanding that the request is that we give authority to increase the debt, to incur additional debt, in the sum of \$9 billion—from \$315 billion to \$324 billion. Let us assume that we grant that authority today. On the basis of my 8 years' experience in the Senate, I can anticipate that in 1965 the administration will be back to ask for another increase in the right to incur debt.

It was quite clearly indicated last evening, when the Senate removed revenues amounting to more than \$500 million, that even today we ought to raise the debt limit from \$324 billion to \$324,500 million, if we take into consideration the

loss of revenues that will be suffered by the action taken by the Senate last night.

We who are concerned about the debt and want to do something to reduce it are told, in effect, that we have ancient ideas; that we are old-fashioned; that we need not worry about the debt. The fact is that ridicule is sought to be heaped upon the Members of Congress who believe that something should be done to reduce the debt. The net impact of those statements is that Members of Congress who do not care about the debt are, in effect, saying, "Ride high. Enjoy yourselves. Take out of Government as much as you can and pass the obligation of paying the debt on to future generations." They are saying, in effect, "Worry not about your children, your grandchildren, and your great grandchildren; let them worry about the payment of the debt." We who are now living say "Take out of Government as much as you possibly can."

The argument is made that the relationship of our gross national product to our indebtedness puts us in a better position than we were in in 1929 and 1940. Those who make that argument do not consider at all the fact that in the gross national product is more than \$100 billion of the taxpayers' money, spent by the U.S. Government. They do not take into consideration that in the gross national product is probably \$50 billion spent by local and State governments.

I am not responsible for the way in which the indebtedness is being increased. Not being responsible for the situation, I do not contemplate voting to authorize an increase in the indebtedness.

Speaking simply and plainly, the Government cannot continue to spend more and tax less without increasing the indebtedness of the Government.

We are moving in a most dangerous manner. The movement ought to be stopped. The evidence is not existent that the present course will be stopped.

One word to the members of families who might be listening: In your homes, if you continued to borrow money to maintain current operations, if the philosophy of the U.S. Congress applied to you, you supposedly would be improving your position by borrowing more every day to meet current expenses. In my judgment, if you did that, you would eventually go to the poorhouse.

That is what the Federal Government is doing. It is borrowing each day to maintain current expenses.

To repeat: The Federal indebtedness is now probably \$50 billion more than it was in 1945, and each year it is going up. I cannot in good conscience vote for the measure that is now before the Senate.

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

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

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. INOUYE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is; shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MORTON (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. PEARSON (after hearing voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. ALLOTT (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the

Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] is detained on official business.

The respective pairs of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and that of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] have been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 21, as follows:

[No. 451 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Bartlett	Hart	Morse
Bennett	Hill	Muskie
Bible	Inouye	Nelson
Boggs	Jackson	Pastore
Burdick	Johnston	Peil
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Randolph
Cannon	Keating	Ribicoff
Carlson	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Case	Long, La.	Scott
Clark	Magnuson	Smathers
Cooper	McClellan	Smith
Dodd	McGee	Sparkman
Douglas	McGovern	Talmadge
Fong	McIntyre	Walters
Fulbright	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	Metcalf	Yarborough

NAYS—21

Aiken	Holland	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Russell
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Simpson
Curtis	Miller	Stennis
Dominick	Mundt	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Prouty	Young, N. Dak.
Hickenlooper	Proxmire	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—31

Allott	Goldwater	Mechem
Anderson	Gore	Monroney
Bayh	Hartke	Morton
Beall	Hayden	Moss
Brewster	Humphrey	Neuberger
Church	Javits	Pearson
Dirksen	Kennedy	Symington
Eastland	Lausche	Thurmond
Edmondson	Long, Mo.	Tower
Engle	Mansfield	
Ervin	McCarthy	

So the bill (H.R. 11375) was passed. Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

GALLAUDET COLLEGE CENTENNIAL

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, Gallaudet College is this year celebrating its centennial. On June 6, 1964, President Johnson spoke at the Gallaudet centennial banquet, and on June 8, 1964, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY delivered the commencement address at the Gallaudet College graduation exercises. In his address, President Johnson declared:

Here at Gallaudet we have a proud example of what education and compassion have achieved. This was the first—and is still the only—college in the world for the deaf. But, since President Lincoln signed Gallaudet's Charter, no boy or girl has been turned away because of the poverty of their parents.

Senator KENNEDY in speaking of the college spoke of it as "this wonderful college" and its many services and contributions to the deaf. It is indeed a wonderful college and has done so much in so many ways for the deaf, and I ask unanimous consent that the address of President Johnson and the address of Senator KENNEDY may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE GALLAUDET CENTENNIAL BANQUET, GALLAUDET COLLEGE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, Senator Hill, members of the Board of Trustees of Gallaudet College, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to be able to join personally tonight in honoring Gallaudet College.

Twenty years ago tonight, on distant shores, America's sons were engaged in a great battle in mankind's greatest war. One hundred years ago tonight on these shores America's sons were engaged in bitter battles of our own cruel Civil War.

How we are observing this historic day says much about America.

In Europe, America's sons meet tonight in peace with yesterday's allies—and adversaries alike—to plan the works of future unity instead of worrying about the wounds of past conflict.

Here in Washington tonight we gather to honor an institution of higher learning which was established as an act of compassion in those times of callous strife 100 years ago.

The character of our Nation is comprised of many traits.

We honor courage.

We value commonsense.

But, across our 188 years, the great cementing influence has always been compassion.

In our purpose abroad and at home, we have always heeded the injunction of the apostle, who told us long ago, "Be ye of one mind, showing compassion one of another."

Yet, our wealthy society is tolerating a worrisome burden of wasted human lives. Tonight, too many of our people are uneducated, untrained, and underemployed. Too many are physically handicapped. Too many are mentally handicapped; too many more are handicapped for life by the environments and the experiences of their childhoods.

America needs these talents. We must not and we cannot let them go to waste.

An ancient Hebrew proverb teaches that there are three pillars of society: education, charity, and piety. For our society, the pillars have been education, compassion, and morality.

In the next 24 hours, the research that comes forth around the world would fill seven sets of the Encyclopedia Britannica.

In the next year, the output of such research would require a man to read around the clock—day and night—for the next 460 years. In the next 10 years, the sum of human knowledge will multiply twofold.

When knowledge is advancing at this pace, a compassionate nation cannot afford to leave any segments of our society behind to form and to perpetuate a human slag heap. We must express our compassion in a greater commitment to education.

Here at Gallaudet we have a proud example of what education and compassion have achieved. This was the first—and is still the only—college in the world for the deaf. But since President Lincoln signed Gallaudet's charter, no boy or girl has been turned away because of the poverty of their parents.

Universal education has brought our society to its present high level of success. If our society is to move higher, higher education must be made a universal opportunity for all young people. Public education and compassion go hand in hand with private morality.

In our private lives as in our public policies we are challenged to show the morality of compassion. When the helpless call for help, the hearing must hear—the seeing must see—and the able must act.

Our rich society will be a mockery if we permit it to become a callous society or an uncaring society.

One hundred years ago, Lincoln told us that this Nation could not stand half slave and half free. Tonight, for my part, I believe this society cannot succeed part committed and part uncommitted, part concerned, and part unconcerned, part compassionate and part callous.

The great battle, the great adventure for Americans living tonight is not only to defend our freedom and to preserve our peace but to defend, preserve, and strengthen those pillars of our society: education, compassion, and morality. To you here who are devoting your lives as committed, concerned, and compassionate citizens, I am proud and honored to present tonight to Gallaudet College the 1964 award from the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

It has been a great pleasure for me to make this appearance tonight. I feel close ties with this great institution. One of the real influences in my life is a young man and, later in my public life, a lady whose intense interest in this college first brought the school to my attention—Mrs. Mary Thornberry—whose son later served in Congress and now sits with distinction on the Federal bench.

I have many old and dear friends who have manifested an interest in your development through the years, particularly that noble American, Senator HILL who honors us with his presence this evening. I know many members of your board, Mr. Collins, and others who have been my friends through the years, so you do me a great honor to ask me to come here to be with you, and I am very proud that I could come. My congratulations to all of you.

GALLAUDET COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS, MONDAY, JUNE 8, 1964, WASHINGTON, D.C.

It is a great privilege for me to be here this morning to greet the graduating class of this college and to see for myself the very fine and inspiring work that has been done here in recent years. I have had an opportunity this morning to visit your campus, to see the fine facilities, the laboratory and the dormitories and to learn something of what you are doing. But the thing that impresses me the most about this college is the student

body. I am filled with admiration for the hard work you are doing. For the effort you are making, successfully, to overcome the fact that you cannot hear, and to make a contribution, as solid citizens, to this city and this Nation.

It would be quite easy for many of you to withdraw, to give up, to let society take care of you the rest of your lives. But you have been willing, at considerable effort, to go out and get as good an education as is available. In coming this far—graduation day—you have already established yourselves as outstanding citizens, and you deserve the congratulations from all of us.

My brother, President Kennedy, was always very interested in the problems of the deaf. He visited your school. He represented, when he was in the Senate, as I do, the State of Massachusetts, where we also have an outstanding institution for the training of the deaf, the Clarke School in Northampton. When he was a Senator, President Kennedy introduced some important legislation for training of the deaf. I know that he felt that deaf citizens should have the same rights as other citizens, and as much responsibility as they could assume, and he believed the Nation should make just a little more effort to make it easier for all of you to live useful and happy lives.

For the last few months the Senate has been considering the civil rights bill. The purpose of this bill is to give Negro citizens some very simple rights: the right to vote, to go to school, to get a job, to get a room in a hotel, to get a meal in a restaurant. These rights have been denied to many Negroes because they are different. They labor under a handicap often more difficult than yours: the handicap of prejudice. But I sometimes feel that people who discriminate—whether it is against another race or another nation or against people with physical defects—have a great handicap of their own. There is a handicap of mind and spirit, that makes it impossible for them to appreciate what others do for them.

Many of you will be able to travel, and will find that in the world in which you are going to live, an education that stops at our borders will not be enough.

I think the experience of this school with its graduates has shown that you will be able fully to participate in almost all the things that life has to offer—whether it is travel, or work, or recreation. Graduates of this school now are engaged in some of the most intricate, technical, and mechanical jobs that exist. They have established themselves as contributing members of the community. As we look through recent history, we see that some of the most outstanding contributions have been made by people with handicaps greater than your own. Henri Toulouse-Lautrec, the French painter, was hunchbacked, but his works of art are admired to the present day. Paderewski was blind, but he was both an outstanding musician and a patriot, whose contribution to Poland, the country that he loved, was immeasurable. He is revered today in the hearts of the Polish people throughout the world. Franklin D. Roosevelt was a cripple, but he was one of the greatest Presidents that America has ever had. Eight pounds of steel, in a brace on his leg, did not prevent him from carrying on his shoulder the hopes and the destiny of all America for 13 years. Deaf graduates of this college are also making their mark. They are building dams and bridges; working on atomic projects; searching into the mysteries of cancer. They are active in the arts, the ministry, in business, in many other fields.

And so I hope that all of you will be able to succeed, not only in your family life and in the work you choose, but also in making a contribution to your community. You may not be able to run for office, but there are

many other jobs to do: in the parent-teachers' association, in community fund drives, in the many organizations that together make up the strength of our country. President Kennedy always believed that these organizations are vitally important to the country. He believed, as has been said, that one man can make a difference and that every man should try.

So as you leave this wonderful college, and go into the world which, because of the education you have received here, holds so much opportunity for you, I would urge you to try to make a difference. To make a difference in your family life, as one who is patient and helps others over the difficulties of life just as you have been helped over your difficulties.

To make a difference in your work, as someone who can be depended on to do the job and help others with their job.

And finally, to make a difference to your community, to always be remembered as one who cared. As a person, who, because of his problem, was sensitive to the problems of others.

It may be that one part of life will be forever shut to you—the world of hearing. But there are so many others, so many deeper senses you can enjoy. You think, and feel, and taste and love and laugh, and even cry. And I think you will be able, in a sense, to appreciate all these other senses more because you lack one of them.

When this college was founded, on Kendall Green, 100 years ago, our Nation was emerging from a war fought to determine whether we would be half slave or half free. That issue was decided in favor of freedom.

Today the issue is whether the world will exist half slave and half free. America has many enemies in the world and there are many other people who do not know the justice and compassion we have here. The establishment of Gallaudet College in 1864 showed the humanitarianism of the United States even in time of trouble. The progress of Gallaudet today is proof to the world that we still feel for our fellow man.

Nowhere else in the world could such a graduation take place. I wish that those people in China and Cuba and Russia who say that Americans are barbarians could be here today to see how we have led the world in holding out our hand to those who cannot hear.

And so as you graduate today I want to wish you the best of luck and success. I know each of your careers will be another feather in the cap of this wonderful college which has done so much for so long to bring achievements and happiness to those who live in the world of silence.

MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES PARTNERS FOR PROGRESS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Mexico City is a difficult place to construct a building. The city is built on the bottoms of drained lakes. As a result the ground is soggy for 30 feet deep. It is hard to sink a foundation which will be secure and lasting. It is hard to do but it can be done.

Last weekend it was my pleasure to fly to Mexico City with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], for the dedication ceremonies of the new U.S. Chancery. The principal speech dedicating the chancery was made by Senator McCLELLAN. This is a large and beautiful building combining the best features of Mexi-

can and United States architecture and based on solid and firm foundations.

The building exemplifies the state of the relationship between our two countries—for Mexico and the United States are bound together in a modern partnership for progress. This is a partnership based on firm foundations and is all the more remarkable because of the difficult years of troubled relations which bedeviled our two countries in our early days. It should be a source of pride and confidence to our two peoples that in our friendship, just as in building our new chancery in Mexico City, a solid and permanent structure has risen on what was once unstable ground.

At the dedication ceremonies on June 20, the Honorable Jose Gorostiza, Foreign Minister of Mexico, represented that country's most able President Lopez Mateos. Representing the United States was our new Ambassador, the Honorable Fulton Freeman, as well as the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. The Senator in his remarks surveyed the extraordinary achievement of modern Mexico, a country of progress, social reform, and a bright future. Mexico and the close partnership which binds our two countries together stands as an example to the peoples of all the world.

LOAN PROGRAM FOR THE ELDERLY IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 1051, House Joint Resolution 1041.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1041) temporarily extending the programs of insured rental housing loans for the elderly in rural areas under title V of the Housing Act of 1949.

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 joint resolution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the committee report.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1108) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The resolution, which was approved by the Committee on Banking and Currency, would extend for 90 days the authority of the Farmers Home Administration in the Department of Agriculture to insure loans on rental housing for the elderly in rural areas. Under existing law this program has an expiration date of June 30, 1964, but it is evident that the Congress will not have time to act on general housing legislation, including the administration recommendation for a continuation of this program, by that time. Therefore, the resolution is needed to prevent an interruption in the program. House Joint Resolution 1041 was approved by the House of Representatives on June 15, 1964.

BACKGROUND AND THE PRESENT PROGRAM

The authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under section 515(b) of the Housing

Act of 1949 to make insured loans to finance rental housing for the elderly in rural areas was granted by the Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962 as an amendment to the Housing Act of 1949.

Under this authorization insured loans may be made to individuals, corporations, associations, trusts, or partnerships to provide rental housing and related facilities for elderly persons in rural areas. The maximum loan is \$100,000. Loans may be made in rural areas and communities of less than 2,500 population. These loans are being made at the present time at 5½-percent interest for terms ranging up to 40 years. This interest rate covers contributions to the insurance fund and administrative expenses, as well as the return to the private lender, so that the program involves no cost to the taxpayer. The insurance fund, authority, and procedures provided under the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 (Bankhead-Jones) are used for these loans.

This program has gained momentum during the past year. By April 30, 1964, seven loans totaling \$277,000 had been approved. The loans will provide 81 rental housing units for elderly families in rural areas.

The program has a great potential. There are some 6 million persons 65 years of age and over living on farms or in small country towns. Many of them are living in inadequate accommodations because suitable housing is not available. Rental housing made available under this authorization permits elderly rural families to continue to live in adequate housing in the communities in which their interests have been centered.

Interest in financing the construction and improvement of rental housing has increased substantially in the past year. On April 30, 1964, the Farmers Home Administration had on hand 56 applications in 30 States. Of these, the 37 applications that were in process would require an estimated \$2,225,000.

Unless this authorization is extended, this promising program will come to an abrupt halt pending further action by the Congress. Extension of the program for a 90-day period will enable the Farmers Home Administration to continue operation of this phase of the rural housing program until the Congress has an opportunity to act on the proposed Housing and Community Development Act of 1964, S. 2468.

A copy of the report of the Secretary of Agriculture supporting Senate Joint Resolution 180, a companion measure, is set forth below as part of this report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1041) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION FOR 2 YEARS OF AUTHORITY FOR TREASURY SALE OF U.S. OBLIGATIONS DIRECTLY TO FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar order No. 1052, H.R. 11499.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11499) to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury.

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.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1109), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

FEDERAL RESERVE DIRECT PURCHASES

H.R. 11499 would extend until June 30, 1966, the present authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts not to exceed \$5 billion outstanding at any one time.

Up to 1935 Federal Reserve banks could purchase Government obligations either in the market or directly from the Treasury. The Banking Act of 1935, however, required that all purchases of Government securities by Federal Reserve banks be made in the open market. In 1942 the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury was restored, but a limit of \$5 billion was placed on the amount outstanding at any one time. The \$5 billion authority was granted initially only through 1944, but the Congress has extended it from time to time so as to provide continuous limited direct borrowing authority ever since. The present authority was granted for 2 years and expires June 30, 1964.

The Treasury Department's reasons for the extension of the act may be summarized as follows:

"(1) Direct access to Federal Reserve credit provides the margin of safety necessary if the Treasury is to follow its customary practice of allowing its cash balances to fall to exceptionally low levels prior to the large inflow of cash over a tax date.

"(2) There may be occasions when Treasury financing operations ought to be postponed for a short period because of market disturbances. The possibility of direct access to Federal Reserve credit increases the Treasury's elbowroom in such a situation.

"(3) In the event of a national emergency, which would disrupt financial markets, direct access to Federal Reserve credit would be necessary to continue the functions of government."

The power extended by this bill is broad and must be used with great care. Its use must not be permitted to have inflationary effects. Its use must be confined within the bounds of the Government's monetary policy. The use of the power up to the present time has clearly been kept within proper bounds. But because of the danger of possible abuse in the future, it is appropriate that the power should be a temporary one, and the committee, therefore, agrees that a 2-year extension should be granted. Whenever the power has been used, a record of it has been included in the weekly statement of condition of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, published in newspapers on Thursday of each week and in the daily Treasury statement. This practice should be continued whenever the power is used. In addition, the existing law requires the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to include detailed information with respect to the use of this authority in its annual report to the Congress.

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

The bill (H.R. 11499) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1053, H.R. 10000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill, H.R. 10000, to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

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.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1110), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 for 2 years—from the present expiration date, June 30, 1964, to June 30, 1966. The bill would also make three amendments to the Defense Production Act. It would extend the contracting authority under section 303(b) of the act from June 30, 1965, to June 30, 1975, so as to provide additional time for sales from the DPA inventory or for contracts for processing or refining materials in the inventory; it would add a proviso to the contracting authority under section 303 of the act, to the effect that no new purchases or commitments to purchase could be made or entered into after June 30, 1964, unless the President made a finding that this was necessary to the national security; and it would add a second proviso to the contracting authority, to the effect that the total of such new purchases and commitments, including contingent liabilities, could not exceed \$100 million.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill would extend for 2 additional years, through June 30, 1966, the remaining powers of the President under the Defense Production Act of 1950. These include power to establish priorities for defense contracts; power to allocate materials for defense purposes; authority to guarantee loans made in connection with defense contracts; authority to make loans and purchases to build up our defense capacity and assure supplies of defense materials and to carry out existing contracts; authority to enable businessmen to cooperate voluntarily in meeting defense needs, with an exemption from the anti-trust laws; authority to employ without-compensation and when-actually-employed employees, including advisers and consultants; and provision for the establishment of a reserve of trained executives to fill Government positions in time of mobilization. The act also establishes the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

These powers are now scheduled to expire on June 30, 1964. They must be extended. Some of these powers are needed now to maintain production schedules on missiles and other defense contracts; others are needed for longer range preparedness programs; and other powers must be maintained in readiness for immediate use in possible future emergencies.

Reports on the proposed extension have been received from the Federal Reserve Board, the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Interior, and Justice, the General Services Administration, and the Civil Service Commission. These reports are either favorable or take no objection to the proposal. Hearings were held at which Mr. Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, testified in support of the bill. No opposition to the extension of the act was made known to the committee. In view of the need for extending the act before its expiration on June 30, 1964, the committee did not undertake to review additional proposals for amendments to the Defense Production Act which were brought to the attention of the committee.

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

The bill (H.R. 10000) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FORT UNION TRADING POST NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, N. DAK.

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar order No. 1055, Senate bill 187.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 187) to authorize the establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, N. Dak., and for other purposes.

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 Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "the historic remains of Fort Union located in McKenzie County, North Dakota, and Roosevelt County, Montana, and such additional lands and interests in lands as he may deem necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act." and insert "the historic remains of Fort Union located in Williams County, North Dakota, and such additional lands and interests in lands in Williams County, North Dakota, and Roosevelt County, Montana, as he may deem necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act: *Provided*, That the total area so acquired shall not exceed four hundred acres."; and on page 2, at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "Such sums as are necessary" and insert "\$30,000"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to commemorate the significant role played by Fort Union as a fur-trading post on the Upper Missouri River, the Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or otherwise, the historic remains of Fort Union located in Williams County, North Dakota, and such additional lands and interests in lands in Williams County, North Dakota, and Roosevelt County, Montana, as he may deem necessary to accom-

plish the purposes of this Act: *Provided*, That the total area so acquired shall not exceed four hundred acres.

SEC. 2. When the site of historic Fort Union and other required lands and interests in lands have been acquired by the United States as provided in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall establish such area or areas as the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall administer, protect, develop, and maintain the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, and the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666).

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$30,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

MR. BURDICK. Mr. President, the Lewis and Clark Expedition of 1803-06 into the great American West brought back reports of rich fur-bearing regions near the headwaters of the Missouri River. Trappers and fur traders went there, establishing Fort Union trading post in the 1820's at the Lewis and Clark campgrounds at the confluence of the Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers in North Dakota near the Montana border.

For nearly four decades thereafter, Fort Union played a key role in the westward movement. My bill, S. 187, co-sponsored by the two distinguished Senators from Montana, would develop the site and historic remains of Fort Union, to interpret the fur trade and the relationship of the white settlers and the Indians.

Two years ago, the Secretary of the Interior, using rigid criteria, designated Fort Union as a national historic site. The Interior Department has endorsed S. 187 to insure adequate commemoration and interpretation.

With enactment of S. 187, the Interior Department has indicated that over a 5-year period it would make an archeological excavation of the fort area, construct a modest visitor center, administration facilities and roads, suitable markers and exhibits and possibly other developments as studies progress.

Studies by the Interior Department indicate that two parcels of land should be acquired to preserve adequately the site of the fort and its environs. The first parcel of about 220 acres includes the 10-acre site of the fort, which is owned by the North Dakota Historical Society. These 10 acres would be donated to the Federal Government by the historical society if S. 187 is enacted. The first parcel also includes a strip of Missouri River bank and benchland above and below the fort site. The second parcel of about 160 acres is about one-fourth mile northeast of the first and would provide an area for development as a scenic overlook.

In the Missouri-Yellowstone confluence area, the Rocky Mountain Fur Co., in 1822, established a trading post, named Fort Floyd. The post was purchased in 1828 by the American Fur Co., headed by John Jacob Astor, and renamed Fort Union. Developed by Kenneth McKenzie, so-called "King of the Missouri," Fort Union soon achieved a monopoly of the rich fur trade with the plains and mountain tribes that roamed the region now encompassing Montana, North Dakota, and part of Wyoming.

As a fur-trading center, Fort Union served as an important means of transmitting the white man's culture to the Indian. The fort became a stopping place for nearly every important explorer, frontiersman, trader, soldier, and traveler, particularly after the first steamboat reached there in 1832. The visitors included Jim Bridger, trapper, Prince Maximilian of Wien, scientist; John J. Audubon, naturalist; Jedediah Smith, fur trader, Father Pierre-Jean De Smet, missionary, and George Catlin and Charles Bodmer, artists.

As the demand for the beaver pelt declined, so did the importance of Fort Union. In 1865, it was sold to the Northwestern Fur Co. A year later, the Army established Fort Buford nearby, and in 1867, purchased Fort Union to provide building material for the new Army post.

Fort Buford played a role in the various Indian campaigns, culminating in the Battle of Little Big Horn in 1876. Many Indian prisoners passed through Fort Buford and it was there that Sitting Bull surrendered in 1881.

The States of North Dakota and Montana have endeavored to preserve and restore the confluence area, but they cannot do a complete job without the technical assistance of the National Park Service. S. 187 carries an endorsement from the Park Service, as well as the Interior Department.

Mr. President, Fort Union, as the principal fur-trading post on the upper Missouri River, had national significance. The recognition provided in S. 187 would enhance understanding of the American past.

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

The bill (S. 187) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, North Dakota and Montana, and for other purposes."

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1112), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 187, introduced by Senator BURDICK for himself and Senators MANSFIELD and METCALF, is to authorize the acquisition of approximately 400 acres of land

in North Dakota and Montana, and the establishment and maintenance there of a national historic site.

Two years ago, the Secretary of Interior designated Fort Union as a national historic site. Further authority is now needed to preserve its historical values. S. 187 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the remains of Fort Union and such lands as he deems necessary to commemorate the significant role it played as a trading post.

With enactment of S. 187, the Interior Department has indicated that over a 5-year period it would make an archeological excavation of the fort area, construct a modest visitor center, administration facilities and roads, suitable markers and exhibits, and possibly other developments as studies progress.

Fort Union is most certainly worthy of this attention. Located in Williams County, N. Dak., at the confluence of the Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers near to the Montana border, it was for nearly 40 years the principal fur-trading establishment on the upper Missouri River and in the northern plains regions.

Studies by the Department of the Interior indicate that two parcels of land should be acquired to preserve adequately the site of the fort and its environs. The first parcel of about 220 acres includes the 10-acre site of the fort, which is owned by the North Dakota Historical Society. These 10 acres would be donated to the Federal Government by the historical society if S. 187 is enacted. The first parcel also includes a strip of Missouri River bank and benchland above and below the fort site. The second parcel of about 160 acres is about one-fourth mile northeast of the first and would provide an area for development as a scenic overlook.

WAIVER OF PREMIUMS FOR CERTAIN VETERANS HOLDING NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE POLICIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1056, H.R. 6777.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6777) to amend section 712 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who become or have become totally disabled before their 65th birthday.

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.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1113), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to extend from age 60 to age 65 the delimiting age before which a person insured under a national service life insurance (NSLI) policy must become totally disabled to be eligible for waiver of premiums on such insurance. Under section 712 of title 38, United States Code, as now in effect, payment of premiums on NSLI may be waived during the con-

tinuous total disability of the insured, which continues or has continued for 6 or more consecutive months if such total disability began (1) after the date of application for insurance, (2) while the insurance was in force under premium paying conditions, and (3) before the insured's 60th birthday. The waiver is effective from the beginning of the total disability, if application is made within 1 year therefrom, and the waiver continues for the duration of such disability.

The age 60 limitation was placed in the law in 1940 when the National Service Life Insurance Act was enacted. Today the trend in the insurance industry is toward providing more health protection for our senior citizens. This trend is based upon experience which has established that persons age 60 and over who are alive today can expect to live longer, healthier, and more productive lives than could a similar person in 1940. The Veterans' Administration has, therefore, recently restudied the question of premium waiver for the older veterans. As the result of such restudy the VA advises that it favors the objective of H.R. 6777. Further, we understand that the Actuarial Advisory Committee, composed of eminent authorities from the private insurance industry, concurs in this position.

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

The bill (H.R. 6777) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TOTAL DISABILITY INCOME PROVISIONS FOR INCLUSION IN NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE POLICIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1057, H.R. 6920.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6920) to amend section 715 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize, under certain conditions, the issuance of total disability income provisions for inclusion in National Service Life Insurance policies to provide coverage to age 65.

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.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1114), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the inclusion of a new total disability income provision in national service life insurance policies, providing for the payment of total disability income benefits if the insured becomes so disabled prior to age 65. The comparable provision issued under existing law authorizes benefit payments if the insured becomes totally disabled before attaining age 60. The new provision could be issued upon application on or after January 1, 1965, proof of good health, payment of an extra premi-

um, and surrender of any existing age 60 total disability income provision.

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

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

BURIAL ALLOWANCES PAID BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1058, H.R. 3941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3941) to amend section 902 of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the offset against burial allowances paid by the Veterans' Administration for amounts paid by burial associations.

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.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1115), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The bill amends the law relating to the payment of the \$250 veterans' burial allowance, to delete the language which requires that amounts paid by burial associations toward burial and funeral expenses be deducted prior to payment of the allowance. In lieu of this provision of the law, which appears to discriminate against burial allowances, there would be substituted a uniform prohibition of payment of a claim for burial allowances when the allowance would revert to the funds of a public or private organization, or would discharge such an organization's obligation without payment.

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

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

UNRELATED BUSINESS TAXABLE INCOME

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1060, House bill 6455.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6455) to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income).

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 Finance with an amendment

on page 2, line 12, after "December 31," to strike out "1962" and insert "1963".

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1118), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

This bill provides an exemption from the tax on unrelated business taxable income in the case of labor unions and agricultural or horticultural organizations where three conditions are met. First, the income must be used to establish, maintain, or operate a retirement home, hospital, or similar facility for the exclusive use of aged and infirm members of the labor union or agricultural or horticultural organization. Second, the income must be derived from agricultural pursuits conducted on ground contiguous to the home, hospital, etc. Third, this income may not represent more than 75 percent of the cost of maintaining and operating the home, etc.

This provision, as amended by the committee, is to apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1963.

II. GENERAL STATEMENT

Present law.—Present law provides that certain otherwise tax-exempt organizations are to be subject to tax on any "unrelated business taxable income." "Unrelated business taxable income" for this purpose is defined as excluding the various forms of passive income such as dividends, interest, etc. It includes income from the active conduct of a trade or business which is not substantially related (apart from the organization's need for profits) to the exempt purpose of the organization in question.

This tax on unrelated business income under present law applies to labor, agricultural, horticultural organizations (described in sec. 501(c)(5)); business leagues, chambers of commerce, real estate boards, etc. (sec. 501(c)(6)); educational, charitable, religious (except churches or conventions or associations of churches), and similar organizations (sec. 501(c)(3)); corporations organized to hold title to property and turn over the proceeds, less expenses, to an exempt organization (sec. 501(c)(2)); trusts forming a part of a plan providing for the payment of supplemental unemployment compensation benefits (sec. 501(c)(17)); and qualified pension, profit-sharing, and stock bonus plans (sec. 401(a)). The tax on unrelated business income does not presently apply in the case of fraternal beneficiary societies, orders, or associations, civic leagues and similar organizations, local life insurance associations, as well as several other categories of exempt organizations.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, this bill would modify the unrelated business income tax to make it nonapplicable to certain labor unions and agricultural or horticultural organizations.

Under the present law, if a labor union which operates a retirement home for its aged members, finances the home largely with profits from a citrus grove located adjacent to the retirement home, the union—although in most respects it is a tax-exempt organization—must pay tax on the proceeds from the sale of the fruit. On the other hand, if a fraternal society or order operates a retirement home for its aged members and finances it precisely in the same manner as the labor union, it is not taxed.

H.R. 6455 recognizes this anomalous situation and deals with it forthrightly.

Under the bill, for the future, labor unions and agricultural and horticultural organizations which operate a retirement home for their members will not be subject to the unrelated business income tax where certain specific tests are met:

First. The income involved must be used to establish, maintain, or operate a retirement home, hospital, or similar facility for the exclusive use of its aged or infirm members.

Second. The income involved must be derived from agricultural pursuit conducted on grounds contiguous to the home.

Third. The income may not exceed more than 75 percent of the cost of maintaining or operating the retirement home, hospital, or similar facility.

These tests will insure that the exemption from the unrelated business income tax provided by the bill will not be abused.

The Committee on Finance made a single change in the bill as passed by the House. The House bill would have applied with respect to taxable year beginning after December 31, 1962; the committee moved the date forward 1 year in order to make the bill prospective in its application.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the committee amendment be agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill (H.R. 6455) was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXEMPTION FROM INDUCTION FOR SOLE SURVIVING SON OF DECEASED FATHER AS A RESULT OF MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1061, H.R. 2664.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2664) to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service.

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 Armed Services with an

amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 App. U.S.C. 456(o)) is amended to read as follows:

"(o) Except during the period of a war or a national emergency declared by the Congress after the date of the enactment of the 1964 amendment to this subsection, where the father or one or more sons or daughters of a family were killed in action or died in line of duty while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, or subsequently died as a result of injuries received or disease incurred during such service, the sole surviving son of such family shall not be inducted for service under the terms of this title unless he volunteers for induction."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1119), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

EXPLANATION OF THE AMENDMENT

The amendment would terminate the exemption of a sole surviving son in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress.

PURPOSE

This bill would exempt from involuntary induction under the Universal Military and Training Act the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I strongly support the bill (H.R. 2664). However, I support it because it is necessary to do immediate justice in connection with the substance of the act.

I point out to the Senate that the entire Universal Military Training and Service Act needs to be thoroughly overhauled. I trust that the appropriate Senate committee is proceeding with a consideration of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, because at the present time it is operating with great injustice and unfair discrimination involving a great many young men in this country. We have almost reached the point where only those are now drafted who are unable to get the advice that permits them to make use of one or another of the loopholes with which the whole Selective Service Act is becoming honeycombed. It is very unfair in its operation.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], who is temporarily absent from the Chamber, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

The exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a veteran who died as a result of military service has been considerably weakened by making it inapplicable in time of war or national emergency.

I do not share the concern of the committee that we face such a shortage of manpower that today we must provide the exemption is applicable only in peacetime. For years we have provided an exemption to the surviving son of a family in which one or more sons or daughters were killed in the

line of duty. House bill 2664, which was similar to my proposal, Senate bill 1857, merely extended this exemption to the sole surviving son of a family in which the father had died as a result of military service. This was an equitable measure and was not objected to by either the Department of Defense or Selective Service System.

But instead of extending the exemption this bill modifies the present exemption by limiting it also to peacetime. The far better procedure, in my judgment, would be to pass H.R. 2664 in its original form and to withdraw the exemption only if and when necessitated by future hostilities. At the present time there is no estimate of a prospective shortage of manpower to require the withdrawal of the exemption in the time of national emergency.

To some the effect of the alternative procedures is similar. To the wife or mother whose husband or children have died in the service of their country there is a meaningful distinction between the procedures. Passage of H.R. 2664, as amended says to these wives and mothers that despite their sacrifice and the possible end of the family line, their only son will be inducted in time of national emergency. And this induction will take place regardless of whether there is a shortage of manpower or not.

I would not take exception to this amendment or have urged the adoption of my own bill if I had any reason to believe it would endanger our national security. I am not persuaded that this committee amendment is necessary but I will not prejudice the exemption to sons of deceased veterans, if only in peacetime, by having the bill recommitted.

Mr. President, whether these exemptions should apply in time of national emergency is one of many questions which should be investigated by the proposed Commission on the Administration of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. In the meantime, I urge that appropriate regulations be issued that these exempted peacetime categories be given the lowest induction priority in time of national emergency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT TO WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 909, the bill S. 1790.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1790) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Special Watersheds Subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee for the past 2 years, I have had an opportunity to become intimately

acquainted with the operation of the watershed protection and flood prevention program which is authorized under Public Law 566. This program, which is carried out on a State-Federal matching basis, has proved to be highly successful and has brought countless benefits to local communities throughout the Nation in soil conservation, flood prevention, and recreational opportunities.

Watershed projects under this act must be initiated on the local level by sponsoring organizations, which in many instances do not have a great deal of financial support. Some of the major costs which must be borne on the local level are the cost of land, easements, and rights-of-way. This problem is greatly magnified when a utility must be relocated from within the area of a proposed watershed development.

This proposed bill would authorize the Federal Government to pay the cost of utility relocations in watershed protection and flood prevention projects whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the local organization is financially unable to bear such costs, or that the bearing of such costs would work an undue hardship upon it. The cost of such relocations is limited, however, to 5 percent of the estimated total Federal construction cost for any single project—including engineering costs.

There is no accurate way to estimate the cost of this amendment but experience has proved that the relocations are necessary in only a small percentage of watershed projects and, therefore, I think the cost would be very negligible. To the small groups which sponsor many of these watershed projects, however, this cost can be prohibitive.

The Department of Agriculture furnished a favorable report on this proposal and it was approved by the Senate Agriculture Committee without dissent. I think it is for a very worthwhile purpose and I hope the Senate will see fit to give its approval.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (1) of section 4 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666), as amended, is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and adding the following: "Provided further, That the costs of utility relocations shall be borne by the Federal Government whenever the Secretary determines either that the local organization is financially unable to bear such costs or that the bearing of such costs by the local organization would work an undue hardship upon it, except that with respect to any single plan for works of improvement, the amount of such costs to be borne by the Federal Government shall not exceed 5 per centum of the estimated total Federal construction cost (including engineering costs)."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the re-

port (No. 940), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

This bill would authorize the Federal Government to bear the costs of utility relocations on projects covered by the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act—

(1) when the local organization is unable to bear such costs or cannot do so without undue hardship; and

(2) in an amount not exceeding 5 percent of the total Federal construction cost (including engineering costs).

Under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act the local organization is required to acquire the lands needed for the project without cost to the Federal Government. This may require the relocation of utilities now crossing such lands, and such relocation costs are therefore considered part of the land costs. In some cases, such as those of gas or oil pipelines, these costs are beyond the ability of the local organization to pay without undue hardship. The bill is designed to take care of such cases.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1045, the bill H.R. 10300.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10300) to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes.

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 Armed Services with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparations, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Continental Army Command

(First Army)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Community facilities, \$681,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Hospital facilities, and troop housing, \$16,225,000.

Fort Hamilton, New York: Utilities, \$118,000.

(Second Army)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$3,564,000.

Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, \$5,244,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Troop housing and utilities, \$7,778,000.

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$2,084,000.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Operational facilities, \$1,600,000.

(Third Army)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational facilities, and administrative facilities, \$5,452,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Troop housing and community facilities, \$5,655,000.

Fort Gordon, Georgia: Training facilities, and troop housing, \$13,968,000.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina: Training facilities, and troop housing, \$15,383,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Training facilities, and troop housing, \$2,994,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$627,000.

(Fourth Army)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$721,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$11,726,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Administrative facilities, \$396,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana: Troop housing, \$627,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$3,207,000.

(Fifth Army)

Fort Carson, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and real estate, \$18,256,000.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Troop housing, \$1,652,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Administrative facilities, \$352,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and real estate, \$18,692,000.

Fort Sheridan, Illinois: Medical facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$4,217,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, \$16,679,000.

(Sixth Army)

Fort Irwin, California: Troop housing, \$2,643,000.

Fort Lewis, Washington: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,906,000.

Presidio of Monterey, California: Training facilities, \$194,000.

Fort Ord, California: Troop housing, \$777,000.

Presidio of San Francisco, California: Utilities, \$283,000.

Yakima Training Center, Washington: Training facilities, \$303,000.

(Military District of Washington, District of Columbia)

Fort Myer, Virginia: Medical facilities, and troop housing, \$4,052,000.

United States Army Materiel Command

(United States Army Missile Command)

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Research, development and test facilities, and utilities, \$2,389,000.

(United States Army Munitions Command)

Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland: Research, development and test facilities, and medical facilities, \$6,843,000.

Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey: Production facilities, \$365,000.

Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Colorado: Administrative facilities, \$29,000.

(United States Army Supply and Maintenance Command)

Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas: Maintenance facilities, \$888,000.

Letterkenney Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Utilities, \$43,000.

Savanna Army Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, \$446,000.

Serra Army Depot, California: Maintenance facilities, \$590,000.

Sunny Point Army Terminal, North Carolina: Utilities, \$131,000.

(United States Army Test and Evaluation Command)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Operational facilities, research, development and test facilities, \$784,000.

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Hospital facilities and utilities, \$4,635,000.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico: Research, development and test facilities, \$2,685,000.

(United States Army Weapons Command)

Watervliet Arsenal, New York: Utilities, \$77,000.

Technical Services Facilities

(Signal Corps)

East Coast Radio Receiving Station, La Plata, Maryland: Utilities, \$93,000.

East Coast Relay Station, Frederick, Maryland: Troop housing, \$257,000.

Army Pictorial Center, New York: Operational facilities and production facilities, \$1,120,000.

West Coast Radio Receiving Station, Santa Rosa, California: Utilities, \$76,000.

(Medical Service)

Brooke Army Medical Center, Texas: Operational facilities, \$104,000.

Letterman General Hospital, California: Hospital facilities, \$14,305,000.

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia: Training facilities and utilities, \$1,019,000.

United States Military Academy

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, cadet housing, community facilities and utilities, \$20,578,000.

Army Security Agency

Two Rock Ranch Station, California: Operational facilities, \$1,014,000.

Vint Hill Farms Station, Virginia: Operational facilities, \$997,000.

Army Component Commands

(United States Army Air Defense Command)

Various locations: Operational facilities and troop housing, \$646,000.

(Alaska Command area)

Fort Richardson, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, \$767,000.

Fort J. M. Wainwright, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$743,000.

(Pacific Command area)

Allamapu Military Reservation, Hawaii: Utilities, \$247,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, \$3,235,000.

Fort Shafter, Hawaii: Administrative facilities and utilities, \$1,370,000.

Tripler Army Hospital, Hawaii: Medical facilities, \$100,000.

Outside the United States

Army Materiel Command

(United States Army Missile Command)

Kwajalein Island: Research, development and test facilities, hospital facilities, and troop housing, \$32,119,000.

Army Security Agency

Various locations: Operational facilities, \$5,662,000.

Army Component Command

(Pacific Command area)

Korea: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and utilities, \$8,509,000.

Okinawa, various: Utilities, \$1,064,000.

Taiwan: Utilities, \$26,000.

(European Command area)

Germany: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, \$3,252,000.

(United States Army Forces Southern Command)

Fort Kobbe, Canal Zone: Troop housing, \$343,000.

Quarry Heights, Canal Zone: Utilities, \$86,000.

SEC. 102. Any of the authority in title I of this Act may be utilized for the establishment or development of Army installations and facilities made necessary by changes in Army missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) Unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interest of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment: *Provided*, That the total cost of projects constructed under this section shall not exceed \$17,500,000: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1965, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 103. (a) Public Law 88-174 is amended under heading "Inside the United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the heading "ARMY COMPONENT COMMANDS" and under the subheading "PACIFIC COMMAND AREA", with respect to "Fort Shafter, Hawaii", strike out "\$74,000" and insert in place thereof "\$91,000".

(b) Public Law 88-174 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "\$154,976,000", and "\$199,633,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$154,993,000", and "\$199,650,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Bureau of Ships Facilities

(Naval Shipyards)

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$1,675,000.

Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities and utilities, \$1,171,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Maintenance facilities and utilities, \$4,760,000.

(Fleet support stations)

Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, North Carolina: Utilities, \$36,000.

Naval Facility, Nantucket, Massachusetts: Community facilities, \$162,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$4,641,000.

Headquarters, Commander-in-Chief, Atlantic Fleet, Norfolk, Virginia: Administrative facilities and troop housing, \$1,550,000. (Research, development, test, and evaluation stations)

Navy Marine Engineering Laboratory, Annapolis, Maryland: Utilities, \$356,000.

David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Maryland: Research, development and test facilities, \$3,811,000.

Navy Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida: Utilities, \$150,000.

Navy Electronics Laboratory, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, \$1,196,000.

Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory, San Francisco, California: Research, development and test facilities, \$793,000.

Fleet Base Facilities

Naval Station, Boston, Massachusetts: Troop housing, \$260,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities and community facilities, \$2,509,000.

Naval Command System Support Activity, District of Columbia: Administrative facilities, \$1,516,000.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Operational facilities, \$428,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Troop housing and community facilities, \$3,054,000.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities and troop housing, \$1,761,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, \$242,000.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Troop housing and community facilities, \$2,775,000.

Naval Station, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$1,320,000.

Naval Weapons Facilities

(Naval air training stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas: Operational facilities, \$268,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Operational facilities, \$149,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee: Utilities, \$594,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, \$106,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, \$3,221,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Operational facilities, \$166,000.

(Field support stations)

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$2,676,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Utilities, \$406,000.

Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$3,372,000.

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Maintenance facilities and community facilities, \$596,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, \$4,818,000.

Naval Air Facility, El Centro, California: Troop housing, \$329,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Operational facilities and medical facilities, \$819,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational and training facilities and utilities, \$1,445,000.

Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida: Operational facilities, \$617,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida: Operational facilities, community facilities, and ground improvements, \$466,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational and training facilities, and community facilities, \$2,916,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, \$103,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California: Maintenance facilities, \$350,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Training facilities and maintenance facilities, \$906,000.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, \$870,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Ream Field, California: Operational facilities, \$1,693,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, San Clemente Island, California: Troop housing, \$176,000.

Naval Air Station, Sanford, Florida: Maintenance facilities and utilities, \$866,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Operational facilities, \$459,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, \$152,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Landing Field, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational and training facilities, \$150,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$3,076,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,746,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, \$344,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, \$326,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, \$1,414,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$2,087,000.

(Fleet Readiness Stations)

Naval Weapons Station, Concord, California: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$720,000.

Naval Photographic Center, District of Columbia: Operational facilities, \$490,000.

Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Utilities, \$1,106,000.

(Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Stations)

Naval Weapons Evaluation Facility, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Research, development and test facilities, \$340,000.

Naval Ordnance Test Stations, China Lake, California: Research, development and test facilities, \$1,080,000.

Naval Parachute Facility, El Centro, California: Research, development and test facilities, and real estate, \$2,540,000.

Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pennsylvania: Utilities, \$340,000.

Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Maryland: Operational facilities, and hospital and medical facilities, \$2,453,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development and test facilities; and on San Nicolas Island, research, development and test facilities, and supply facilities, \$1,988,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina: Supply facilities, \$455,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California: Administrative facilities, \$590,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Utilities, \$668,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$144,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Community facilities, \$213,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Utilities, \$277,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$5,143,000.

Marine Barracks, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Training facilities, \$198,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twenty-nine Palms, California: Supply facilities, and troop housing, \$527,000.

Service School Facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$1,333,000.

Naval Training Center, Balnbridge, Maryland: Troop housing, \$1,091,000.

Fleet Anti-Air Warfare Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia: Supply facilities, \$448,000.

Naval Station, District of Columbia: Community facilities, \$103,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, \$13,661,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia: Training facilities, \$323,000.

Fleet Training Center, Mayport, Florida: Training facilities, \$587,000.

Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California: Troop housing, \$330,000.

Fleet Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational and training facilities, \$2,011,000.

Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island: Training facilities, \$335,000.

Officer Candidate School, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing, \$2,600,000.

Fleet Training Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, \$116,000.

Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare School, San Diego, California: Troop housing, \$534,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Troop housing, \$2,760,000.

Medical Facilities

Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing, \$589,000.

Naval Hospital, Jacksonville, Florida: Hospital and medical facilities, \$7,400,000.

Naval Hospital, Oakland, California: Hospital and medical facilities, \$14,500,000.

Communications Facilities

(Communications stations)

Naval Communications Station, Adak, Alaska: Utilities and ground improvements, \$150,000.

Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake, Kodiak, Alaska: Utilities, \$80,000.

Naval Radio Station, Dixon, California: Community facilities, \$135,000.

Naval Radio Station, Driver, Virginia: Operational facilities, \$217,000.

Naval Communications Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, and real estate, \$1,593,000.

Naval Communication Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, \$350,000.

Naval Communication Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, and troop housing, \$1,279,000.

Various locations: Utilities, \$3,111,000.

(Security group stations)

Naval Security Group Department, Newport, Rhode Island: Administrative facilities, \$275,000.

Naval Security Group Department, Norfolk, Virginia: Administrative facilities, \$449,000.

Naval Security Group Department, Northwest, Virginia: Troop housing and community facilities, \$385,000.

Naval Security Group Department, San Diego, California: Administrative facilities, \$276,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Skaggs Island, California: Troop housing, and utilities, \$1,490,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine: Troop housing, \$237,000.

Office of Naval Research Facilities

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development and test facilities, \$5,628,000.

Naval Training Device Center, Mitchel Field, New York: Research, development and test facilities, \$550,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, \$1,866,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, \$130,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California: Utilities, \$228,000.

Outside the United States

Bureau of Ships Facilities

Atlantic Undersea Test and Evaluation Center, Andros Island, Bahama Islands: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, \$4,882,000.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines: Community facilities, \$403,000.

Fleet Activities, Yokosuka, Japan: Utilities, \$198,000.

Naval Weapons Facilities

Naval Station, Argentia, Newfoundland, Canada: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, \$289,000.

Naval Air Station, Atsugi, Japan: Operational facilities, \$101,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Futema, Okinawa: Medical facilities, \$76,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Iwakuni, Japan: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$1,210,000.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland: Operational facilities, and community facilities, \$1,906,000.

Naval Station, Midway Islands: Utilities, \$743,000.

Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$297,000.

Naval Air Facility, Naples, Italy: Operational facilities and troop housing, \$793,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$6,869,000.

Naval Station, Rota, Spain: Supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and troop housing, \$718,000.

Fleet Activities, Ryukyus, Okinawa: Community facilities, \$278,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$2,455,000.

Communications Facilities

Naval Radio Station, Fort Allen, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, \$292,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Futema, Okinawa: Operational facilities, \$90,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Galeta Island, Canal Zone: Troop housing, \$225,000.

Naval Radio Station, Isabela, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, \$106,000.

Naval Communication Station, Londonderry, North Ireland: Operational facilities, \$1,100,000.

Naval Communication Station, Sabana Seca, Puerto Rico: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$195,000.

Naval Communication Station, San Miguel, Republic of the Philippines: Community facilities, and utilities, \$466,000.

Various locations: Utilities, \$3,398,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Navy Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities, \$112,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines: Utilities, \$463,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of \$34,203,000.

SEC. 203. Any of the authority in title II of this Act may be utilized for the establishment or development of Navy installations and facilities made necessary by changes in Navy missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment: *Provided*, That the total cost of projects constructed under this section shall not exceed \$17,500,000: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1965, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been modified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 88-174 is amended in section 201 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Maryland, by striking out "\$70,000", and inserting in place thereof "\$108,000".

(b) Public Law 88-174 is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602, the amounts "\$115,563,000" and "\$202,462,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "\$115,601,000" and "\$202,500,000".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Air Defense Command

Ent Air Force Base, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Operational facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$1,035,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Maintenance facilities, \$112,000.

Kincheloe Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$1,470,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Troop housing, \$233,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, \$380,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$299,000.

Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Troop housing, \$40,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, \$102,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Hospital facilities, \$2,746,000.

Air Force Logistics Command

Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Alabama: Administrative facilities, \$1,300,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,108,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$1,085,000.

Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pennsylvania: Supply facilities, \$273,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and administrative facilities, \$2,045,000.

Newark Air Force Station, Newark, Ohio: Maintenance facilities and administrative facilities, \$3,269,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California: Operational facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, \$2,146,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$2,969,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and hospital facilities, \$4,454,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, \$3,084,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and administrative facilities, \$5,948,000.

Air Force Systems Command

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, \$883,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, \$843,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, \$6,065,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, \$1,586,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Operational facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$4,833,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, \$337,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Troop housing, \$365,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$3,300,000.

Various locations, Atlantic Missile Range: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$1,854,000.

Air Training Command

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and real estate, \$4,354,000.

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$394,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and real estate, \$3,427,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Administrative facilities, and utilities, \$215,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Blixiol, Mississippi: Troop housing, and utilities, \$1,040,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, and troop housing, \$1,288,000.

Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities and troop housing and community facilities, \$4,599,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,550,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Training facilities, \$132,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Maintenance facilities, \$161,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$3,763,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$888,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, \$1,191,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Maintenance facilities, and real estate, \$475,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Operational facilities, and community facilities, \$379,000.

Air University

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Troop housing, \$125,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Community facilities, \$239,000.

Aeronautical Chart and Information Center

South Saint Louis Storage Annex, Saint Louis, Missouri: Supply facilities, and administrative facilities, \$1,271,000.

Alaskan Air Command

Elelson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska: Operational facilities, and utilities, \$1,389,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$1,310,000.

Galena Airport, Galena, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$406,000.

King Salmon Airport, Naknek, Alaska: Operational facilities, \$189,000.

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, \$2,545,000.

Headquarters Command

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$5,597,000.

Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia: Administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$4,353,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$159,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, \$1,843,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, and community facilities, \$687,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Operational facilities, hospital facilities, and troop housing, \$3,137,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Maintenance facilities, \$261,000.

Pacific Air Force

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Troop housing, \$625,000.

Strategic Air Command

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Utilities, \$100,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$1,185,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$231,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$136,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Maintenance facilities, \$348,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$618,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, \$108,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$358,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$715,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational facilities, and administrative facilities, \$223,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Operational facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$2,241,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, and troop housing, \$3,021,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, \$499,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, \$896,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Operational and training facilities, \$245,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Troop housing, \$422,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$505,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational facilities, \$92,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Real estate, \$32,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, \$641,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Operational facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$1,462,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Maintenance facilities, \$381,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$1,888,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$163,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$297,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Maintenance facilities, \$152,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, \$617,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Utilities, \$690,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, \$51,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, \$392,000.

Tactical Air Command

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and hospital facilities, \$5,809,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, \$1,884,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, \$2,294,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, \$1,824,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Administrative facilities, \$391,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$583,000.

McCormick Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, \$2,743,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Troop housing, \$190,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, and community facilities, \$2,297,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, \$2,032,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Troop housing, \$462,000.

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, \$361,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, and troop housing, \$6,015,000.

United States Air Force Academy

United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Cadet housing, community facilities, and utilities, \$15,680,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, \$1,062,000.

Outside the United States

Air Defense Command

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$906,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Wake Island: Troop housing, \$88,000.

Pacific Air Force

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$12,526,000.

Strategic Air Command

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, \$665,000.

United States Air Forces in Europe

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$3,925,000.

United States Air Forces Southern Command

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, \$2,842,000.

United States Air Force Security Service

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities,

medical facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, \$3,113,000.

Sec. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$113,647,000.

Sec. 303. Any of the authority in title III of this Act may be utilized for the establishment or development of Air Force installations and facilities made necessary by changes in Air Force missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment: *Provided*, That the total cost of projects constructed under this section shall not exceed \$17,500,000: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1965, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

Sec. 304. (a) Public Law 88-174 is amended in section 301 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES," as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND," with respect to NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs, Colorado, by striking out "\$7,000,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$10,000,000".

(2) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana, by striking out "\$168,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$250,000".

(3) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND," with respect to Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas, by striking out "\$3,985,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$4,158,000".

(b) Public Law 88-174 is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 the amounts of "\$158,685,000" and "\$488,367,000" and inserting in place thereof "\$161,940,000" and "\$491,622,000" respectively.

TITLE IV

Sec. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for defense agencies for the following projects:

Defense Atomic Support Agency

Sandia Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Training facilities, and administrative facilities, \$2,636,000.

Defense Supply Agency

Defense Supply Agency, Alexandria, Virginia: Administrative facilities, and utilities, \$1,609,000.

Defense Clothing and Textile Supply Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, \$104,000.

Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia: Supply facilities, \$141,000.

Tracy Defense Depot, Tracy, California: Supply facilities, \$204,000.

National Security Agency

Fort Meade, Maryland: Operational facilities, \$280,000.

Kent Island, Maryland: Real estate, \$31,000.

Sec. 402. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop classified installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of \$5,500,000.

TITLE V

Military family housing

Sec. 501. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units and trailer court facilities, in the numbers hereinafter listed, but no family housing construction shall be commenced at any such locations in the United States, until the Secretary shall have consulted with the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If the Secretary and the Administrator are unable to reach agreement with respect to the availability of adequate private housing at any location, the Secretary shall immediately notify the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in writing, of such difference of opinion, and no contract for construction at such location shall be entered into for a period of thirty days after such notification has been given. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

(a) Family housing units for—

(1) The Department of the Army, two thousand one hundred and thirty-five units, \$38,346,000.

Fort Richardson, Alaska, one hundred units.

Fort Irwin, California, one hundred units.

Fort Ord, California, one hundred and fifty units.

Presidio of San Francisco, California, one hundred units.

Two Rock Ranch Station, California, forty units.

Fort Gordon, Georgia, three hundred units.

U.S. Army Installations, Hawaii, one hundred units.

Fort Sheridan, Illinois, two hundred and fifty units.

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, one hundred units.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina, two hundred and fifty units.

Atlantic Side, Canal Zone, one hundred and forty units.

Pacific Side, Canal Zone, two hundred units.

Fort Buckner, Okinawa, two hundred units.

ASA Location 12, sixty units.

Classified location, forty-five units.

(2) The Department of the Navy, four thousand one hundred and fifty-six units, \$74,755,000.

Naval Station, Kodiak, Alaska, one hundred units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, one hundred units.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, two hundred units.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California, seventy-four units.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, one hundred and forty units.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, one hundred units.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California, four hundred units.

Naval Complex North Bay, San Francisco, California, one hundred units.

Naval Post Graduate School, Monterey, California, two hundred units.

Naval Base, San Francisco, California, three hundred units.

Naval Station, Washington, District of Columbia, one hundred and fifty units.

Naval Base, Key West, Florida, four hundred units.

United States Navy installations, Hawaii, three hundred and fifty units.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, one hundred units.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island, two hundred units.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, one hundred units.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, one unit.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, five hundred units.

Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington, one hundred units.

Naval Security Group Activity, Galeta Island, Canal Zone, twenty-six units.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, nine units.

Naval Communication Station, North West Cape, Australia, one hundred and thirty units.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, one hundred units.

Naval Facility, Antigua, the West Indies, thirty-eight units.

Naval Facility, Eleuthera, Bahamas, thirty-eight units.

Classified location, two hundred units.

(3) The Department of the Air Force, three thousand five hundred and ninety-five units, \$64,657,000.

Beale Air Force Base, California, three hundred and thirty-seven units.

George Air Force Base, California, five hundred units.

Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, one hundred and fifty units.

Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, ninety units.

MacDill Air Force Base, Florida, twenty units.

Hunter Air Force Base, Georgia, one unit.

Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, one hundred units.

Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, one hundred units.

United States Air Force Installations, Hawaii, one hundred units.

Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, one hundred and fifty units.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, two hundred and eighty-seven units.

Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, two hundred and fifty units.

Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, four hundred units.

Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, two hundred units.

McChord Air Force Base, Washington, one hundred and fifty units.

Goose Air Base, Canada, two hundred units.

Naha Air Base, Okinawa, two hundred units.

Site 4-S, one hundred and eighty units.

Site 6-S, one hundred units.

Site 10-C, eighty units.

(b) Trailer court facilities for:

(1) The Department of the Navy, 280 spaces, \$500,000.

(2) The Department of the Air Force, 358 spaces, \$529,000.

Sec. 502. Authorizations for the construction of family housing provided in this Act shall be subject to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures:

(a) The cost per unit of family housing constructed in the United States (other

than Hawaii and Alaska) and Puerto Rico shall not exceed—

\$24,000 for generals or equivalent;
\$19,800 for colonels or equivalent;
\$17,600 for majors and/or lieutenant colonels or equivalent;

\$15,400 for all other commissioned or warrant officer personnel or equivalent, except that four-bedroom housing units authorized by sections 4774(g), 7574(e) and 9774(g) of title 10, United States Code, may be constructed at a cost not to exceed \$17,000.

\$13,200 for enlisted personnel, except that four-bedroom housing units authorized by sections 4774(f), 7574(d), and 9774(f) of title 10, United States Code, may be constructed at a cost not to exceed \$15,000.

(b) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than those listed in subsection (a), the average cost of all such units, in any project of 50 units or more, shall not exceed \$32,000, and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed \$40,000.

(c) The cost limitations provided in subsections (a) and (b) shall be applied to the five-foot line.

(d) No project in excess of fifty units in the areas listed in subsection (a) shall be constructed at an average unit cost exceeding \$17,500, including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

(e) No family housing unit in the areas listed in subsection (a) shall be constructed at a total cost exceeding \$28,000, including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

SEC. 503. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions not otherwise authorized by law, to existing public quarters at a cost not to exceed—

(a) For the Department of the Army, \$2,300,000;

(b) For the Department of the Navy, \$1,250,000;

(c) For the Department of the Air Force, \$1,250,000;

(d) For the Defense Agencies, \$971,000.

SEC. 504. Section 515 of Public Law 84-161 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 515. During fiscal years 1965 through and including 1966, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military installations in the United States and Puerto Rico for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge, upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than five thousand of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may not exceed an average of \$160 a month for any such unit, including the cost of utilities and maintenance and operation."

SEC. 505. There is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense or his designee for military family housing as authorized by law for the following purposes:

(a) for construction and acquisition of family housing, including improvements to adequate quarters, improvements to inadequate quarters, minor construction, rental guarantee payments, construction and acquisition of trailer court facilities, and planning, an amount not to exceed \$188,168,000; and

(b) for support of military family housing, including operating expenses, leasing, maintenance of real property, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts in-

curred, payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715m), an amount not to exceed \$472,437,000.

TITLE VI

General provisions

SEC. 601. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529) and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255) and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 602. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, and V shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, \$234,632,000; outside the United States, \$51,061,000; or a total of \$285,693,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, \$158,270,000; outside the United States, \$27,665,000; section 202, \$34,203,000; or a total of \$220,138,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, \$164,869,000; outside the United States, \$24,065,000; section 302, \$113,647,000; or a total of \$302,581,000.

(4) for title IV: A total of \$10,505,000.

(5) for title V: Military family housing, a total of \$660,605,000.

SEC. 603. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska, if he determines in the case of any particular project that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost arising in connection with that project, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such project was submitted to the Congress. However, the total costs of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 604. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts; the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 605. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be expected under the jurisdiction and

supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semi-annually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 606. (a) As of October 1, 1965, all authorizations for military public works (other than family housing) to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before November 8, 1963, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization, are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before October 1, 1965, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) notwithstanding the provisions of section 606 of the Act of November 7, 1963 (77 Stat. 307, 328), the authorization for the following items, which shall remain in effect until October 1, 1966:

(a) operational facilities and utilities in the amount of \$3,105,000 at classified locations that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "ARMY COMPONENT COMMANDS (European Command Area)" of the Act of June 27, 1961 (75 Stat. 98);

(b) utilities in the amount of \$115,000 for Naval Magazine, Cartagena, Spain, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "NAVAL WEAPONS FACILITIES" of the Act of June 27, 1961 (75 Stat. 102);

(c) troop housing in the amount of \$611,000 at Fort Benning, Georgia, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", and subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Third Army)" of the Act of July 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 223);

(d) administrative facilities in the amount of \$833,000 at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", and subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Third Army)" of the Act of July 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 223);

(e) maintenance facilities in the amount of \$212,000 in Germany, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "ARMY COMPONENT COMMANDS (European Command Area)" of the Act of July 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 225);

(f) operational facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and utilities in the amount of \$3,705,000 at classified locations that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "ARMY COMPONENT COMMANDS (European Command Area)" of the Act of July 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 225);

(g) troop housing in the amount of \$383,000 at Fort Meade, Maryland, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Second Army)" of the Act of July 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 223);

(h) troop housing in the amount of \$679,000 for Marine Corps Air Facility, Iwakuni, Japan, that is contained in title II, section

201, under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "NAVAL WEAPONS FACILITIES" of the Act of July 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 229);

(i) community facilities in the amount of \$476,000 for the Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "NAVAL WEAPONS FACILITIES (Field Support Stations)" of the Act of July 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 228);

(j) community facilities in the amount of \$189,000 for the Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, California, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "NAVAL WEAPONS FACILITIES (Fleet Readiness Stations)" of the Act of July 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 228);

(k) the development of classified facilities in the amount of \$30,000 which is included in the line item amount of \$4,080,000 for the Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, that is contained in title II, section 202 of the Act of July 27, 1962 (76 Stat. 230).

(b) Effective fifteen months from the date of enactment of this Act, all authorizations for construction of family housing which are contained in this Act or any Act approved prior to November 8, 1963, are repealed except the authorization for family housing projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before such date.

SEC. 607. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project inside the United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) \$32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) \$8 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) \$1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) \$8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters; unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 608. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 9 of the Act of April 1, 1954 (Public Law 325) as amended, no funds may be appropriated after the date of enactment of this Act for construction at the Air Force Academy unless appropriation of such funds has been authorized in this Act or any Act enacted after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That funds are authorized to be appropriated to accomplish advance planning and minor construction at the Air Force Academy in the same manner as for other projects under the Act of September 28, 1951, as amended (31 U.S.C. 723), and title 10, United States Code, section 2674, as amended.

SEC. 609. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, and VI of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1965."

TITLE VII

Reserve forces facilities

SEC. 701. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop additional facilities for the Reserve Forces, including the acquisition of land therefor, but the cost of such facilities shall not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Army—

(a) Army National Guard of the United States, \$10,000,000.

(b) Army Reserve, \$5,100,000.

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, \$6,500,000.

(3) for Department of the Air Force—

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, \$12,800,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, \$4,600,000.

SEC. 702. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities

under this title without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 703. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Authorization Act, 1965."

UNVEILING OF STATUE TO MEMORIALIZE FREEDOM FIGHTER TARAS SHEVCHENKO, A POET OF THE UKRAINE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as we celebrate this month the 150th anniversary of the birth of Taras Shevchenko, as well as the unveiling of a splendid memorial statue in his honor, I feel it only proper that we pause to remind ourselves of the ideals for which this Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter stood.

A statue in honor of Taras Shevchenko will be unveiled Saturday, June 27, at 1 p.m., at 23d and P Streets NW., in Washington.

At a time when the Ukraine was undergoing the oppression of Czarist autocratic power, Taras Shevchenko won his freedom from serfdom and then dared to risk it through his actions and his poetry. He wrote brilliantly and bravely, but he was a man who lived his words. For this if for no other reason, he is to be admired and respected by all men everywhere.

Throughout his life of endeavors to free all subjugated nations from the heel of autocracy, Shevchenko idealized and identified with our greatest of all American patriots, George Washington. His poetry, translated today into 52 languages, speaks out:

When shall we get ourselves a Washington to promulgate his new and righteous law?

At a time when throughout the world so many are enslaved by prejudice, poverty, and ignorance, it is only fitting that we stop to pay homage to Taras Shevchenko—a symbol of hope and freedom for the entire world.

PENNSYLVANIA ELKS LODGES, IN STATE CONVENTION, CALL ON CONFEREES TO PASS BILL FOR GI EDUCATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the cold war GI bill, S. 5, has been on the Senate Calendar since July 2, 1963, and we are now approaching the first anniversary of inaction by this body on the most urgent measure pending before the Senate, either on the floor of the Senate or in the committee. I wish to call attention to the phenomenal sup-

port which S. 5 is accumulating throughout the country. Despite the length of time which the bill has been waiting to be considered, the public has not been content to sit and wait for the bill to be passed, as the Senate has been content to do. Instead, the citizens of our Nation have followed a course of action in pledging their unwavering support.

As with any just cause, this bill's merits have not been affected by the mere passage of time, or the change of temporal surroundings, but it stands firm in its appeal to the minds of just men. Although I realize the cause of justice often takes a long time to be achieved, I believe this bill has served its sentence and need no longer be handicapped by the indecision of men. In the interest of the future of this Nation, and in the name of justice, I believe it is now time to lend our ears to the voices of our citizens and listen to their pleas for the passage of this bill.

As an illustration of the persuasive arguments for the cold war GI bill, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania department of veterans affairs of the Pennsylvania Elks at their recent statewide session and the letter from their State commissioner Dennis White, both be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

I.B.P.O.E. OF W.,
PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT
OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Philadelphia, Pa., June 22, 1964.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Enclosed you will find resolutions adopted during the annual statewide session of the Pennsylvania Department of Veterans' Affairs, I.B.P.O.E. of W., on May 23, 1964, in Washington, Pa.

We will appreciate your favorable support in regard to supporting legislation that will accomplish the objectives of these resolutions.

With kindest regards, I am
Very truly yours,

DENNIS C. WHITE,
State Commissioner.

RESOLUTION 2

Whereas the Congress of the United States has recognized the justice, equity, and benefits to the Nation arising from giving educational and training benefits to veterans by enacting the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346 of the 78th Congress) and the Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1952 (Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress); and

Whereas the benefits under these acts are not provided to servicemen who entered or who enter the Armed Forces subsequent to February 1, 1955, notwithstanding the fact that the Nation has continued its compulsory military service program; and

Whereas the results that many young men who serve in our country's armed services will lose educational and economic opportunities even though the need for education for the purpose of competing in civilian life continues to be of great importance; and

Whereas it is a well known fact that reliable statistics have proved that increased income to veterans arising out of their higher education level will more than reimburse the National Treasury of the entire cost of the GI training program by 1970; and

Whereas our Nation has found it necessary to its security, well-being, and a position among nations to increase the educational level, professional competence and technical skill of its citizens; and

Whereas the increased earning power, increased efficiency in commerce, national products, and income directly attributable to the program of educational and training benefits for servicemen results in increased tax revenue to the U.S. Government so that the cost of the program is largely repaid by the tax revenues: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Pennsylvania Department of Veterans Affairs, Improved Benevolent Protective Order Elks of the World convening their regular annual statewide session on May 23, 1964, in Washington, Pa., implore the Congress of the United States to extend GI educational benefits to all veterans who entered, or enter military services from and after February 1, 1955, and that such educational benefits be extended so long as the provisions of the draft law exist and this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and each Member of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation.

Unanimously adopted May 23, 1964, in an annual statewide session of the Pennsylvania Department of Veterans' Affairs, I.B.P.O.E. of W. held in Washington, Pa.

DENNIS C. WHITE,
State Commissioner.
WILLIS A. FULLER,
Department Adjutant.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I shall not read the entire resolution, but I should like to read a portion of it:

Resolved, That the Pennsylvania Department of Veteran Affairs, Improved Benevolent Protective Order Elks of the World convening their regular annual statewide session on May 23, 1964, in Washington, Pa., implore the Congress of the United States to extend GI educational benefits to all veterans who entered, or enter military services from and after February 1, 1955, and that such educational benefits be extended so long as the provisions of the draft law exist and this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and each member of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation.

The resolution was unanimously adopted at a statewide meeting. It is only emblematic of the strong and increasing support over the Nation for the passage of the GI bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first, I wish to associate myself with everything that the Senator from Texas has said in support of his education bill for GPs.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10300) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. I turn now to a question or two in regard to Calendar No. 1045, the bill (H.R. 10300), authorizing certain construction of military installations and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to have a quorum

call so that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who is the Senator in charge of the bill, may be brought to the floor of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that the Senator from Oregon wishes to ask a few questions in relation to the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I have a few questions about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thought that the Senator might have.

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 further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

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

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this morning I sent identical telegrams to Mr. Robert Kintner, president of the National Broadcasting Co., Rockefeller Plaza, N.Y., and Mr. Al Morgan, producer of the "Today" show, National Broadcasting Co., Rockefeller Plaza, N.Y. The telegram reads as follows:

NBC Commentator Scherer in interview with Senator FRANK CHURCH on "Today" show of June 26 falsely stated that on "Today" show of yesterday, June 25, I had called President Johnson a warmonger.

I respectfully request that the producer of "Today" show and NBC retract this false and libelous statement of your commentator, or I shall take the necessary steps to protect my legal interests. I disagree with President Johnson's foreign policy in South Vietnam, but I have not charged him with being a warmonger. I am satisfied he seeks peace in Asia but is following a mistaken course of action for attaining it.

When guests accept invitations to appear on NBC programs, they should have the right to assume that NBC commentators will not subsequently make false and libelous statements about them.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10300) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the pending business.

The bill before the Senate provides construction and other related authority for the military departments within and outside the United States, including authority for the construction of facilities for the Reserve components. The sum total of the new authorization contained in the bill is \$1,518,522,000. In addition thereto, approval is granted for an increase in prior years' authority for a total authorization of \$1,521,832,000.

The Army would be authorized \$285.7 million; the Navy \$220.2 million; the Air Force \$305.8 million; the Department

of Defense \$10.5 million; for family housing \$660.6 million for all the services and a total of \$39 million for the Reserve components.

As submitted to the Congress this year, the bill called for a total authorization of \$1,809,739,000, but subsequent additional requests brought the total considered by the Senate committee to \$1,850,912,000. This increase is primarily accounted for by the additional construction requirements generated for the Army and Air Force Academies as a result of the enlargement of the cadet corps authorized by the Congress earlier this year. The authority finally granted by the committee is \$329,080,000 below the amount requested, and \$68,834,000 below the amount authorized by the House of Representatives.

The House in its consideration of the bill denied over \$200 million in line items and the Senate was requested to restore about 75 percent of this amount. But after carefully considering each item and the appeals made by the various military departments and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the committee restored only \$11.6 million of the requested amount.

As a matter of general information, the bill contains more than 1,200 line items. Each one of the items has been thoroughly examined by the subcommittee and testimony was taken on each one. Each item was considered and passed on by the subcommittee, and it was then brought in review before the full committee.

As a general guideline, we undertook to leave in the bill requests for funds for every item that was considered essential. In case of doubt, we left the item in the bill. We also left in the bill items which strengthened the service, whether we thought them absolutely essential or not. We did not eliminate any item unless there was substantial evidence that it was not absolutely necessary now. We deferred some items for further consideration for various reasons. One of the major reasons for deferral was that there were quarters available now for a particular mission, and that the request could be reasonably postponed for at least 1 year or maybe more.

We did not merely reach into the bill and take out any item. If an item was taken out of the bill, it fell in the general formula that we were using to gage the need therefore. We made some reductions based on testimony that we thought was sound, but when there was the belief that just as much good could be done with less money. I shall take up some of them in the course of my remarks.

As in past years, we found the authorization requested in the bill is based on a 5-year projection of the missions and forces to be supported. Such projections are important in planning military construction in view of leadtime required for many construction projects. The projects approved in the bill are those that are required to be in place by the end of fiscal year 1967. The committee is convinced that the authority granted in the bill now before us provides adequately for this year's increment of the 5-year program. The bill provides for

no new bases, nor does it provide for any base where tenure is in doubt so far as the committee could ascertain. Authority is provided for the continued support of the strategic weapons and provides additional operational facilities of the Minuteman missile program, additional training facilities for the Polaris system as well as a large number of minor improvements to support these forces. This year greater emphasis has been placed on the readiness of the tactical and airlift forces and provisions are made for improvements to the air defense detection system, and emphasis is given to research and development of the Nike-X antiballistic missile. A major amount of construction is provided in support of the troops as represented by substantial new authority for barracks, bachelor officer quarters, and hospitals. In regard to the latter, 11 replacement hospitals are provided for, although some minor reductions were made in other medical support facilities.

We went through the list of hospitals; and even though they are very expensive and rather extensive, we allowed all the new hospitals requested, even though they were replacements. We did defer for further consideration some relatively small additions to existing hospitals and minor medical support items.

I should like to cover some of the major items where substantial reductions were made. In its review, the committee endeavored to eliminate those items where there appeared to be a question as to actual need, where duplication or extravagance was apparent, where it appeared that existing facilities were adequate for the present, and those of low priority and were not to be included in the funding program.

In other words, if no money was to be asked for this year, we took the project out of the bill.

The committee found in its review of the bill that substantial sums were being requested for certain projects that seemed to be questionable in scope and validity as to their military application. Falling within this category was \$45 million for the relocation of certain Nike-Hercules batteries.

These are ground-to-air missiles for defense from bombers. Those missiles have been located in certain outer areas. Now it is proposed to move them from the outer areas to the interior.

The House of Representatives properly denied this request but the Senate committee was requested to restore \$35 million to the amount denied which we declined to do. During the last few years, this program has been shuffled and reshuffled on various occasions. It is a weapons system that is obviously becoming more and more obsolete with time. The fact that they are being relocated shows this to be true. It has been a vastly expensive program; and further expenditure of funds to again relocate many of these batteries is unwarranted.

For the second year, now, the committee has denied authority for tactical aircraft shelters overseas. Here, again, if approval were granted for this request, we would embark upon a very expensive program that would produce question-

able results. It seems to me that little is to be accomplished by protecting our aircraft if there remain no runways from which to launch them. It is believed that our best protection will accrue from having our aircraft in the air in time of conflict.

Of course, this cannot be done fully; but certainly little good can come from putting aircraft in a bombproof shelter. If an attack were to destroy the aircraft on the runway, it would destroy the runway itself.

The ballistic missile and space facilities program admittedly is highly complex and fraught with many complications and changes. For several years, the Congress has been called upon to grant what amounts to more or less blanket authority in furtherance of the program, with relatively little justification or detail only to find that in subsequent years, still more funds are requested to supplement those previously granted. This year the committee reduced the amount requested for these programs by nearly \$25 million, of which about \$10 million relates to the Minuteman and Titan systems for which \$99 million was requested. It is believed that by this time the Defense Establishment should have sufficient experience to more accurately estimate their requirements and to identify those areas in which economies can and must be practiced.

Heretofore, we have always scanned all items carefully, even one as small as \$20,000, but at the end of the bill, we would include a lump sum of many millions of dollars for all missile bases. Then we would be called upon to allow millions more in the next year or the second year following. We are satisfied now, from the experience we have had with its development, that this program should not be so expensive. So we plan to make a reduction, and we are recommending it.

A request was denied for a substantial amount for another alternate command center, the details of which are classified. Approval of this request would have been only the beginning of a project that would eventually cost an astonishing amount of money and would at least, to some extent, duplicate facilities on which millions of dollars have already been spent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, would the Senator from Mississippi object to my asking him some questions?

Mr. STENNIS. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. It is my understanding that the bill authorizes \$1,521,832,000.

Mr. STENNIS. The report shows that \$1,521 million of new authority is provided in the bill as presented to the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. The \$1,521,832,000 is an increase of \$3,318,000 from the previous year's authorization.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator's figures are correct.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator know of any item in the bill that involves any installations in the State of Oregon?

Mr. STENNIS. We have a list according to States. I do not recall offhand whether any installation for Oregon is

included. The report will show that. We really do not consider these items from the standpoint of States, although I certainly favor a distribution of our bases and installations.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Mississippi does not need to tell the Senator from Oregon that they are not considered from the standpoint of States. How well I know that. The fact is that the report does not show the State of Oregon, because Oregon has no major military installation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mississippi has very few.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator can take care of Mississippi; I am going to take care of Oregon.

The Senator from Mississippi is aware, is he not, that the senior Senator from Oregon has urged the Senate Committee on Armed Services, before it brings to the floor of the Senate a report recommending new authority, new installations, and new expenditures, to examine thoroughly whether or not deactivated facilities, such as the excellent and permanent facility at Tongue Point, Ore.—a facility which the Senate treated so wretchedly on the floor the other day—could be used at a saving to the Government, instead of the facilities that are included in a bill such as this. Is the Senator from Mississippi aware that I have made that request?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Oregon has been alert and vigilant with respect to the project he has mentioned; also the development and utilization of any projects that were already in his area, and the possibility of future use. The Senator was a valuable member of the Committee on Armed Services and in years past—perhaps 10 or more years ago.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Committee on Armed Services in a position to advise the Senator from Oregon whether any study was directed to be made by the professional staff of the committee concerning facilities such as Tongue Point—and there are others throughout the country—that have been deactivated? Was any examination made to determine whether such facilities could have been used for any of the services that are encompassed in this bill for the authorization of more than \$1 billion?

Mr. STENNIS. When the announcements were made—the last one being in January—the Senator from Mississippi studied all of them and made some determinations then. Frankly, so far as I was able to go with my study, there was little that could be said to refute the position that the Department of Defense had taken. I know that one of the facilities that was totally vacated and discontinued was in Mississippi. Frankly, I could not give a contrary argument to the action of the Department.

I feel compelled to say that, as a general proposition, we still have too many installations. I think more money could be saved. We are soft on the subject of too many installations.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Mississippi feels that way, he encourages me to vote against the bill. I am sure the Senator from Mississippi knows

how the Senator from Oregon feels. I have examined the bill. I should like to have some help from the Committee on Armed Services. I had hoped that a staff study would be made on the basis of the request I made of the Committee on Armed Services. I had hoped that a staff study would be made concerning the possibility of using deactivated facilities.

But let us consider the remarks made by the Senator from Mississippi a few minutes ago concerning what the bill provides for hospital facilities. I want to advise the members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations that one of the finest hospital buildings that can be found among military installations for its size exists at Tongue Point. It is nothing short of a national shame that that hospital facility is not being used for the benefit of the Military Establishment of this country, rather than to come before the Senate today with a bill providing additional funds for hospital facilities for the Defense Establishment.

I have examined the bill thoroughly. I believe that a prima facie case exists for the use of Tongue Point, and that a prima facie case could be made for the use of similar facilities. But I know Tongue Point backward and forward, from A to Z.

Because it is such a fine establishment, President Kennedy recommended that it should be reactivated for Federal uses.

To my knowledge, President Kennedy, through his special aid whom he assigned to this matter, Ralph Dungan, of the White House, recommended that Tongue Point be restudied for military uses.

I charge—and Mr. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, take note—that the Department of Defense has not even attempted to give this facility the consideration to which it is entitled.

Here in the Senate Chamber I get the kind of treatment that the Senate handed me the other day when it would not even make \$5 million available for the assistance of some thousand to two thousand Indian student boys and girls in this country. At least, the facility could have been made useful for a special school for those Indian boys and girls.

I am going to start objecting to every single bill involving appropriation funds when I am satisfied, as I am satisfied in connection with this bill, that use can be made of such facilities as we have at Tongue Point, and some other facilities which have been quite properly removed from previous uses.

As I said in debate the other day, no member of the Appropriations Committee has crossed swords with me on the facts involved at Tongue Point. That cannot be done, because the facts are not on the side of members of the Appropriations Committee.

Until there is a showing that existing, deactivated facilities cannot be used, I shall object to action by unanimous consent granting huge sums of money to any department of the Government.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] points out to me that this is the

authorization bill, and that this is the place to do the authorizing and direct the use of some of these facilities.

I agreed that Tongue Point should be deactivated for the previous naval use, because it was obsolete for that purpose. At the time of that agreement, I immediately took up with the administration the desirability of using it for other Federal uses.

As a result of a long series of conferences, President Kennedy not only agreed with me, but went out to Tongue Point; and on the scene, he issued the release and the announcement that Tongue Point be reactivated for Federal purposes.

I believe that we should keep faith with the late President.

I repeat what I said the other day: forget about me, but I do not propose, as long as I am in the Senate, to see my State get the kind of treatment it is getting from one committee after another in regard to authorizations for Tongue Point. The deactivation of Tongue Point was the major cause of digging the deepest poverty pocket of any community in America. I am fighting for some relief for the deepest poverty pocket in this country.

There is not a Senator who has not always had my support on the merits of any relief program involving depressed areas in his State.

I sat in the Chamber the other day and urged that many millions of dollars be appropriated for the State of Montana because of a flood situation that had developed there which had created a serious emergency. I have supported Federal funds for the State of West Virginia, for the whole Appalachian area, and for other depressed areas in this country.

I am fed up with the discrimination against my State in connection with the matter of bringing some relief to the deepest poverty pocket in the country.

The Senator from Mississippi states that Mississippi does not have many military installations, either; but I say to him that my State is at the bottom of the "totem pole" when it comes to an expenditure of Federal dollars.

Why should I sit here in silence?

Why should I not protest?

Why should I not use whatever authority goes with my office to protect the people of my State?

Mr. President, it is important to keep calling this matter not only to the attention of the Senate, but also to the attention of the country, and to the attention of the voters of my State; because the voters of my State resent the kind of treatment that they are getting in connection with the expenditure of Federal tax dollars.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. The naval base hospital to which the Senator is referring was on a naval base which was closed 5 years ago. It is nowhere in the vicinity of the area of any hospital that is in this bill; so there is no relationship between what is in the bill and the Senator's problem, even though I am in sympathy with the Senator's problem—and greatly so.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Mississippi yield on that point?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I only wish to say that this is an excellent hospital institution, and that it should be used.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. It should be used by the Defense Establishment for defense hospital needs.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe that the Senator from Oregon has made a very strong point. Perhaps it could be converted into a general hospital to take care of a large area.

I point out that we have reduced the amount of the authorization in the bill to a total of \$329 million, even though it still remains a large and broad appropriation. Of course, these facilities do extend around the world. This program includes the money necessary for housing.

Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] had indicated that he had a problem he wished to discuss, and I shall be glad to yield to him now, if it is convenient to him.

Mr. KUCHEL. First, as I believe I have had the honor of doing in the past, I salute the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Massachusetts, and Senators who have served with them, in successfully bringing to this floor each year a carefully screened recommendation to the Senate with respect to the public works asked for by the Defense Department for authority for the next fiscal year.

Today, I say most sincerely that I congratulate Senators once again for the type of legislation so carefully prepared.

Mr. STENNIS. We thank the Senator. We have always had his cooperation.

Mr. KUCHEL. Having said that, I wish with equal respect to point out one item recommended by the Department of Defense, urged by the Navy, approved by the Bureau of the Budget, passed in the House of Representatives, but regrettably, in my opinion, deleted by the committee, because, I think, the facts were not sufficiently developed in the committee hearing.

I speak about one of two items intimately connected, which have to do with a great military installation at Monterey, Calif.

Those two items consist specifically of the following: First, an item to authorize the construction in its first phase of a naval postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif., in the amount of \$2,470,000.

Second, in connection with that same item, is a naval postgraduate school in Monterey, Calif., for troop housing, in the amount of \$330,000.

The military defenses of the people of the United States, and of the cause of freedom on this war-weary globe, depend not alone on the incredible power of our nuclear weapons systems, and the might of our conventional arms, but depend also on competent American military personnel, trained and qualified by continuing education in all the sophisticated techniques required, so that they, too, would be able properly to respond

to the fateful decision, if it ever were to be made.

Thus, basically the problem of American defense is one of education. There is the key to our defensive strength, as, indeed, it is to our American way of life. I think to the great credit of the Defense Department, and to the U.S. Navy, recommendations have been made to this Congress to step up the postgraduate instruction for naval personnel, and indeed for officers of the other branches of the service, as well.

Today, in Monterey, Calif., 1,400 students, naval personnel, and others, are being educated in a naval postgraduate establishment.

That establishment is physically located in a part of the old Del Monte Hotel properties, which I am sure the able Senator will recall—and which were acquired by the Navy. It is utilized now to educate, on a postgraduate basis, those 1,400 students. To its credit, the Navy has recommended that there be a stepped-up program of graduate education so that in the next few years 2,377 students will receive such advanced instruction in that military educational facility in the State from which I come.

It is rather interesting to point out for the RECORD that while in 1930 to 1940, almost every officer was a Naval Academy graduate, today 39 percent of the officers who serve the people of the United States in the naval service are non-Academy graduates. And by the wise planning of the Naval Establishment, after officer personnel have served at sea, many are brought back to receive additional requisite, technical, and scientific education in the postgraduate courses which are provided at Monterey.

The two items recommended by the Department of Defense are intimately connected. The item which the Senator's committee saw fit to place in the bill would take that portion of the hotel properties, now used to educate 1,400 college graduates and naval officers, and would convert that area into bachelor officers' quarters.

Today, as was brought out in the House hearings—and I regret that the Naval representatives, before the Senate committee, did not develop the entire matter as extensively as they were able to in the Housing hearings—it costs some \$139,000 a year of public moneys at the present time for the bachelor officers to live in privately owned quarters in the area of Monterey. Of course, those funds would all be saved through the utilization of the bachelor officers quarters, created through conversion of this portion of the hotel properties. The amount requested for the conversion was, of course, approved by the Senate committee.

I want to develop the background information on the second item. As a concomitant of creating additional BOQ's, it is necessary for Congress to authorize the expenditure of approximately \$2 million as the first phase of a new postgraduate school, which will be equipped, not simply to carry on the education in advanced atomic and scientific techniques for the 1,400 students, but, as I

say, almost 2,400, which the Defense Department believes is necessary for the security of our Republic.

The question might well be asked—and this is important—"This question was not raised in the Senate committee. Why cannot military officer personnel come back and be ordered to go to private schools and public universities all across the country?" They can and, in many instances, are. But there is this exception. In the curriculum of the Naval postgraduate school at Monterey, there is a complete top priority classification. The courses at this school are highly specialized, highly classified, and are designed for military personnel, and those connected with problems of nuclear defense.

We deal here with secrets by which the American people through their Military Establishment can most effectively deter aggression, or, if necessary, combat it. The type of curriculum is unique in this Naval Establishment. It is something which obviously would not be duplicated at a private or public college or university in this country.

I cite these facts for the RECORD and I say respectfully to the able Senator that I received a letter this morning, written at my request, from the Department of Defense, which illustrates the purpose which the Department of Defense has in mind, as part of this Senator's attempt to supply additional facts lacking in the testimony given before the Senate subcommittee.

The House of Representatives approved both of these items. In addition to that, the House Appropriations Committee desired to determine if there were any problems. It wished to determine if, indeed, the request of the Navy, joined in by the Defense Department, and the Bureau of the Budget, was a feasible one. I am glad to recall here today that the House Appropriations Committee sent an inspection team to Monterey to determine whether or not there was feasibility in the two items pertaining to Monterey. I am happy to report to the Senator that the House Appropriations Committee team has reported that there is complete feasibility and justification—indeed, high urgency—to both these particular items.

On that basis, I conclude by saying that if at the time the conference committee meeting takes place, the Senator would with the usual fairness which has manifested his action, give consideration to the additional facts which I have attempted to supply today to the one item which, although approved by the House, was deleted at the committee hearings.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I hasten to assure the Senator from California that we certainly appreciate his special interest and presentation of facts regarding this matter.

We would certainly be glad to seriously consider any additional points that he has made here, and weigh them along with the facts which we have already had under consideration, and give the matter our utmost consideration.

I assure the Senator that I know I speak for all Members who will be on

the conference committee from the Senate. I point out, as part of the RECORD at this point, that we have been getting to these schools as fast as we could. For instance, this year, we have granted \$35 million total for West Point and the Air Force Academies to provide for the expanded training programs. We have other education facilities in the bill. Even though there is only \$2.4 million in the item that the Senator has requested here, that is just part of a \$6.6 million program that is planned for the Navy postgraduate school.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may comment on that statement?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Not far from here, at Annapolis, more than 50 years ago, in 1902, as I recall, the Navy began to develop postgraduate courses for Naval Academy graduates. But this fine service academy cannot expand at that location, property development in the area being what it is. The facilities do not exist; and that is why the proposal is made for the postgraduate school at Monterey for members of a farflung Navy, 39 percent of whom were not graduates of the Naval Academy. They, and their comrades in the other services may attend a postgraduate school, which is necessary, as I am sure the Senator will agree.

Mr. STENNIS. The school is a very fine one. It is already a going concern at Monterey.

I should like to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, who has done a great deal of work on the bill. I wish publicly to give him credit for a major part of what we were able to achieve as a subcommittee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator. As a member of the conference committee, I join with the Senator from Mississippi in his statement that the question will be given further consideration. I should like to say to the Senator from California that one thing that impressed us was the fact that in the present year about \$86 million is being requested for increases in academic facilities throughout the Defense Establishment. About 40 percent of that amount would go to the Air Academy in Colorado and to the Army Academy at West Point. For that reason, and because there were a number of other items concerning education in the bill, we asked for further study from the Defense Department on three establishments: First, the academic building, Army Logistics School, at Fort Lee, Va., and the modernization of the National War College at Fort McNair, Washington, D.C., in the amount of \$1.5 million; second, the academic and the postgraduate naval school in Monterey, Calif., at \$2.140 million.

I know the Senator has the report before him. In addition, I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the evidence shows that ultimately \$10 million will be spent in Monterey. So with \$86 million in, and \$40 million of that being spent on two academies, we felt that the three postgraduate schools should be

given further study. That is the reason we reached the conclusion that we did.

As the Senator has said, the subject is covered in the House version of the bill. It is in the appropriation bill sent to the Senate by the House. So when we go to conference, as the Senator from Mississippi has said, we shall join in giving the question of the school in Monterey further study.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am grateful to my able friend from Massachusetts. I am equally grateful to my able friend from Mississippi. I thank both of them for their comments.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. We assure him of our concern about the projects in his State. The Senator has been alert, and his State has fared mightily well. We have invested in capital investments in the great State of California about \$4 billion.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator. Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts has worked long on the bill, and even though I have some general items that I wish to discuss further, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts now. I know that another committee of which he is a member desires his presence.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have a very brief statement which I should like to make. I appreciate very much my work with the chairman of the committee in the past on this and other subjects.

At the outset let me pay tribute to our chairman, and the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi, who have once again done an excellent job in offering to the Senate a carefully considered bill.

This is an authorization bill and not an appropriation bill. We shall have an opportunity to go over the appropriations when the appropriation bill comes before us. We can then see what statements the military forces wish to make, and give the subject further study at that time. But this authorization bill, which contains the vast amount of \$1,521 million, is \$68,834,000 less than the House-passed bill and \$329,080,000 less than the amount requested of the Senate. Those are important figures to remember, because when we are spending on military construction every year more than \$1 billion, we wish to keep that amount down so far as we can.

Based on the testimony we heard we felt that a good case was made for some restoration. The total restoration requested from the House cuts was approximately \$150 million. Of this amount we granted restorations of less than \$15 million.

After a careful study of the hearings and the data submitted in justification, our committee made some substantial reductions of items which were included in the House passed measure. Several of these are of such importance I feel I should comment on them specifically.

First, we made some substantial cuts in academic facilities in the Army and Navy because we felt there should be an overall study to see where joint use of existing buildings is feasible. An ex-

ample of this is a reduction at the Army War College and the Industrial College of \$1.5 million. Here the War College and the Industrial College operate side by side at Fort McNair. The committee felt that before such a program was undertaken we should have before us all of the data on the total facilities and their use.

Another major project with which we have dealt concerned the move of the Fifth Army Headquarters from Chicago to Fort Sheridan—a distance of 35 miles north. The original estimate of cost was \$3.3 million. The committee allowed \$2 million, striking out funds for an underground communications center since we felt it was not needed.

At a number of points in classified testimony, large sums of money were requested for underground and bomb-resistant structures here and overseas. The committee was not impressed with the urgency and need which was given on these and hence struck the items from the bill.

That subject is classified, but substantial amounts of money were involved.

Let me speak finally about the request for \$17.9 million for an administrative and classroom building for the Defense Intelligence Agency at Arlington Hall, a former girls' school located on Route 50 just beyond Fort Myer in a residential section. The committee denied this request on the grounds that it would enlarge a facility that already overburdens the neighborhood in which it is located. Also, the committee is anxious to have further proof on why the personnel level of our intelligence functions—and this is important, Mr. President—continues to grow at its present pace when the establishment of the Defense Intelligence Agency was designed to coordinate and cut back on the duplicative efforts in this field of endeavor.

Finally, Mr. President, I think this is an excellent bill. It provides for our construction needs in a very adequate manner.

I feel that we have been careful in our consideration of the bill and held each item to strict proof. Where we have made cuts I feel the proof has not been convincing. If needed items have been eliminated I feel sure these will be presented next year with more adequate justification. On balance this bill provides for our needs and is worthy of the support of all Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, I conclude by saying that I appreciate working with the Senator from Mississippi who, as usual, has gone into these items with a great deal of care, as have also the subcommittee and the full committee. The report, which was a unanimous report of the full Committee on the Armed Services, sets forth substantial cuts of approximately \$329 million under the requests of the administration.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much for his contribution and his statement. I appreciate deeply his overgenerous remarks. I should like to respond that it is a privilege to work with him, and it is particularly helpful to

have him working on a bill of which he has such fine knowledge.

Continuing with my remarks for the full committee, the projects I have earlier described are some of the major ones receiving the committee's close appraisal and represent a substantial portion of the reduction made in the bill, but we went still further in the more routine aspects of the program. This appeared to be a year to request additional administrative and academic facilities and improvements and additions to existing structures. Substantial reductions were made in this area; particularly, a trend has been noticed to increase the academic facilities of various types, and over \$86 million was requested for this purpose. Some 40 percent of this is directly attributable to the expansion of the two military academies I referred to earlier, but it is the remainder that is cause for concern. The committee is of the opinion that a thorough review should be made of the military school system, ranging from the recruit to the top planners, with a view to eliminating duplication and consolidating like facilities where possible. Here, again, a substantial reduction was made by denying two projects for the Army and one for the Navy.

The one for the Navy was just discussed by the Senator from California.

I have said many times that one of the sources of strength for the men in the services is that they continue with their training, and continue attendance at school, keeping up at the same time not only in weapons and techniques but in other subjects that relate to their responsibilities. At the same time, we find that there is little tendency for the services to cooperate in the consolidation of academic and administrative facilities. It has become very expensive to provide these fine facilities for those in the service. We thought where facilities were available, they should be utilized, and that we should wait at least until the situation could be studied more closely.

The committee denied requests of \$2.9 million for the academic building at the Army Logistics Management School, Fort Lee, Va., and \$1.5 million for modernization of the National War College, at Fort McNair, Washington, D.C. There may be later requests for the modernization of the Industrial College located adjacent thereto. We thought perhaps the two facilities might be consolidated, at least in part. We shall go into that subject further, as has already been noted.

Before concluding my presentation, I should like to say a few words about the military family housing program. It will be recalled that 2 years ago, under the guidance of the Congress, a family housing management account was established within the Department of Defense, and for the first time all costs of family housing were brought together in order that it might be analyzed as a single program. This system has by this time had a reasonably fair trial, and I am pleased to report the system is proving most beneficial, and I believe is resulting in substantial economies.

I may add that it seems to have been well managed and is working well. It is certainly a far cry from and much better than the preceding housing programs, under which housing was built without the use of appropriated funds. Now all military family housing requires appropriated funds.

This year we were requested to approve a housing program of \$711 million which would have included the construction of 12,500 new units. The Committee concurred with the House action in reducing the amount requested by \$50.3 million. The \$660.6 million in new authority granted, however, is believed adequate for the coming year and provides for approximately 10,000 new housing units, which is consistent with last year's grant.

In considering this matter, however, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and I were reminded that we are on the Appropriations Subcommittee that considers these matters and that we were in no way bound by the figure here set, and that we were merely approving it as eligible for appropriated funds. We will go into proof of the need later, in another subcommittee, and have a recommendation made, in view of the testimony given and further consideration of the subject.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Am I correct in my understanding that the administration submitted a request for 12,000 housing units?

Mr. STENNIS. 12,500 units.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And the House authorized 9,800 units?

Mr. STENNIS. 9,887 is the exact figure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The committee agreed with the House figure, with the general statement to the Armed Services Committee that we would consider how much to appropriate for this year when we reached the appropriation stage. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. We were not bound by any figure, but we will consider it again after a closer survey.

Only one addition was made to the bill over and above the budget requested. An increase of \$4.6 million was made in the bill for the Army National Guard for a total of \$10 million. This important program has been allowed to lag, and now that the reorganization and realignment of the guard is completed, the Committee strongly feels that this program should be accelerated. Testimony indicated that the amount allowed is the very minimum necessary to properly carry out a sound National Guard program. The amount allowed will provide for 38 armories and 25 nonarmory projects in 38 States, as opposed to 24 armories and 16 nonarmory projects in 29 States, as would have been provided for in the original request.

One word further about the selection of armories to be eligible for funding. The Committee does not select the armories. They are selected by the Defense Department and National Guard official

in the various States in accordance with a national formula that is worked out by the Army National Guard. Consideration is given to the needs in the States and the availability of funds.

Mr. President, I believe I have fairly summarized the Committee's action in regard to the military construction bill before you. I believe we have adequately provided for the essential requirements as we see them at this time. We have tried to eliminate the frills, the desirable but unnecessary, and the unneeded. We have been generous indeed in providing for replacement projects in realization that many temporary facilities built during World War II and still in use have long outlived their usefulness and are reaching an advanced stage of deterioration. Almost 30 percent of the entire program this year falls within this category.

We restored a number of relatively small items for installations this country has in Western Europe, because they were needed and did not represent such a large expenditure of funds. Major items for Western Europe that were found to be nonessential were eliminated. One was for \$20 million and another one was for \$4 million.

If any Senator has questions to ask the Senator from Mississippi or some other member of the subcommittee, we shall be glad to try to answer. Otherwise I suppose the Chair will be ready to ask for any amendments that may be offered.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is a member of the subcommittee, and I understand he may have a statement to make, if the Chair will recognize him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the statement made by the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], chairman of the subcommittee, who presided in an outstanding manner over the special subcommittee appointed by Chairman RUSSELL to consider the military construction authorization bill for the fiscal year 1965.

I felt that it was a high privilege for me to be permitted to serve as a member of this subcommittee under the leadership of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and in association with the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who was present throughout the consideration of the bill.

I was impressed with the comprehensive knowledge of the subject displayed by the subcommittee chairman, by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and by other members who have had extensive experience with matters relating to the military.

Mr. President, very definitely, this is a good bill, and very definitely this is a bill which is entirely compatible with the austerity program announced by the administration. The committee worked hard on this subject, and the members of the committee, with the exception of the junior Senator from Ohio, who is now addressing these few remarks to the

Senate, have had extensive experience over the years on military construction authorization matters and regarding legislation pertaining to the Armed Forces of our country.

The bill before us is indeed a complex one and contains over 1,200 line items for some 585 military bases throughout the world. Every item was individually considered and carefully weighed in deciding which should remain in the bill.

To summarize the whole program, I might state that about 34 percent of the amount requested in the bill will provide important operation and training facilities; 27 percent is for facilities to support and house the troops, including provisions of medical and community facilities; while the remaining 39 percent covers facilities required for all important research and development, maintenance, supplies, administration, land, and utilities.

Although a reduction of about 18 percent was made in the amount requested I am convinced the recommendations of the committee amply provide for the basic construction requirements of the Military Establishment for the next 12 months. I believe the committee has been most generous in many areas, particularly in the area of replacement facilities, such as troop housing, hospitals, and military family housing, which to a great extent is for enlisted personnel.

On the other hand, the committee was very discerning in eliminating those items believed unnecessary. This particularly applies to what to many seems an inordinate request for additional land acreage. We were called upon to authorize the acquisition of 1,418,379 additional acres, at an estimated cost of \$35 million. Approval was granted to acquire only 162,425 acres, at a cost of about \$21 million. Mr. President, I am basically opposed to depriving private citizens of their property, particularly those whose living is derived from the cultivation of the soil. We must, however, be realistic and recognize the necessity from time to time of acquiring some additional land to provide adequate training areas for our troops. I can assure the Senate that approval was granted to acquire only that land for which a valid and urgent military need exists.

Another area of considerable interest to me is our overseas bases, particularly in the light of the gold-flow problem and the uncertainty of our tenure in certain localities. Here again each project was carefully weighed and provisions have been made for only the most essential military requirements.

Mr. President, finally I should like to state that it was indeed an enlightening experience to have participated in the review of this measure.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer, but before offering it I wish to say a few words about the problem of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, which has been a continuing one in New York State, and to express some puzzlement over the substantial amount authorized in the bill for naval shipyards. I have been told a number of times, most recently on Wednesday, the day before

yesterday, by the Secretary of the Navy, that a full-scale study was underway of our navy yards, to determine whether they should remain open or be reduced in number and size.

If such a real study is underway, and if the Defense Department is really making an honest effort to evaluate this situation with regard to navy yards, and if, as we have been repeatedly assured, no decision will be made until late November, as we have been told so many times, it seems rather curious that the Navy would be getting more than \$1½ million for the naval shipyard at Charleston, S.C.

The bill includes 1,400 units of family housing, to be erected in the vicinity of naval yards which, we are told, may be closed down in late November.

Unless the Defense Department has already made up its mind on them, and the study is merely for the purpose of delay or coverup, it would appear more sensible to me not to authorize these funds this year, but to wait and see which navy yards will be closed, rather than to authorize a great deal of money for any yards this year.

It seems to me that the Defense Department is doing a little bit of talking out of both sides of the mouth. When a press release goes out from the Defense Department for public consumption all we hear about is great savings. When the Defense Department comes to Congress for an appropriation or an authorization, it says it must do a great deal of rebuilding of many structures. Any action the Senate takes in approving funds for navy yards before the Defense Department has completed its study as to which ones are to remain open and which ones are to be closed, or cut back, would be a clear waste of taxpayers' money.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I do not want to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that, having discussed the subject with our administrative aid, who is particularly informed on military construction, this is the only military construction bill that will come before Congress this year. There might be a bill for some emergency. In the bill there are only two items that would come within the purport of the Senator's amendment, as I understand the situation.

Mr. KEATING. I have not yet offered my amendment. I am discussing an entirely different matter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. KEATING. I am talking about navy yards. I am about to offer my amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is not talking about that subject?

Mr. KEATING. I am talking about navy yards. I am talking about the study that is underway as to the closing of navy yards. The Defense Department has told us that it has not yet made the decision as to what navy yards shall be closed. Yet a million and a half dollars is provided in the bill for the Charleston Navy Yard.

It seems to me we have the cart before the horse, unless the Defense Department has made its decision. The Defense Department has told us that it has not yet made its decision on navy yards. The Secretary of the Navy says that the Navy may close one or two yards. However, it does not make sense to me to spend a great deal of money for the construction of new facilities at one of these navy yards. That is my point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe I can answer the Senator's question on that point. I believe I can answer it factually. The Charleston Navy Yard in South Carolina has become the headquarters on the Atlantic seaboard of the Polaris submarines. The Polaris submarines which come in there for refitting, replenishment, and so forth, have two crews, one of which goes on board, and the other which comes ashore for training and rest.

There is no question in my mind that the Charleston Navy Yard is one installation that would not, in any event, be given up, because we have been increasing the facilities at the Charleston Navy Yard for the past 2 or 3 years, including the berthing facilities. The Polaris submarine facilities is 25 miles out and there are additional buildings for the navy yard in Charleston. The housing is necessary to go with the navy yard.

I personally have been there twice. I examined that navy yard in two different years. While the navy yards in Boston and New York may have to be given up, I think the Senator from New York can be assured that because the Charleston Navy Yard has been made the headquarters of the Polaris submarines, that yard will not be given up. Therefore, we are justified in providing additional housing in a limited area there now. I know that of my own knowledge.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for that information. It is information that we have been unable to get from the Department of Defense or the Navy Department. They have insisted that no decision has been made concerning which navy yards are to be closed. Now the Senator from Massachusetts tells us—and he certainly should know, because he has been in the midst of this discussion—that a decision has been made to retain the Charleston Navy Yard.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When I say that the Charleston Navy Yard will be retained, I make that statement of my own knowledge, not based on any report from the Secretary of Defense. I spoke with the Secretary of Defense within the last 2 or 3 days on the entire subject. He stated to me emphatically that it was a difficult decision to determine which navy yards should be closed, and that the Department does not expect to have a final answer for a number of months. I made my inquiry of him particularly with reference to the Boston Navy Yard, in which I am interested, just as the distinguished Senator from New York is interested in the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Mr. KEATING. I thought perhaps the Senator from Massachusetts was speaking on behalf of the Brooklyn Navy Yard. I am disappointed to hear that

his remarks had to do with the Boston Navy Yard; but I can understand that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am speaking of the Navy yards on the east coast, of which New York, Boston, Portsmouth, and Newport News are four. What I said concerning the Charleston, S.C., Navy Yard was based on my own knowledge, and not on any report of the Secretary of Defense. I do not see how the Charleston Navy Yard could be given up when its facilities have been increased and it has been made the headquarters for the Polaris submarines on the east coast.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, the Senator believes there is a special reason for providing housing at Charleston which does not apply to other Navy yards through the country?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my interpretation.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know what the Senator's amendment provides.

Mr. KEATING. We have not come to the amendment, but I am about to offer it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What would be its effect on the item for the transfer of 5th Army Headquarters from downtown South Chicago to Fort Sheridan?

Mr. KEATING. It would have no effect, because I propose to modify my amendment by striking out "elsewhere" and inserting in lieu thereof "in other States."

Mr. President, I now offer amendment No. 1076, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as modified will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 119, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

"Sec. 610. No funds shall be authorized to be expended by this bill for the purpose of constructing new facilities in other States to replace facilities at installations ordered reduced or closed pursuant to the announcements of the Secretary of Defense dated December 12, 1963, or April 24, 1964, for 'economy reasons.'"

Mr. KEATING. I shall explain the purpose of the amendment.

The Department of Defense, on December 12, 1963, and April 24, 1964, announced widespread cutbacks and closing of defense installations. The cutbacks and closings were publicized as a source of great savings for the taxpayers.

Every year, substantial sums are appropriated for the construction of new military facilities, and this year is no exception. The purpose of my amendment is to prevent the use of funds for the construction of facilities in other States to do the work which was performed in the particular installations that have been closed. In other words, no economy would be achieved by the construction of such new facilities. The purpose of the two orders of the Department of Defense, as stated, was to achieve economy. No economy is involved if an installation is closed and a

new installation is built in another State or another area to do the same work that was done in the facility that was closed.

My amendment would prevent the Department of Defense from spending large sums to erect huge new edifices to replace facilities that are being closed. I know of no case in which that is specifically proposed to be done, but I believe the principle is important and should be stressed. I had hoped that the chairman and the other members of the committee would feel that they could take the amendment to conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the Senator has modified his amendment so as to make it read:

No funds shall be authorized to be expended by this bill for the purpose of constructing new facilities in other States to replace facilities at installations ordered reduced or closed pursuant to the announcements of the Secretary of Defense dated December 12, 1963, or April 24, 1964, for "economy reasons".

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So it is my understanding that if that is the language of the amendment as the Senator has now drafted it, only two items would be included, both of them in States in which facilities now exist, one in Illinois, the other in the State of the distinguished Senator from New York. Those are the only items in the bill, on the authority of our able assistant. If this is to be the only authorization bill this year, the Senator's amendment would not apply to those two items, which are the only such items in the bill.

Mr. KEATING. I was hoping that was correct and was hoping, for that reason, that the chairman and the other members of the committee would see no objection to accepting the amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I know of the Senator's concern about the situation at Rome, N.Y., and have much sympathy with the problem there. I wish there were something we could do to alleviate the situation concerning that installation. But if the Senator's amendment has now been modified so that it does not apply to the items in the bill, why place the amendment in the bill at all?

Mr. KEATING. I shall be frank with the Senator. The reason for offering the amendment was to make very clear the principle that facilities may not be constructed anywhere else in the country to do the work that was done in the closed facility at Rome.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator understands that the bill provides nothing for the Rome installation.

Mr. KEATING. Nothing specifically singled out to replace building at Rome.

Mr. STENNIS. Also, as I understand the modified amendment, it would not apply to two items that the original version applied to. It does not apply to anything in the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Are there only 2 items for construction of new facilities in the

bill in the same field of operations as facilities being closed down?

Mr. STENNIS. There were several items. There were 5 or 6 in the bill that would be affected by the original version of the Senator's amendment, but they were taken out by the committee. They are not in the Senate version at present. Therefore, there are only two items in the bill which the Senator's original amendment would affect. One of those would be in his own State and the other in Illinois. Naturally, the committee would wish to protect those two items.

Mr. KEATING. My understanding is—I may be misinformed about it—that these two facilities, to which the Senator has referred, and which are not now covered by the revised bill, are not the only ones where there is new construction, renovation, or other activities. All that we ask is: If they are going to spend money for new facilities, whether they are new buildings or new facilities of any kind, they ought not have a purpose which is being served in an installation that is being closed down; in other words, let us say there is a warehouse to house electronic equipment at Rome, N.Y., it would seem to me it would not be economy and would be a mistake to permit the construction of a warehouse in some other State to house that electronic equipment. It is quite simple. The two installations that we have been talking about do not apply—the one in Illinois and the other in New York. They are not covered in this revised amendment; but it seems to me that this amendment states a principle which is sound from the point of view of economy; namely, that the Defense Department should not close down a facility and then use these funds for the building of a new one somewhere else that is designed to do the same work as the one being closed down.

Mr. STENNIS. I would have to disagree with the Senator, because we can save \$20 million, perhaps, in operational funds, at installation X, by closing it down; but we would have to spend money at some other installation to take care of some of the items which will carry over and continue. So if we had to spend \$5 to \$8 million, the Senator's illustration would not apply. If the numbers are to be reduced, they cannot be put in a straitjacket and not permitted to spend any money on any other installation where they are making a transfer. The Air Force transferred one installation out of Mississippi to three or four different schools. They sent one to California, one to Utah, and one somewhere else. No doubt they had some additional construction to take care of in those places, and new homes had to be built, but the operation does save the operational costs of maintaining a base.

Another item in the House bill—we took it out of the Senate version, but it will be in conference—which the Senator's amendment would affect would be the Oakland Army Terminal Center, a \$2 million item. If the Senator's amendment were included, that would preclude this item, unless the conferees rejected it.

Mr. KEATING. Does the Senator mean to say that the Oakland Army

Terminal is to perform functions of one of the terminals reduced under these orders?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct—Fort Mason, which is nearby the Oakland Army Terminal.

Mr. KEATING. That would not apply if it were in the same State.

Mr. STENNIS. The last version of the Senator's amendment would not apply.

Mr. KEATING. No; not if they were both in California. It would apply only if they were moved from one State to another.

The Senator has put his finger on it. Certainly I do not oppose coordination and consolidation of activities within a small area, but what I am objecting to is transfers of jobs and installations all over the country which then lead to large new construction requirements.

Mr. STENNIS. We have conferred, and we believe the Senator has a serious point; but we believe that his amendment is too tightly drawn. An emergency could occur, such as the Cuban crisis, for example, in which we had to rush a great Army. The Marines, the Air Force, and everything else had to move almost instantly, and we spent a great deal of money doing so. We could take this item to conference with the understanding that we will try to work out some language which we think does not go too far, and does not harm the bill as a whole. If we cannot do that, we shall have to drop the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from Mississippi is always helpful. He has just suggested that perhaps the language should not be quite so tightly drawn as this, but should state that if the Defense Department is going to do this, it must make a special report to the Congress, which is frequently done.

Mr. STENNIS. We will take it to conference, with that understanding.

Mr. President, with that understanding we accept the amendment, as modified.

Mr. KEATING. As modified. I appreciate it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York, as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ALLEGED SAVING ON PHASEOUT OF ROAMA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a joint statement which was made by my colleague the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], Representative PIRNIE, and myself, and following that, that my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who is unable to be present today because of official business, be given permission to insert his statement.

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

**JOINT STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN PIRNIE
AND SENATORS JAVITS AND KEATING**

The General Accounting Office report on the alleged savings to be realized from the planned phase-out of Roama raises serious questions as to the basis for the Air Force decision.

The General Accounting Office was unable to evaluate the single most important item in the total alleged savings because the Air Force did not provide sufficient detailed support to substantiate its claims with regard to savings it contends will be realized by the elimination of personnel spaces from the Logistics Command as a result of the transfer.

There appears to be as much of a mystery surrounding this aspect of the report as is contained in any James Bond fiction. We have been advised that one unidentified officer gathered all the supporting data to justify the claimed personnel savings. Upon completion of his study, the officer was ordered to destroy all the documentation. We can understand why the CIA or Secret Service occasionally operate in this manner but we question the need for such an approach by the Air Force.

Beside the notable lack of information on the major portion of the alleged savings, three other items in the report demand particular attention:

1. Of the estimated savings of \$11.8 million for fiscal years 1965 through 1967, GAO was able to identify \$2 million which did not appear to be savings properly attributable to the transfer.

2. Of the estimated annual savings of \$9.9 million beginning with fiscal year 1968, GAO was able to identify \$2.7 million which did not appear to be savings properly attributable to the transfer.

3. Of the estimated cost of \$3.6 million for constructing new facilities at the air materiel areas receiving Roama's functions, GAO was able to identify \$1 million in additional expenses which the Air Force had omitted in its figures.

The significant overstatements of savings and understatements of costs, coupled with the mysterious lack of information with respect to the claimed savings in personnel, give rise to serious doubt of the Air Force contention that the phaseout of Roama is in the best interest of Government economy and national defense.

The phaseout of Roama was widely publicized as a source of great savings to the taxpayers, yet the GAO report reveals that the Air Force has no figures to support its exaggerated claims. If a 3,000-man defense activity can be eliminated with no detailed justification, then no military base or facility or job anywhere in the country is secure.

In view of this situation, we shall continue to press for an immediate postponement of any further phaseout action until all the facts can be assembled and reviewed.

If a full disclosure of all the facts should reveal that the transfer of Roama is in the best interest of Government economy and national defense, as the Air Force claims, then we would withdraw our objections to the move. Until the Air Force claims are proved, we will not accept the phaseout of Roama and will continue to fight for full and fair reconsideration by the Air Force.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAVITS

I should like to express my support of the amendment introduced by my colleague, Senator KEATING, and which I have cosponsored. The Defense Department announcement of military installation closings throughout this country have deeply affected many of our States. I am certain that no one would be opposed to the curtailment of operations of any of these military installations if true economies for the benefit of our Nation were to be obtained.

Whether the closing of all the installations announced by the Defense Department will result in economies is, in my view, very much open to question.

Yesterday, the Comptroller General rendered a detailed report on the Department of Defense's plan to close the Rome, N.Y., Air Materiel Area and transfer its functions from Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y. The Air Force claimed that the transfer of functions from Rome, N.Y., would save the Federal Government \$11.8 million for fiscal years 1965 through 1967. Of the \$11.8 million estimated savings for this period, the Comptroller General was able to identify \$2 million which, according to his report, "did not appear to be savings properly attributable to the transfer." As to the Air Force's claim of annual savings of \$9.9 million beginning with fiscal year 1968, the Comptroller General was able to identify \$2.7 million which "did not appear to be savings properly attributable to the transfer." The Comptroller General also concluded that with respect to the relocation costs which the Air Force expected to incur, "the estimated cost of \$3.6 million for constructing additional facilities at the air materiel areas receiving the functions of Rome Air Materiel Area appeared to be understated by about \$1 million." In addition, the "reasonableness" of the remaining alleged savings could not be determined because the Air Force reported that it had destroyed the detailed justification of their estimates.

The disclosures of the Comptroller General's report are quite disturbing to me for not only do they undermine the principal Air Force argument for the transfer of the Rome Air Materiel Area, but they raise questions as to the true economies which are being obtained by military base closings. The closings are a matter of grave concern to the States and local communities affected. Their economic impact affects the livelihood of millions of people, yet serious questions remain as to the basis and validity of at least one of the decisions which has been made as an "economy move."

With respect to the Rome Air Materiel Area closing, Representative ALEXANDER PIRNIE, the dedicated Congressman of the Rome area, Senator KEATING, and I will continue to fight for a full and fair reconsideration by the Air Force of its proposal to close this installation until claims of savings by the Air Force are proved.

The amendment to the pending military construction bill, which Senator KEATING and I have introduced, would prohibit the authorization of funds to construct facilities to replace installations closed by the Defense Department. If economies are to be obtained, unnecessary expenditures should not be made to duplicate missions which are being phased out. The amendment would not restrict authorization of funds for necessary military construction but would merely prevent funds from being utilized to replace existing facilities.

NAVY YARDS

With respect to the matter of economies, I should also like to express my concern over the item in the military construction bill which provides for funds for construction at two Navy yards included under authorization for Bureau of Ships facilities. This expenditure would be made despite the fact that the Defense Department is conducting a study of the question of whether there is excess capacity in our naval yards and has been reducing employment and work allocation at the Brooklyn Navy Yard over which Senator KEATING and I have been deeply concerned. I hope that serious attention will be given by the Defense Department to the question of whether meaningful economies can be obtained by curtailment of operations in one naval yard and expansion of operations in others.

I also hope that the Senate will accept our amendment in the interest of true economy.

MR. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the text of the letter of transmittal from the Comptroller General.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

June 25, 1964.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PIRNIE, SENATOR JAVITS, AND SENATOR KEATING: Enclosed is our report on the Department of Defense plan to transfer the functions of the Rome Air Materiel Area from Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y. Our review was undertaken at your request * * * in which you asked that we review the Department of Defense plans to close the Rome Air Materiel Area and the Schenectady Army Depot. Our findings with respect to the latter installation were submitted to you by letter dated March 16, 1964 (B-153174).

The Air Force has stated that it was decided to reduce the organizational structure of the Air Force Logistics Command from nine air materiel areas to eight as a result of a continuous decline in recent years in the scope of the Logistics Command's operations. The Air Force selected the Rome Air Materiel Area for closing primarily because its workload can be relocated to other air materiel areas which have some experience in managing equipment similar to that presently managed at Rome and because these other air materiel areas have overhaul and maintenance capabilities that are lacking at Rome. The Air Force has stated that all the air materiel areas except Rome have huge investments in major industrial overhaul and repair facilities which would be extremely difficult and costly to relocate.

The Air Force estimated that significant savings in personnel and various operating expenses would be realized by consolidating the functions of the Rome Air Materiel Area with those of other air materiel areas and that these savings would be substantially greater than the relocation costs which would be incurred in the transfer. The Air Force has estimated that, during the period in which the transfer is to be accomplished—fiscal year 1965 through fiscal year 1967—savings of about \$11.8 million will be realized as the Rome functions are transferred on a phased basis. The Air Force anticipated that these estimated savings would be offset by the costs of relocating personnel, equipment, and material; other personnel costs; and costs of altering, building, or modifying facilities at the locations receiving the additional functions, which were estimated at about \$6.3 million. The Air Force has estimated that, after the transfer is completed, savings of about \$9.9 million a year will be realized, starting with fiscal year 1968. In arriving at these saving estimates, the Air Force considered the salaries for the number of military and civilian personnel who could be eliminated from the Logistics Command's authorized strength and the anticipated reductions in various operating expenses.

We have analyzed the Air Force estimates of savings anticipated as a result of transferring the functions of Rome Air Materiel Area, as well as the costs which will be incurred to accomplish the move. Of the estimated savings of \$11.8 million for fiscal years 1965 through 1967 and the anticipated annual savings thereafter of about \$9.9 million a year, we were able to identify about \$2 million and \$2.7 million, respectively, which did not appear to be savings properly attributable to the transfer.

With regard to the major portion of the savings attributed to the transfer by the Air Force, we are unable to determine the rea-

sonableness of the Air Force estimates because the Air Force has not provided sufficient detailed support for the single most important factor affecting the estimates; that is, the number of personnel spaces that can be eliminated from the Logistics Command's authorized personnel strength as a result of the transfer. We were informed that the detailed work to arrive at this estimate was performed by one officer in order to avoid premature widespread concern over the proposed closing during the early planning stages and that the officer was instructed to and did destroy the detailed papers supporting the estimate. Air Force officials have stated, however, that recent detailed planning for the first phases of the transfer indicates that the original estimates were reasonably accurate.

With respect to the relocation costs which the Air Force expects to incur, we found that the estimated cost of \$3.6 million for constructing additional facilities at the air materiel areas receiving the functions of Rome Air Materiel Area appeared to be understated by about \$1 million. We found no basis on which to question other elements of the estimated relocation costs.

It is generally recognized in the Air Force that some difficulties will be experienced in a transfer of management responsibilities of this magnitude. The Air Force believes, however, that such problems will be temporary and can be overcome by special attention as required. From an audit standpoint, it is not possible for us to predict the extent to which the Air Force will experience a loss of management capability by not having the management of electronic ground communications equipment centralized at a single location, nor is it possible for us to predict whether the savings anticipated will actually be realized.

This report is also being submitted today to Senator JACOB K. JAVITS and Congressman ALEXANDER PIRNIE. We plan to make no further distribution of this report unless copies are specifically requested, and then only after appropriate approval has been obtained or public announcement has been made concerning the contents of the report.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee substitute as amended.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for some questions?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask for the floor so that I may yield to the Senator from Illinois for questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi a few questions about statements which are made on page 15 of the committee report, dealing with the transfer of the headquarters of the 5th Army from Chicago to Fort Sheridan, 36 miles north.

Before I ask this question, I wonder whether I might be permitted to make a prefatory statement.

I am a strong supporter of Secretary McNamara, and believe that he is doing a magnificent job in seeking to reduce military waste.

I do not wish to defend the existence of any unnecessary locations, or to stand in the way of desirable economies. Sec-

retary McNamara has launched a fine program to reduce waste in the military service—a good portion of which program, incidentally, I had the privilege of suggesting. But I was skeptical about the economy claimed for the transfer of the headquarters of the 5th Army from Chicago to Fort Sheridan.

It seemed to me that this involved, in its original proposal, an outlay of well over \$5 million with the possibility that additional costs might be incurred, and that such economies as were claimed could be obtained by reductions in force at the existing location. This would not require a change of location.

I notice that the committee makes the following statement on page 15 of its report:

The sum of \$3,323,000 was requested for headquarters facilities to permit the relocation of the 5th Army Headquarters from the city of Chicago to Fort Sheridan, Ill.

Then there is this most interesting statement:

Although the committee was advised this was basically an economy move, the committee has reservations as to how much might eventually be saved, if any, since it appears there will be generated further expense requirements for family housing, and perhaps other facilities.

I take it that the committee has distinct reservations as to whether any economies at all would be effected by this change?

Mr. STENNIS. There is a considerable claimed annual saving in this change. That had some appeal to us, of course. The estimate by the services themselves were to be \$1,160,000. We found that those estimates, as to what the savings would be, proved to be mighty liberal. We learned by experience to be skeptical about it.

In this case, we encountered the fact that we had a housing problem involved in connection with the change, although, for the time being, they proposed to continue to occupy this housing that is available in the city of Chicago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That will still keep the staff split between the city of Chicago and Fort Sheridan.

Mr. STENNIS. That is true. We removed an underground situation from the project here. That eliminated approximately \$1.3 million. The change then did have an overall appeal to the committee. There will be some savings perhaps. I would not try to estimate, but there could be none, frankly. There is an advantage here with reference to the change, especially when we remove the \$1.3 million. That will not be allowed, I do not think, in any future hearing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois has stated that most of the claimed economies come from a scheduled reduction in staff which could be carried out regardless of where the headquarters are located. I would support such economy. But the economies claimed for the move are largely delusive.

I am encouraged by the statement of the Senator from Mississippi, who is very careful about these matters. Would

the Senator mind if, when we come to appropriating money, we check closely on the appropriations justification?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be glad to make a careful check. That is one of the advantages of being connected with both authorization and appropriations. We can get into it from a different approach sometimes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am certain that Secretary McNamara's intentions are the very best. But he must work through a staff. And the staff is influenced by the desires of the military men on the spot.

I remember that back in 1946 when my wife was Congresswoman at Large from Illinois, the 5th Army demanded that it come into Chicago for its headquarters. They would not have their headquarters at Fort Sheridan. They said that it was more economical to operate inside of Chicago. They took over the Chicago Beach Hotel, which was badly needed for housing. They preempted space into which veterans could have moved.

Now they say that they want to go to Fort Sheridan. They say it would be more economical to operate there. Eighteen years ago they had the opposite viewpoint. A few months ago I drew down on my head the ire of the Chicago newspapers when I said that the atmosphere of the Lake Forest and the Onwentsia Country Clubs had an influence in the desire to move there as contrasted to maintaining the headquarters in the humble ward in which I reside.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is not only a member of the Armed Services Committee, but also of the Appropriations Committee. And so is the Senator from Mississippi. I hope they will double their close scrutiny and not be taken in with false and delusive arguments of economy.

Mr. STENNIS. I am certainly willing to do that. I wish the Senator would cross-examine the Senator from Massachusetts on the same subject.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Senator STENNIS and I sit side by side in both committees. That gives us a chance to watch out for this.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This could not be called an interlocking directive.

Mr. STENNIS. We appreciate the attitude of the Senator. One of the purposes of the report was to try to hold the Army down on any future construction they may ask for on later projects.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a hard job.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] is here. I want to especially thank him. He is a member of the subcommittee. He made some special inspections for us. He took several trips and rendered a fine report on many of these matters. I think every single one of his recommendations was accepted. They do not seem to be attacked here on the floor. So they are going right along with the bill. We appreciate your services.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in connection with the Fort Sheridan matter,

a Member of the House of Representatives sent me a memorandum on the subject. He has followed it very closely.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter from Representative McCLORY, under date of June 24, 1964, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 24, 1964.

HON. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
Senate Office Building.

DEAR EVERETT: The statements on the new headquarters facilities at Fort Sheridan are covered quite well on pages 110 through 115 and pages 702 through 704 of the hearings before the Military Construction Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services.

I think my testimony is responsive to most of the objections which Senator DOUGLAS may interpose. These facts seem to me significant:

1. The 5th Army is the only Army (of the six U.S. armies) whose headquarters is not presently located at a military post.

2. At the present time only 60 military families occupy the Wherry (Twin Towers) private housing on the South Side, located near the present 5th Army Headquarters at the old Chicago Beach Hotel. More than 150 military personnel whose families are presently living at Fort Sheridan are transported daily by buses to the present Chicago Beach Hotel headquarters.

3. Not 2,000 but only approximately 800 civilian employees will have their duties transferred from the Chicago Beach Hotel to Fort Sheridan.

4. The existing program to construct 250 military housing units at Fort Sheridan is independent of the 5th Army move and relates primarily to relocating 97 families now occupying trailers at the Fort Sheridan post.

5. The estimate of the new headquarters as set forth in the military construction bill (H.R. 10300, S. 2467) is \$2 million. This is less than the Defense Department estimated would be produced for the sale of the Chicago Beach Hotel and the other properties to be disposed of on the South Side, which was shown in the testimony to amount to \$2.8 million.

6. In response to any argument that housing cannot be located for Negroes in the area of Fort Sheridan, I want to report authoritatively that within the last 6 months accommodations have been found for 40 Negro families, all of the Negroes which require such housing.

7. There is unanimous support for moving the 5th Army headquarters from its present location in the Chicago Beach Hotel. If the headquarters does not go to Fort Sheridan and stays in Illinois, there are 12 other States in the 5th Army area which would like to have the headquarters.

In addition to the copy of the hearings which accompanies this letter, I am sending pages from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD relating to debates in the House.

Please call if I can be of any help or for any additional information.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT McCLORY,
Member of Congress.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Minnesota had promised that we would have a quorum call. I understand that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has some short remarks to make. Perhaps the Chair would want to recognize him before we have the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

RETIREMENT OF COLIN F. STAM, CHIEF OF STAFF OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, it is my duty to make one announcement with deep regret, and my privilege to make a second announcement with unusual satisfaction. Both of these developments occurred in a meeting of the joint committee today.

It is with regret that I advise the Senate that Mr. Colin F. Stam told the committee of his desire to retire at the end of July as chief of the committee staff. It is with satisfaction that I can tell you that the committee named Mr. Laurence N. Woodworth to succeed him.

I am sure every Member of the Senate will join me in an expression of appreciation for the fine service rendered to the Congress and the country by Mr. Stam—and in extending to him very best wishes for good health in deserved retirement.

Mr. Stam has been on the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation for 37 years—since 1927—and he has been chief of the committee staff for 36 years, since 1928.

It has been my privilege, as a member and chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, to have been associated with Mr. Stam for 31 of those years. I want to say that his country is indebted to him for a lifetime of the finest service—service which is both immeasurable and invaluable.

I do not hesitate to say that I regard him as the best authority in the field of Federal tax law—in all of its aspects—in the Government, and perhaps in the country.

He has served his country and the Congress as a dedicated public servant in the very best sense of the word, and I know he has rejected positions outside the Government which would have been far more remunerative.

The longer I have known Mr. Stam the more I have respected him. He is a man who has been motivated by devotion to his work and best endeavor to protect the interests of the Government of the United States with all justice to taxpaying citizens.

The high caliber of his work has made him a man of exceptional influence in the Congress, throughout the Government, in many areas of the legal profession, and with the general public.

It is gratifying to note that Mr. Stam and his outstanding contributions have been nationally recognized. He received the Rockefeller Public Service Award in 1961, and the Tax Foundation Award in 1962.

By nature, he is a retiring man. His eminence is based on ability and the quality of his work.

I understand a farm on the eastern shore of Maryland has been his principal relaxation. He has truly earned retirement, however he wishes to use it. But we shall surely miss him.

We have Mr. Stam to thank also for the excellent staff he has developed in the difficult field of tax legislation. And from that fine staff we are fortunate to have Larry Woodworth to take over in the position of chief of staff.

The joint committee unanimously chose Mr. Woodworth for the position. Mr. Stam and Mr. Woodworth are men of mutual respect, and Mr. Woodworth comes to his new position with Mr. Stam's highest recommendation.

Mr. Woodworth has been on the staff 20 years—since 1944. And he has worked with Mr. Stam on virtually all important tax legislation since that time, including the tax code of 1954, and the Revenue Acts of 1962 and 1964.

Senators have observed him on the floor of the Senate yesterday and today, and I commend him as highly as I can to every Member of the Senate. I doubt if we could have found a finer man, or one better equipped for the position.

He is a native of Loudenville, Ohio, and received his education from Ohio Northern University, the University of Denver, and New York University. He is well qualified, not only by 20 years on the committee staff, but also by prior work with the Tax Foundation in New York, and the Civic Research Institute of Kansas City, Mo.

His new duties will be of exacting and highly responsible nature, but the committee has utmost confidence in his ability and character. I know Members of the Senate will welcome him cordially and with satisfaction, as I do.

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

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who served on the Finance Committee for only a short time, but who has had many questions before the Finance Committee at various times, and who has had many constituents who have wished to discuss subjects of finance and taxation, I know how cooperative Mr. Colin Stam has been and how authentic is the information that he gives out. He is always independent in his views. His views may not always be supported by the Internal Revenue Department, but he is factual and he knows the tax laws of our country probably better than any other individual. I am sorry that he is leaving.

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

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as Colin Stam retires from service in the Senate and as a member of the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation, the Nation loses a dedicated public servant—one who has devoted practically an entire lifetime to the subject of taxation. Taxation is a difficult and complex subject. One must live it to follow the current changes that take place from year to year as the Congress changes tax laws, and to follow the administrative rulings that also effect changes in tax laws.

Colin Stam has practically given his entire life to that very service; he has lived it. That is one of the reasons why

he has really been of great help not only to the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee, but also the Congress and the Nation. It was my privilege to serve on the House Ways and Means Committee with Colin Stam as our adviser and counselor for 10 years; and during the last 10 years it has been my privilege to serve as a member of the Senate Committee on Finance under the very able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Therefore, I feel that I know Colin Stam and appreciate his service to his country. He is a very quiet and unassuming man, but he has been a dedicated public servant. I, together with the chairman, wish him many years of rest and retirement to which he is entitled.

I am also pleased that the chairman has seen fit to secure for the Joint Committee of the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee the services of Laurence Woodworth or, as he is affectionately known, Larry Woodworth. Those of us who helped to write the tax bills of 1962 and 1964 fully appreciate his knowledge in that field. He has been under good tutorship under Colin Stam. I feel confident that our committee will be well served by him. I welcome him into this new position, and appreciate the privilege of serving and working with him.

I wish Colin Stam many years of pleasant rest in retirement.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, although I have not had the privilege of being a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I think I must rank well up toward the top of the list of Senators who have called on Colin Stam for information and advice pertaining to tax subjects.

Mr. Stam has always been very ready to help all of us whenever we have needed help. So far as I am concerned, that has been most of the time. Not only has he been accurate in the information which he has given us, but he has also been very prompt. I join with all Senators who are sorry to see him retire after 37 years of service. Of course, his retirement makes it all the more important that the chairman of the committee be available for the next few years so that we can get our information from him. Probably what I have been asking of Mr. Stam I shall now be asking of the chairman of the committee, who is equally well qualified.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, ever since my early days in the House of Representatives, Mr. Stam has been "Mr. Taxation," along with the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. He has been helpful to me personally on many occasions in relation to tax problems, as he has been to nearly every Senator and many in the other body. I join in wishing him well in his retirement. We shall certainly miss him here. I wish for him long years, great health, and happiness.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the very able and distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee,

the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], in his tribute to Mr. Colin Stam, chief of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation staff for the past 36 years.

It has been my honor and privilege to work with Mr. Stam ever since I have been in the Congress; and all of us who know him, certainly owe him an everlasting debt of gratitude for the great public service he has rendered, not only to the Congress, but also to the people of the United States.

He is a man of the highest character, integrity, and exceptional ability. After many years of service to his country, however regretful we feel about his leaving us, he certainly is more than entitled to the retirement he now desires to take. I could not agree more with my distinguished chairman when he says all of us will miss Colin Stam.

I take this opportunity to wish him continued health, success, and enjoyment in all his future endeavors.

At the same time that our loyal and devoted friend, Mr. Stam, is retiring, the joint committee staff has chosen another very able individual to head it—one known to all of us here in the Senate, Larry Woodworth, who has served on the joint committee staff since 1944. We are confident that while he has a pair of big shoes to fill, he will measure up to the task, because he, too, follows the line of an individual dedicated to public service in the highest sense.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, today there is occasion for both sadness and joy. Colin F. Stam has announced his plan to retire after 42 years of Government service, the last 26 of which have been spent as chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. It is a sad occasion that we in the joint committee, in the Congress, in the Federal Government and in the Nation as a whole are going to say goodbye to Mr. Stam as far as his work in our Government is concerned. However, we should rejoice with Mr. Stam in his retiring to the tranquillity of his Eastern Shore farm and we wish him many years of happiness.

Also, we have good reason to be happy today in that Mr. Stam has provided us with a most capable and competent successor in Laurence N. Woodworth, the new chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Colin Stam came to the Government, and to the Bureau of Internal Revenue in particular, in 1922. In 1927 he switched his allegiance from the executive branch to the legislative branch of our Government, becoming an assistant counsel for the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. And, on July 1, 1938, he was appointed chief of staff of that committee.

I have only been a member of the joint committee for a short portion of the time that Mr. Stam has been its chief of staff, and, in fact, I have only been a member of the Senate Finance Committee for 14 years, but, throughout that time, I have observed the great ability and kind understanding of Mr. Stam and I have learned so much from

this remarkable man and expert on taxation. I shall certainly miss his counseling and his expertise, but certainly he deserves a rest from the arduous job he has held for so many years. And I hope that we shall continue to see and advise with him about revenue problems for years to come.

Laurence Woodworth was unanimously decided upon today by the joint committee as its new chief of staff. For my part, there was no hesitancy in voting for Dr. Woodworth. Ever since I have been on the Finance Committee and then on the joint committee, I have seen what a keen intellect, what a gracious manner, and what an untiring devotion Dr. Woodworth has brought to his work. However, it was not until this year that I was really able to work intimately with Larry and that was in connection with the big and complex tax reduction and reform measure which was enacted into law. As manager of that bill, I was faced with one of the most difficult tasks of my legislative career. I do not know that I could have managed that mammoth revenue bill satisfactorily if I had not had the assistance of Larry Woodworth who was at my side at all times, supplying me with information on any of so very many technical aspects to this bill. If the United States is to be benefited by the tax reduction measure enacted into law this year, and I believe that it will be greatly benefited, a great debt of gratitude is owed to Larry Woodworth. Therefore, I feel that the joint committee is under most capable direction with Laurence Woodworth at the helm.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, like many other Senators, I regret to see Mr. Colin F. Stam retire as chief of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

It was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives for a period of 10 years. For the past several years, I have been a member of the Senate Committee on Finance. Membership on these committees has brought me in close contact with Mr. Stam. He is a fine gentleman and one of the best qualified tax men in this country. He was always patient, understanding, and helpful.

The public little realizes the great contribution that Mr. Stam has rendered day after day throughout the last 37 years. He is one of the most outstanding of all the Government civil servants. I wish to express my gratitude to him for his wonderful work and extend to him every good wish for his years of retirement.

A fine man, Mr. Laurence N. Woodworth, has been named to succeed him, and I wish Mr. Woodworth well in undertaking this important work.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10300) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

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

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have the third reading?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question first is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD],

the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 1, as follows:

[No. 452 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Alken	Gruening	Muskie
Allott	Hayden	Nelson
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bennett	Hill	Pearson
Bible	Holland	Pell
Boggs	Hruska	Prouty
Brewster	Humphrey	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Russell
Cannon	Johnston	Saltonstall
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Church	Keating	Smith
Clark	Kuchel	Sparkman
Cooper	Long, La.	Stennis
Cotton	McCarthy	Talmadge
Curtis	McClellan	Walters
Dirksen	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Dodd	McGovern	Williams, Del.
Dominick	McIntyre	Yarborough
Douglas	Mechem	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Fong	Morton	
Fulbright	Mundt	

NAYS—1

Morse

NOT VOTING—29

Anderson	Hart	Monrone
Bayh	Hartke	Moss
Beall	Javits	Neuberger
Burdick	Kennedy	Ribicoff
Eastland	Lausche	Robertson
Edmondson	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Engle	Magnuson	Symington
Ervin	Mansfield	Thurmond
Goldwater	McNamara	Tower
Gore	Miller	

So the bill (H.R. 10300) was passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mrs. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the remainder of the session of the Senate today.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am about to leave the floor to take a plane to Seattle on official business. The plane leaves Washington about 6 o'clock this evening. I do not know whether there will be a vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Hamer H. Budge prior to that time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is our intention to call up the nomination this afternoon. I have consulted with the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Montana, and it appears that there will be no yeas-and-nays vote, but there will be some speeches on the nomination.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the Senator's statement. If I am not present, and am on my way to Seattle when a voice vote is had, or when a yeas-and-nays vote is had, on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Budge, I wish to be registered in opposition to the nomination.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting majority leader whether there is any change in the plans with respect to the pay bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have discussed with a number of Senators the situation relating to their own personal circumstances and commitments, and when we would take up the pay bill.

It now appears that the pay bill will be called up on Wednesday. It is uncertain how much time will be spent on it, but we would like to dispose of it before we leave for the Fourth of July weekend.

Monday will be utilized in disposing of other bills on the calendar—possibly the transit bill—as soon as we have an opportunity to consult with the able Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

On Tuesday other items on the calendar will be taken up. We hope to be able to take up a number of bills that are pending on the calendar.

On Wednesday we shall move to consider the pay bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the acting majority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the will of the Senate?

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

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

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hamer H. Budge to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the nomination of Mr. Budge, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, is a troublesome and puzzling nomination.

Three of the outstanding newspapers of this country have seriously questioned the nomination. The New York Times, for example, has said, in part:

AN UNPROFESSIONAL APPOINTMENT

The term of J. M. Whitney, a Republican, had expired, and a Republican or independent had to be appointed because the law states that no more than three members of one party can serve on the SEC. But Mr. Budge, who calls himself a "conservative" and favors cooperation rather than control of industry, has had no experience in the field of security regulation. His lack of professional background and his unsympathetic attitude toward reform is in striking contrast to the attributes of his predecessor and to the prevailing policy of the SEC itself.

The naming of Mr. Budge assumes special importance due to the fact that William L. Cary, the SEC's exceptionally able Chairman, will soon be leaving his post. Under Mr. Cary, the SEC, watchdog of the marketplace, has been completely revitalized. It is no longer enfeebled or insensitive to the many changes taking place in the sale and distribution of stock. On the contrary, it has played an active, reformist role, taking the lead in raising standards in the securities industry. Its position will be strengthened by congressional passage of the proposed securities reforms bill; but it will still require a conscientious and professional Chairman like Mr. Cary, one who has the devotion and support of its staff, to insure that regulation is both intelligent and effective.

We hope that the naming of Mr. Budge will not set a precedent. Professionals should be chosen for the regulatory agencies. There is always a grave risk that political regulators will either succumb to industry pressure of simply go to seed. It is a risk that we cannot afford to run.

The Washington Post also strenuously questioned this nomination, and said, in part, as follows:

Until now the SEC has been winning its fight to institute long-overdue reforms in the operations of the organized security exchanges and the over-the-counter markets. But the President's unfortunate nomination of Budge is being interpreted in the industry as invitation to resist further proposals from Washington. And within the SEC, which will soon lose a distinguished Chairman with the departure of William L. Cary, those staff members who would do more than a perfunctory job in protecting the investors see some ominous handwriting on the wall.

The regulatory agencies are afflicted by a number of maladies. A couple have been rendered obsolete, or partly so, by technological change. And in others a failure to define specific goals leads to an obsession with trivia and the harassment of business. But the appointment of men such as Budge who are more interested in "cooperation" than in regulation can only make matters worse by interjecting a strong element of "clientism," the jargon word used to characterize the regulatory agency which protects the interests

of its client industry rather than those of the public.

Mr. President, the Washington Post's point concerning "clientism" is extremely important today. Regulatory bodies have great power. Some people feel that in the aggregate they have more power than Congress has; and that they constitute the most powerful element of our Federal Government. Regulatory bodies have great power and discretion. They are constantly subject to extreme pressures by the people whom they regulate. They see them constantly. They become friends with them. And naturally commissioners, like other human beings, want to be liked. They are open to the importunings, the pressure, the tendency to cooperate by not protecting the public interest. It takes a man of remarkable character and objectivity, a man who has a sensitive conscience and a deep understanding of his responsibility to the public, to resist that kind of pressure. This is particularly true in the Securities and Exchange Commission. It is especially important that persons appointed to the SEC have the kind of qualifications that have been characterized by nominations to the SEC made by President Roosevelt, President Truman, President Eisenhower, and President Kennedy.

There is no question that among the qualifications for appointment to the SEC should be a real appreciation of the contributions of corporate enterprise to American strength. The Securities and Exchange Commission as a regulatory body regulates the process of securing capital for the Nation's great corporate enterprises. If a man does not appreciate or understand that, he will be an unsympathetic and unsatisfactory commissioner. So we should certainly consider as a qualification a man's understanding and wholesome appreciation of support for American business.

It is also desirable to have as a Commissioner one who has an imaginative capacity to make the SEC work, so that the raising of capital will be as easy and efficient as possible, and that the incentives that characterize our free enterprise system shall be preserved.

In the light of all this, why question the nomination of Mr. Budge? Mr. Budge served in Congress for 10 years. He served for 2 years as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations. He has been a judge in Idaho for several years. He has practiced law. He was graduated from Stanford University and the University of Idaho Law School. Obviously he has qualifications for some positions. But it is also important that a Commissioner have imaginative zeal to provide pertinent information for the investing public, so that the public may protect itself against deception and fraud. This requires pitiless, constant, and comprehensive disclosure, in all phases of investment.

In the course of the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, I asked Mr. Budge to give his views concerning the function of the SEC. I asked him, since the SEC is an

agency to regulate private industry, what he believed his job should be. He said:

BUDGE'S LIMITED INTERPRETATION OF HIS RESPONSIBILITY

I think in my whole career, I have done everything within my means to enforce the law. That is what I would expect to do on the Commission.

Later, Mr. Budge was asked the same kind of question, and again he said:

Senator, I have tried a number of cases, both as an attorney and on the bench, involving fraud and misrepresentation. I think I understand what evidence is necessary to carry out the mandate of the Congress in enforcing the law, and I see no bar of any kind that would prevent me from doing what both of us agree is the proper function of the Commission, which is to protect the investor from fraud.

Those are the words of the nominee. Further, he said:

If a person were a crook, whether he is in the securities industry or any other industry, I would deal with him as such.

The final reference I have to his appearance before the committee was when Mr. Budge said, in answer to a question:

To me, this position is not a bit different from the position I now hold on the trial bench.

Mr. President, this position to which Mr. Budge has been nominated entails extraordinary discretion. There is all the difference in the world between being a Securities and Exchange Commissioner and being a judge or one who will conscientiously carry out the law as written. The position of Securities and Exchange Commissioner requires great discretion. It requires extraordinary judgment. In the view of our great newspapers, including the Milwaukee Journal, the Washington Post, and the New York Times, the position requires professional capacity and a technical understanding of the exchanges.

IMMENSE DISCRETION BUDGE WILL HAVE AS COMMISSIONER

Let me list some of the discretionary power with which Mr. Budge will be empowered as a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

As a Commissioner, he and his fellow Commissioners will have the power to exempt any class of securities, where the offering does not exceed \$300,000, from the provisions of the Securities Act.

He will have the power to exempt securities issued by a small business investment company under the Small Business Investments Act of 1958, and from the provisions of the Securities Act. Some small businesses are becoming very large and are growing constantly.

Furthermore, as a member of the SEC, he may require additional information in a registration statement or dispense with certain requirements.

He will have the power to allow omissions or require additional information in a prospectus. In addition, he may classify and require the filing of prospectuses.

Furthermore, section 19 of the Securities Act of 1933 gives the Commission

special powers to make, amend, or rescind rules and regulations necessary to carry out the act and grant authority to prescribe the forms to be used.

All this is a far cry from the simple matter of dealing with crooks.

The Securities Act of 1934, in addition to the provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, gives the Commission powers to classify securities as "equity securities." That is a discretionary decision. It is a decision that can have wide implications.

Also, it grants the power to classify securities as "exempted securities"; also the power to define technical, trade, and accounting terms.

MORE BUDGE DISCRETION

The Commission may require information from exchanges applying for registration. It may impose terms on an exchange desiring to withdraw its registration. It may establish rules and regulations relating to a broker's aggregate indebtedness.

As a Commissioner, Mr. Budge may establish rules and regulations relating to the hypothecation of securities; rules and regulations relating to pegging, fixing, or stabilizing the price of a security registered on a national securities exchange; and rules and regulations relating to put, call, straddle, or other option as privilege.

That is not only a matter of discretion and judgment; it is also a matter of technical understanding and a professional knowledge of what is happening in the great securities markets of this country.

Judge Budge said:

To me, this position is not a bit different from the position I hold on the trial bench.

Is it not? Listen to these additional discretionary powers:

He will have power with other Commissioners to establish:

Rules and regulations in connection with short sales and stop-loss orders of securities registered on the National Securities Exchange.

STILL MORE BUDGE DISCRETION

Rules and regulations prohibiting manipulative or descriptive devices in the purchase of sales of securities.

The Commission has the power to regulate or prevent floor trading by members of national securities exchanges. It can regulate off-floor trading by members.

The Commission can exempt odd-lot dealers and specialists within the limitations of section 11(b) and section 11(a).

This is not merely a matter of enforcing the law. I shall read a few more of the powers of the Commission.

The Commission, which means Budge and his four colleagues, has the power to develop rules and regulations with respect to information filed in registering a security on an exchange. This means power. It means great discretionary power, which involves careful judgment. It concerns the Commission's attitude toward business and toward the regulation of trade.

The Commission may establish rules and regulations with respect to a security being withdrawn from listing by an ex-

change. Mr. Budge would have the power to make such a decision.

This can permit exemption from operation of section 12 to securities listed on an exchange at time of exchange registration, but not later than July 1, 1935.

Budge will have:

Power to grant and terminate unlisted trading privileges.

Requirements with respect to reports that must be filed by issuers who have a security listed on a national securities exchange.

Rules and regulations relating to the solicitation of proxies.

EVEN MORE BUDGE DISCRETION

Rules and regulations relating to information which must be filed by a broker-dealer wishing to register with the Commission.

Rules and regulations relating to the use of fraudulent, manipulative, deceptive, or other fraudulent device by a broker-dealer in the over-the-counter market.

This is a very subtle, complicated and very important kind of power over the broker-dealer relationship, because many people feel that there is a conflict of interest when a person is a broker and a dealer, dealing and having an account, a client, and his own interest, which requires judgment and regard for the public interest.

The law also provides that the Commissioner, the nominee, shall have power, if approved, over: the financial responsibility of brokers and dealers; information to be filed by OTC issuers of a certain size; information to be filed by a national securities association desiring registration.

He will have power with respect to information that must be kept current by a registered securities association; power to abrogate or alter the rules of a registered securities association; power to exempt transactions from section 16.

Rules and regulations with respect to foreign or domestic arbitrage to carry out the purposes of section 16.

Rules and regulations relating to the keeping and preservation of records by exchanges, members and registered broker-dealers.

ADDITIONAL BUDGE POWERS

Also the power to order or suspend or withdraw the registration of a security—an immense power. This is a power that should be exercised under some conditions. It requires a tough-minded person, with an attitude toward business which can be objective, which can be one which recognizes primarily the public interest and the interest of the 17 million stockholders.

Power to suspend or expel members or officers from a national securities exchange—which, of course, is another immense power.

Power to suspend trading in a security.

There is nothing in the law which tells a commissioner whether to do it or not. This is a matter of judgment, and of the ability to withstand the kind of pressures that are most extraordinary.

Power to alter or supplement exchange rules in specific areas.

Power to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the execution of their functions under the act.

Rules relating to transactions on foreign security exchanges.

Budge will have additional rulemaking powers under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, the Investment Company Act of 1940, the Public Utility Holding Company Act and the Trust Indenture Act. All of these acts are administered by the Commission.

There is a constant area of judgment as to whether the exchange, the National Association of Security Dealers, or the SEC should set the rules of conduct. SEC is the final court. The SEC can decide it at its own discretion. The problems arise as a result of observation of individual practices and the assessment of whether these are "proper," but no particular definition is available of the word "proper."

HOW BUDGE POWER WILL OPERATE

A specific example is the work of individual floor traders, whose conduct is largely governed by the National Association of Security Dealers, but the SEC must constantly judge whether, in practice, such direction by the NASD is adequate.

This is obvious, since the NASD is composed of the industry itself—the dealers themselves—and the SEC must represent the stockholders, so that there must be and there is an area in which there is an adverse position. Taking this adverse position requires a degree of regard for the public interest which should be demonstrated in the record of the nominee.

Section 4 of the Investment Company Act permits broad latitude to the SEC on mutual funds.

Yet, is a "front end load" fair? Or a "front end load" an investment in security funds?

Some of those now require that as much as 50 percent of the amount an investor will invest in a mutual fund shall go in commission, and only 50 percent will actually be invested. This is considered by many people, by many professional observers, and by others in the industry, to be gravely unfair to the investor. Regulation of this is a matter of discretion. It is a matter for the SEC to determine whether it is unfair.

The SEC Commissioner should be dispassionate and so expert and so zealous for the interest of the stockholders that he is willing to step in, under the circumstances, which will encounter a great deal of hostility by the mutual fund, a great deal of objection by the mutual fund, and pressure by the mutual fund, to let them take for example 50 percent of what an investor invests.

For instance, if an investor puts a thousand dollars into a mutual fund under some practices, the mutual fund may take \$500 the first year as its commission and buy only \$500 worth of stock.

Is that right?

Many people feel that a maximum of 9 percent for a commission should be permitted in any one year, and that the investor should be safeguarded. He is not safeguarded right now.

Perhaps the SEC should step in to provide those safeguards. A serious question of judgment is involved, as well as a serious question which requires professional knowledge, and a serious question which requires a person who has the zeal to protect the public interest which can be demonstrated on the basis of his record.

The SEC has not answered this question, although the recent study suggested that the practice should be curbed.

The key words in the statute are "in the public interest and/or for the protection of investors."

How should these words be interpreted in this case of "front end load" which I have just described?

Section 10(a) of the 1934 act provides for SEC control over short selling, but then permits exemptions from the rules. There is a continuing question of when abuses of the exemptions occur which may require the SEC to change the exemptions in individual sentences.

They have to step in and determine whether the short-seller has been using the short-selling device to take advantage of the rules. This requires judgment and firmness in the face of industry pressure.

Sections 9, 10, 11, and 19 of the 1934 act deal with general powers over trading. Yet there are really no rules over such items as stop orders, quotations, and so forth. Practices must be carefully observed and individual rules established.

THE MURCHISON CASE

I should like to give one final example, which is a graphic example of the kind of tough and serious problem facing the SEC, and why it is so important to have people who can be just as zealous in the public interest as possible.

The question before the SEC and the courts in 1962 was whether the Murchisons' acquisition of control of Alleghany and Investors Diversified Services, Inc.—which incidentally represents the largest system of investment companies in the world, and constitutes \$4 billion—would not entitle the thousands of small investors in IDS to refunds of many millions of dollars in investment advisory and underwriting fees paid to IDS, because the Investment Company Act declares that it is against the national public interests and that of investors whenever the "control or management" of investment companies is "transferred without the consent of their security holders."

The SEC Division under Director Conwill took the position, according to a staff summary of Commission memorandums and minutes of April 18, 1962, April 20, 1962, and May 31, 1962:

That a change of control of a corporation (Alleghany) which controlled a corporate adviser or distributor (IDS) whether by transfer or as the result of a proxy contest would affect an assignment of the advisory and distributing contracts * * *. The Division argued on this basis the definition could and should be read to include other sections which result in a change of control and thus a change in the identity of the adviser, since it was the purpose of the act to enable stockholders to approve or disapprove of a new adviser (sec. I(b)(VI)).

The Division also urged that the brief assert that no distinction was intended by Congress by the effect of a transfer of control through exercise of the power to sell a security or the exercise of the power to vote a security, since both are incidents of ownership.

This is obviously a complex but vital and important question of financial judgment, as well as legal judgment.

What happened to Director Conwill, who made this recommendation?

The New York Times of February 13, 1964, stated:

Alan F. Conwill said last night he planned to resign this summer as Director of the Securities and Exchange Commission's Division of Corporate Regulation and return to private law practice in New York.

Mr. Conwill said he notified the White House of his plans about 4 weeks ago and asked to be dropped from consideration for the seat on the five-man Commission that has been open since the resignation of J. Allen Frear, Jr., last September.

Some say that Mr. Conwill was the leading candidate to replace Frear when President Kennedy was assassinated.

I should point out that Mr. Frear was replaced by Commissioner Owens, of Oklahoma. Mr. Conwill was the man who in the Murchison case had the highest regard for the investors, certainly for the small investors. He was able to stand up to one of the Nation's most powerful combines.

This close relationship of an appointment to the Securities and Exchange Commission to the welfare of investors is illustrated by the fate of the very case in which Director Conwill advocated enforcement of the Investment Company Act against the Murchisons. It also illustrates how crucial the vote of one Commissioner alone can be when the Commission is divided. The SEC record above quoted shows that:

The Commission, by a vote of 4 to 1 authorized the (Amicus Curiae) brief (of the Commission in *Willheim v. Murchison* in the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit) to urge adoption by the court of the position advanced by the Division. Upon subsequent reconsideration, however, the Commission by a vote of 3 to 2, directed that the brief be limited to the position urged by the General Counsel.

Now this matter is currently before the Commission to vote upon again. If Director Conwill had replaced one of the three Commissioners who on "subsequent reconsideration" voted against "the position advanced by the Division," he would have provided the decisive vote in favor of an interpretation of the Investment Company Act that would result in the Alleghany-Murchison controlled IDS being forced to make some 10 millions of dollars of refunds to the thousands of shareholders of the IDS funds.

Mr. President, this is a job requiring men who understand the discretion and the judgment required by the Securities and Exchange Commission, not simply as the nominee has said, "To lock up the crooks."

SUMMARY

A summary review of all the evidence that I have just placed into the Record would convince anyone that this position

is not similar to the job of a judge who sits in a circuit court. This is a vastly complicated, highly discretionary, exceedingly responsible position. The position involves billions of dollars, and the fate of literally millions of investors.

We need men in the tradition of the great former Commissioners. Think of the men who have been nominated and have served on this Commission. William O. Douglas, now one of the great Supreme Court Justices, was Chairman.

One of the finest Commissioners that we have ever had in any capacity on any Commission was William Cary, a distinguished professor at New York University, but a man who had a practical knowledge of the workings of the market, and a man who, as the New York Times has stated, revived and revitalized the Securities and Exchange Commission. Joseph Kennedy, the father of the late President Kennedy of the United States, is conservative in his views. But he knew the stock market up and down. He understood every facet of the stock market as well as any man. He showed his knowledge by his great success in the stock market. He could bring to the position of Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission a marvelous, and practical appreciation of what was going on and an ability to protect the investor.

The present nominee has high integrity. He has the support of two of the very finest Senators with whom I have served. The nominee is a lawyer. He is a judge, and a former Representative, in Congress. But he has no professional qualifications to recommend him—certainly not in this field.

His attitude toward regulation and the strict legalized interpretation of his duties, in my judgment, raises grave question as to how zealously he will administer, interpret, and apply the law to protect 17 million stockholders.

I respect Mr. Budge. I have met and talked with Mr. Budge. I have nothing against him. He is a man of honesty. He has a record of integrity. He has the support of very fine people. But, with all respect, I would suggest that Mr. Budge is one of the least likely men in all America to carry out the revitalization of the Securities and Exchange Commission to which the New York Times referred, under Chairman William Cary.

This nominee is about as likely to help make the Securities and Exchange Commission the vigorous watchdog of the marketplace that it should be, as Senator GOLDWATER is to carry Harlem for the Presidency next November.

I hope and pray that Mr. Budge will make me a bad prophet.

There are few responsibilities for advising and consenting to nominations that should weigh heavier with the Senate than those in connection with appointments to these immensely vital commissions.

I hope that in the future the Senate will give these nominations the responsible, careful, discriminating scrutiny that they deserve.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I have little to add to what has been said.

I know Judge Budge. I concur in the opinion that Senator CHURCH and Senator JORDAN have expressed.

I believe he possesses the highest integrity. So it grieves me to have to stand on the floor of the Senate and suggest that this is an unfortunate and ill-advised appointment. I am not so concerned that Mr. Budge has not had the experience that should be brought to the Securities and Exchange Commission. I feel that we should appoint professionals to these commissions. I think we should appoint people who are familiar with the complex and complicated matters that come before the commissions. But, as the Senator from Wisconsin has pointed out, one of the greatest members of the Commission was Justice Douglas, who had experience in the law.

The thing that causes me to stand on the floor today and object to the confirmation of Judge Budge to the Securities and Exchange Commission is that Judge Budge does not believe in the kind of regulation that a Commissioner should. He does not believe in this sort of regulation at all.

His voting record in the House of Representatives, and his entire history, indicates that he feels that the Government should not regulate business in the way that the Securities and Exchange Commission regulates it. When we pay tribute to his integrity and when we pay tribute to his character and suggest that he is a man of great ability, we are appointing a man to do a job on a commission that he does not believe in.

He does not believe that this job should be done.

The Senator from Wisconsin talked about revitalizing the Securities and Exchange Commission. We hope that they will extend their authority to the over-the-counter market, for example. An investigation is being made now to extend the powers of the Commission.

I am convinced that Judge Budge will not go along with that sort of thing, as a matter of principle, in the philosophy that he has advocated in all the years in which he has been in public service, both in Congress and in the court.

As has already been pointed out, handling all these complicated, difficult decisions that will be handled as a matter of discretion in the Securities and Exchange Commission is different from passing judgment on convicted criminals, or deciding a case after a jury has brought in a verdict, as a trial judge.

I feel that the appointment is probably the worst that could possibly be made. There are thousands of Republicans throughout the United States who have the experience, the judgment and the discretion who would be able to do the job that needs to be done in administering the Securities and Exchange Commission in the public interest. Judge Budge is not the man for the job. I feel very deeply that President Johnson should not have appointed this man. It is difficult to vote against the confirmation of a man whom one respects, with whom one has served in the other body, and one who is a man of character and integrity, but, for many of the reasons which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] has pointed out, I shall

have to vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Judge Budge.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to Senators state their reasons why Judge Budge should not be appointed a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission. I wish to raise my voice in urging approval by the Senate of the nomination which has come to us from the President of the United States for this very important post.

Judge Budge appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency, where he was thoroughly examined by a majority of the members of the committee who were present. I was there to present Judge Budge and to speak for him. I thought he handled himself very well before the committee. I was most gratified to find that he was approved by the committee with only one dissenting vote.

Mr. President, all of us seem to be agreed on several particulars. We agree, first, that Judge Budge is a man of great integrity, that he is a man of fine character, and that he has a good educational background. We agree also that he has served well in the legislative and judicial branches of government.

The point at issue is Judge Budge's particular qualifications for the important job to which he has been appointed. In all sincerity I believe the job requires a man of mature and discriminating judgment. I believe that Judge Budge, in his judicial career on the bench as a district judge in Idaho, has demonstrated those qualities very ably.

First, I should like to tell the Senate a little about Judge Budge. I have known him ever since he returned from World War II, where he served in naval intelligence. I served with him in the Legislature of the State of Idaho. I was Governor of my State when he served in the Congress of the United States. He served there for 10 years and he did a very creditable job.

In 1960 Judge Budge was appointed to the district bench in Idaho, where he was still serving when the appointment to the Securities and Exchange Commission was tendered to him by the President of the United States. He has a fine background. He is a graduate of Stanford University and the University of Idaho College of Law. He was a practicing attorney, legislator, Member of Congress, and district judge. He has evidenced those very particular traits which Senators have indicated that they think are so necessary for this important job.

The main objection that my colleagues level against Judge Budge is that he has no experience in the job to which President Johnson has nominated him.

It seems to me that this is like saying that no man is qualified to serve in the Senate unless he has had previous experience as a U.S. Senator.

I turn now to the hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency at which Judge Budge was examined the other day. He was interrogated by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] in the following fashion:

Senator JAVITS. But you have heard some securities fraud cases?

Mr. BUDGE. Yes.

Senator JAVITS. What is your reversal record like as a judge?

Mr. BUDGE. Well, I would just have to approximate this. In the 3 years I have been on the court, I have probably handled something like 300 or 400 matters that have gone to final judgment. I think the Supreme Court has reversed me less than six times. And in one of those instances it did it with an apology, because they said they were also reversing themselves.

Senator JAVITS. Well now, as a man of conscience, would you say that there is any association or affiliation that you have which would prevent you from carrying out the duties of this office in the manner and spirit and with the philosophy which is represented by your answers to Senator PROXMIER and to me?

Mr. BUDGE. I would state unqualifiedly, "No."

Mr. President, I make the same statement. Judge Budge is a man of conscience and of proven judgment. He is eminently qualified for this high position. I commend President Johnson for the excellence of his choice of Judge Budge to serve as a Republican member of the Securities and Exchange Commission; and I urge confirmation of this nomination by the Senate.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the junior Senator from Idaho with respect to the appointment of Judge Hamer Budge.

I also wish to commend the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] with respect to the matters discussed by them upon his appointment or nomination.

It is my purpose and intention to call the attention of Judge Budge to the interesting colloquy which has ensued on the floor prior to the confirmation of his nomination, which I hope will follow soon.

I say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I am sure Judge Budge will profit by what the Senator from Wisconsin has said. I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that in my 25 years of association with Judge Hamer Budge I have found him to be a man of unimpeachable integrity, a man with a keen analytical mind, an unassuming man, but a man with an iron will and with exceedingly good judgment. I am sure he is sympathetic toward the small investors, and that is the basis upon which he accepted the appointment.

I am sure President Johnson must have thought highly of this man and made an investigation before appointing him to this high and distinguished office.

I am sure Judge Budge will heed the warning signals that have been placed along the path of his nomination by the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Montana.

I join my distinguished colleague from Idaho in urging on the Senate that it vote to confirm the nomination to the post to which Judge Hamer Budge has been named.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Hamer H. Budge to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission?

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 10669. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11375. An act to provide, for the period ending June 30, 1965, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday morning I appeared on the "Today" program on the National Broadcasting Co. network on the subject of the war in Vietnam. This broadcast inspired more mail than I usually receive on this subject, though it has come in steadily in support of my position.

I ask unanimous consent to have various communications printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters, telegrams, and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In southeast Asia—no escalation without representation. Why is the U.S. Senate powerless to assert its democratic and constitutional prerogative against President Johnson and Secretary of Defense McNamara in their war which is being paid by our money and the lives of our sons? This is to say nothing of the suffering we are causing in Vietnam. I am ashamed.

But how grateful I am for your tremendous effort, Senator Morse. Please continue. (I know you will.) We are behind you.

Yours,

Mrs. IRENE HOGLUND.

CONCORD, MASS.

DEAR SIR: Millions of Americans agree: You are right, the United Nations should take the place of Cabot Lodge, not a general.

JAMES ROBERTS.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

CHAMPAIGN, ILL., June 25, 1964.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your courageous statement about southeast Asia on "Today" program.

JOHN J. DEBOER.

WICHITA, KANS., June 25, 1964.

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As a World War II combat veteran with four children, and a member of one of America's founding families, I wholeheartedly support you on the southeast Asian situation.

EUGENE FIELDS,
President, Town and Country Mobile
Homes, Wichita, Kans.

SEATTLE, WASH., June 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Many thanks for your expressions of opinion on southeast Asia. I am for you all the way. Wish you were a Senator from Washington State so that I could vote for you.

With sincere admiration,
Mrs. SIGRID HARRIS.

JUNE 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE B. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: All of America owes you a debt of gratitude for it seems that your voice is the only sane one in all of Washington concerning the U.S. policies and actions in South Vietnam.

Please continue your efforts to halt the war in Vietnam and bring the problems faced there to the conference table. I feel that millions of Americans wholeheartedly support you in these efforts.

My husband, Dr. Thein Wah, and my father, Mr. Alphonse Hvalgren (705 Locust St., Prophetstown, Ill.), concur with me in the attitude I have expressed above.

Sincerely yours,
EDITH HVALGREN WAH.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE

HONORABLE SIR: I could only wish that there were more Senators like you and Senator GRUENING.

Your courage to speak your mind on our Government's policy and actions in South Vietnam and other areas, is admirable.

Why can't we let the people of those countries settle their own problems?

Thank you for your wonderful stand for justice.

Sincerely,
Mrs. E. LEHMAN.

JUNE 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: This is to express our heartiest support to your courageous stand on our involvement in Vietnam.

Our country must be steered away from its collision course, a course that will lead us, very soon now, to a world disaster.

The latest actions of the administration to escalate the war should alarm all of us. Your statements on this question give people courage to fight and a feeling of optimism that perhaps peace and moderation can still win out.

So keep up the fight. There are more and more people beginning to see how close we can be to disaster and are willing to act.

Sincerely,
LEO A. KOSK.

GLENDALE, CALIF.

MENLO PARK, CALIF., June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your speech regarding Vietnam is very fine. Let's learn the ways of peace.

Sincerely,
MARTHA ACENEDO.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 23, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Your foreign policy statements which have been promulgated by the press recently seem to indicate your possession of an unusual insight into the facts and circumstances of U.S. involvement in the Far East.

I would greatly appreciate your sending me a list of publications wherein I could read a fuller exposition of facts and views similar to those you publicly express. These would hopefully include contemporary books that expose the true situation behind American foreign maneuvers.

Thank you and best wishes for future political success at a higher level.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM MARSHALL OWEN.

JUNE 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: After watching you on Walter Cronkite's CBS news tonight, I was prompted to write the enclosed letter to President Johnson.

Please continue to fight for peace. You have my best wishes.

Yours truly,
Mrs. GERI EVANS.

JUNE 23, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have been a lifelong Democrat, but, if you speed up the war in South Vietnam, I cannot, in good conscience, vote for you.

I endorse Senator MORSE's views on southeast Asia and urge you to be a Democratic President that seeks peace and not war.

Yours truly,
Mrs. GERI EVANS.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
June 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my deep appreciation for myself and my family for your courageous opposition to the extension of the war in southeast Asia. I have read your excellent speech in the Senate on March 4 and would be happy to receive copies of any later statements you may have made.

Newspaper coverage of your and other Senators' attacks on administration policy in South Vietnam has been poor, but I have heard several of your statements on TV. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,
LINCOLN WOLFENSTEIN.

NEW ROCHELLE, N.Y.,
June 23, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have had considerable difficulty acquiring complete detailed reports of your remarks on the role of the United States in southeast Asia, in particular on the Indochinese peninsula. I would very much appreciate copies of your remarks on these matters. In addition I would be interested in your opinions regarding the appointment of General Taylor to the post in South Vietnam.

If I have correctly understood the sketchy reports of your remarks on the role of the United States in Laos especially, and also in South Vietnam, I would like to express my hearty agreement with and support for your position. It seems to me that it is the

United States which threatens the peace in Asia at the present time, most outrageously in the flurry of aggressive, and highly irresponsible statements of recent days on the possibility of initiating open, hot war against China and North Vietnam and the Pathet Lao forces in Laos. Our Nation's words and deeds show continued and flagrant contempt for all past and present efforts to find peaceful settlements, to end civil wars setting back badly needed economic development for decades.

Indeed, it is hard to understand our policy in Asia, to understand just who makes decisions with what long-range and presumably, consistent goals. The very thought of the United States "carrying the war further" inspires, at least in my mind, a mixture of fear, shame and growing anger.

I very much hope your efforts to publicize the nature and implications of the U.S. policy in southeast Asia are successful. Unfortunately, it is more urgently important that practical steps be taken to check dangerous and irrevocable words and deeds. Let me thank you for all you may be able to do in these respects and for what you have already done.

I am a graduate student in economics and will be continuing my studies at Yale University this September.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD D. WOLFF.

CLINTON, N.Y., June 24, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was delighted to hear of your speech before the Senate on radio yesterday. I know you've made plenty of them recently but I've never heard or seen a word anywhere before.

Thank you for your great efforts on behalf of our boys and the Vietnamese people. I clipped this item from the New York Times Saturday and send it on to you. I also bought an extra paper to get it with a letter to President Johnson.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK SLATER.

[From the New York Times, June 20, 1964]
SCIENTISTS SCORE UNITED STATES ON CHEMICAL WARFARE

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., June 19.—The Federation of American Scientists today called on President Johnson to halt all development and production of chemical and biological weapons.

"There is ample evidence that the U.S. Government is engaged in a large-scale effort to develop and produce lethal biological and chemical weapons," the federation said.

"It appears likely that the principal targets would be civilian populations rather than military personnel. We find this morally repugnant."

The federation's statement was given out at a news conference in the office of Prof. Alex Rich at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The statement said: "We are concerned with reports of the field use of chemical weapons in Vietnam. Reports that defoliating agents have been used to destroy protective cover have been confirmed by representatives of the Department of Defense.

"These charges give rise to the broader implication that the United States is using the Vietnamese battlefields as a proving ground for chemical and biological warfare."

TACOMA, WASH., June 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
State Capitol Building,
Salem, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I are very much inclined toward your position on southeast Asia, but we feel inadequately informed. Your suggestion that we are violating the United Nations Charter by our actions in southeast Asia has seemed valid. Further,

we seem to be obstructing rather than aiding popular political development in Laos and southwest Vietnam. Are we misinformed? Is the administration not acting on a judicious appraisal of more complete information (not only military, but cultural, psychological, etc.) than has been made evident through news media?

In the past few months, from Newsweek magazine and from television news (largely CBS), we have grown (in spite of lullaby propaganda) toward the following hypotheses:

1. That the U.S. presence in southeast Asia is hardly assuring the Asians the right of self-determination; this right would seem to be what Americans would be fighting for most of all.

2. That the peoples of Laos and South Vietnam hardly exhibit the cultural or educational readiness for democratic self-determination, which is the kind of determination which we seem to be promoting.

3. That the popular movement (i.e., that supported by the majority of active citizens and most in harmony with their aspirations at this stage of their social, political, economic, etc., development) is best represented at this time by the Communists. Even in spite of careful rhetoric to the contrary in Newsweek magazine, the people of North Vietnam appear—for Asians—to be very well off: active, dedicated, with a rising standard of material well-being and of education (even if Communist oriented now, always a moderating influence in the long run—cf. Russia).

It had seemed to us that the United States could represent itself in a most enlightened and inevitably influential manner by withdrawing from southeast Asia (or by merging into a United Nations agency), by allowing the people to determine their own course (which would probably be communistic now), and then by offering encouragement and scientific-political-educational-etc. assistance when, in the future, they had evolved to the point where they were ready for a new or "more advanced" form of government (much as the Soviet Union has evolved, under bettering economic and educational conditions, from a revolutionary extremism to a more self-confident and self-content moderation).

Thus, when we learned of the decision to "hold fast" irrevocably in southeast Asia, we were chagrined. Not only is there the risk of escalation and even of nuclear war with the Chinese, but the point of the decision did not seem to be directed toward what would seem to be our main purpose in southeast Asia: self-determination of the southeast Asians. Is the effort to halt the Chinese and the Communists an inseparable part of the effort to assure self-determination to the southeast Asians?

Some of the questions which perplex us are:

1. Would the peoples of Laos and South Vietnam determine a form of government "suitable to us" if we successfully held back the Communists?

2. In spite of all the material wealth we can invest in southeast Asia, are the people ready (re culture, education, etc.) for democracy? Or are we ready to accept other forms of government: communism, socialism, benevolent monarchism, military dictatorship, etc.?

3. Will China not challenge our nuclear forces? Or is southeast Asia comparable to Berlin?

4. Is U.S. "determination" not aiding southeast Asia less than it is fanning Communist revolutionary zeal and xenophobia in Asia toward a "belligerent," militaristic United States? Is it in our interest toward international understanding and harmony to nurture hate (compare characteristics of mass movements in Eric Hoffer's "The True Believer"), or does our determination breed less hate than respect?

5. Are political motives involved (in our national scene) and, if so, are they worth it (though it would almost seem worth it if it could "defuse" and defeat Senator GOLDWATER—in many ways a worse threat than the Chinese).

In any case, the administration seems to have facts which run counter to those which we can derive from public media. We feel bewildered in our ignorance, and concerned to know the facts as they are available.

What information have you available which may clarify and substantiate your position on southeast Asia? We would appreciate any printed material of your own, and/or references to current books, periodicals, or pamphlets dealing objectively and informatively with the problem.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD N. HUGGINS,
Instructor of English, University of
Puget Sound.

JUNE 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: If only there were more Senators like you who would speak out against what practically amounts to a declaration of war in Vietnam. It is unspeakably awful.

Thank you.

P. KLINGHOFFER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

JUNE 20, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are gratefully relying on you to call out opposition to U.S. military thrust into Laos.

For ourselves it will end in futility even if we escape a third world war. For native populations it will add cruel suffering to their misery. Communism couldn't be worse than war.

Sincere thanks,

RUTH H. POOL.

SEATTLE, WASH.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am all for your stand on cessation of our stand on South Vietnam.

B. GALNESON.

CRAWFORD, N.Y.

JUNE 20, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to commend you for the courage you show in your forthright statements about South Vietnam. I hope you make a national tour to arouse the people.

Respectfully yours,

DAVID SEIDMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I fully support your position concerning our role in South Vietnam. It seems as though we are about to step up our war offensive in that area. The results could be tragic. I admire your courage and urge you continue your fight for withdrawal or neutralization.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL SAMBERG.

BENNINGTON, VT., June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D.C.:

Your interview on the "Today" program this morning was an inspiration.

FERN OLSON.

NEW YORK, N.Y., June 25, 1964.
 Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your courageous and factual presentation on "Today." We are grateful, please, again and again and again the facts.
 Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR W. DANA.

BRUNSWICK, MAINE, June 25, 1964.
 Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Living since World War I, I was heartbroken by General Taylor's appointment. Now listening to your marvelous NBC speech, I take courage. The U.N. is the answer for this world catastrophe into which we are headed. I pray you make it your immediate duty to rally all the millions who agree with you that are speechless. May you have continued strength and wisdom.

Gratefully,

GERTRUDE TIEMER WILLE.

RED BANK, N.J., June 25, 1964.
 Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.:

Re "Today" June 25, the only correct analysis re southeast Asia expressed by any, repeat any, Member of the Senate or Congress was expressed by you this day. Your statement on the subject should be rebroadcast on the hour every hour throughout this Nation until the American people wake up to the fact that they are violating the laws set forth in the U.N. Charter and are thus selling out a lot of boys who died in two wars.
 EDITH W. AYKENS.

HIGHLAND PARK, N.J., June 25, 1964.
 Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your program this morning on "Today" was most enlightening. It would be wonderful if all of us could help you get the message of South Vietnam across to the Nation.

With kindest regards,

KEVIE SCHULMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 25, 1964.
 Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.:

Forgive the silence of necessity. I envy the Oregonians their Senator MORSE, an honest, courageous, brilliant, independent who is a Democrat with a small "d" and American with a capital "A." Keep up the magnificent work for the loyal opposition.

Mrs. MARY CLARK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
 June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 U.S. Senate,
 Washington, D.C.:

My family support your courageous opposition war in Vietnam. Continue speaking out.

ROSEMARY LUSHER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
 June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 U.S. Senate,
 Washington, D.C.:

Beg you continue your opposition war in Vietnam. America will be proud of you.

ALBERT MALTZ.

DANVERS, MASS., June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.:

Endorse heartily your views re Vietnam expressed "Today's" show. Please continue ef-

orts for saner policy, especially United Nations participation.

Dr. WM. M. GOLDBERG.

ALBION, MICH., June 24, 1964.
 Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senator from Oregon,
 U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations again on your protest against war with Red China. I am protesting to the President.

ARTHUR W. OUNK, Ph. D.

SEATTLE, WASH., June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.:

Have been in the doghouse for 6 months for opinions such as you express. If there is anyone in our section still available to openly talk with, please inform me.

Mrs. H. B. ANDERS.

PALOS VERDES ESTATES, CALIF.,
 June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Washington, D.C.

SIR: Heard your strong stand this morning on "Today's" show. As a mother of two boys in Army, what can I do as loyal fellow Democrat?

RUTH PALMER.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.:

I fully endorse your unequivocal statements on Vietnam on "Today" program. We need more statesmen with the courage and convictions like you and Senator FULBRIGHT to arouse public opinion.

H. P. REMPERT.

DAYTON, OHIO, June 25, 1964.
 Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Congressional Building,
 Washington, D.C.:

Your comments on "Today" show most timely. Back you 100 percent.

C. CONOVER and T. SMALLWOOD.

PORTOLA VALLEY, CALIF.,
 June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.:

Heard you on "Today" show. Agree in every respect. Am sure you could get signatures of most everyone in America on a petition. Please tell me what I can do.

MARY WINKLER.

ANDERSON, IND., June 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree with you 100 percent on the Vietnam situation. If the Government over there were any good we would not have to worry about their being taken over. I don't know of any really good government yet, that ever fell to the Communists.

It also seems clear to me that the military takeover in South Korea proves that our boys over there died in vain. I hope you will keep up the fight and that we won't make a far bigger mistake in Vietnam. I think the policy of the British is about the best of any country I know of. We have two fine Senators in Indiana now, but don't believe they have the wonderful courage that you have.

Yours truly,

VEACHEL SMITH.

JUNE 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your inexhaustible and courageous stand against our participation in an undeclared war in Vietnam has won you the admiration and respect of every peace-loving American.

I, for one, am deeply grateful that our country has produced a man of your caliber and convictions.

I salute you for your genuine interest and concern for the peace and well-being of your fellow citizens.

We will support you to the nth degree in this vital issue.

With sincere gratitude,

Mrs. A. BRENNER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

THE COMMUNITY CHURCH OF BOSTON,
 Boston, Mass., June 24, 1964.

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: The decision of Senator MORSE not to confirm the appointment of Gen. Maxwell Taylor as Ambassador to South Vietnam meets with my wholehearted approval. The implication of this appointment is that a military approach to the problem of that unhappy country is the policy of our Government. I believe that our approach should be a political one based upon a decision to negotiate the issue with the interested parties. The defeat of the French Army in Vietnam was a demonstration that the military approach is doomed to failure and now, in light of greater complications at the present time, is dangerous to the peace of the world.

As a matter of fact, the sending of American troops to die in South Vietnam is a policy that I cannot support. The hypocrisy of our helping to kill the people of South Vietnam in the name of its liberation while our own citizens are deprived of the right to vote and are dying to preserve the right to vote in Mississippi is both tragic and hypocritical. When it comes to liberation we should begin at home in Mississippi rather than 10,000 miles away. If armed forces are to be used for purposes of liberation, let them be taken out of South Vietnam and be sent to Mississippi.

Sincerely,

Rev. DONALD G. LOTHROP.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
 June 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just written to President Johnson protesting the continuation of the war in southeast Asia and the appointment of General Taylor as our Ambassador there. We should get out of southeast Asia, and sit down at the negotiating table with China and other interested nations to seek the neutralization of Laos and Vietnam. Thank you for leading the fight against this wretched war. You have many admirers and supporters who wish you full strength to continue your campaign.

Sincerely,

MIRIAM KELBER.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 U.S. Senate,
 Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I certainly agree with you that President Johnson is "making the United States the world's leading threat to world peace." In a speech yesterday you insisted he should take up the issue with Congress, which alone has the right to make war. You stated further that "No President is alone entitled to threaten war or to commit the United States to war." I want to commend you for your speech denouncing the present warlike policy.

The nomination today of General Taylor to succeed Henry Cabot Lodge as Ambassador to South Vietnam is very disturbing. This nomination looks like a step toward war. I hope the Senate will take a long, hard look at General Taylor when his nomination comes up for approval.

Very truly yours,

FLOYD MULKEY.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE MORSE: Wholeheartedly agree with your stand on Vietnam and applaud your position on having a general sent as our Ambassador to Vietnam.

How can ordinary citizens such as myself assist you?

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY LENS.

MILITARY AID GOES TO BANGKOK

WASHINGTON.—Four cargo ships bearing tanks, armored personnel carriers, and other heavy military equipment are now steaming toward Bangkok. The equipment reportedly is to resupply U.S. stocks there.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I recently read your letter in Four Lights published by WILPF and am so thrilled to think that someone has the same belief as I about South Vietnam. And I was greatly disturbed to see this statement by Admiral Felt. Does he realize that all-out war would mean the end of civilization and would mean the loss of perhaps over a billion lives? War is unthinkable. It has never been the solution. History proves that.

I should like you to send him some publications of United World Federalists, Inc., 1319 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Send me the bill.

Mrs. RUTH G. YEAGER.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.

P.S.—Keep up the good work for us all. God bless you.

ARMED U.S. JETS OVER LAOS

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Air Force, it was learned today, has been flying reconnaissance missions over Laos with heavily armed jet escorts.

UNITED STATES WOULD RISK ALL-OUT WAR

TAIPEI, FORMOSA.—Adm. Harry Felt, leaving his post here as commander in chief of U.S. Forces in the Pacific, states the United States would risk even all-out war to check Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

SOMERVILLE, MASS.,

June 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been following the position taken by yourself and far too few of your colleagues regarding the war our Government is waging against the people in South Vietnam.

My concern is not only, as you expressed it today, that the United States will be hated for the next 500 years, but too that innocent people—Vietnam civilians, and Americans (soldiers who, God knows, never really know what it's all about) are being slaughtered.

Having had the courage to be honest in your past, I urge you to do all in your power, with the sanction of your fellow Senators who share your views, to bring the issue to the public and to create dissension and strong public opinion. These pressure factors alone can end the war, or at least stop its expansion. I suggest, if it is in any way possible, that you and others go on a nationwide speaking tour to talk against the war. That prospect may seem difficult. It is, regardless, imperative.

Sincerely,

DENVER, COLO.,

June 23, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for helping keep us out of war in Asia. Transporting our men and supplies that far and fighting in

jungles, mountains, valleys, fields, and heavily populated areas where we have to make and defend roads to frontlines would become extremely unpopular.

Slaughtering millions of people with atomic bombs and leaving millions half dead and suffering would turn civilized nations against us.

What would we do with 700 million Chinese in Asia, if we conquered them? Would we doctor all of the radioactive and suffering people or let them gradually die while we talk about winning the war on poverty? If we try to prevent communism by winning the war on poverty that way, most of the people in the world would rather do it without our help. We would not do ourselves or them any good with all of that enormous expense and destruction.

We do not speak the Chinese language or read their writing. It would be difficult to distinguish individuals we could trust from those who would betray us.

What would we do with these Chinese prisoners and what would they do with the American prisoners? They have enough people to wreck our roads, cut off our supplies, and capture our men who cannot instantly change their features and language and escape unnoticed like natives.

Trying to shoot an idea like communism with a bullet is like shooting in the dark—we are almost sure to miss our target—and we might cause disaster unintentionally.

If GOLDWATER wants a war with Panama, Cuba, Zanzibar, Vietnam, China, minority races at home and abroad, let him do the fighting without our support.

Sincerely,

NATHAN L. BEATTY.

CHICAGO, ILL.,

June 23, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have read with gratification your repeated outright speeches in favor of a peaceful Asiatic policy.

For this reason I am herewith forwarding copy of my today's letter to President Johnson, in the hope that the peace voices may triumph.

Sincerely yours,

OTTO WANDER.

CHICAGO, June 23, 1964.

The Honorable L. B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As previously indicated, I consider our intervention in South Vietnam, Laos, etc., unwarranted and opposed to our national interest.

This intervention represents an undeclared war in which neither the Congress nor the people of the United States have been consulted. It is in violation of the Big Power agreement, reached after the evacuation by the French, looking toward a plebiscite to reconcile or unify North and South Vietnam. It is, furthermore in violation of good military policy which opposes involvement in continental Asia.

In this nuclear age a modus vivendi with mainland China must be found as the only alternative to eventual suicidal war.

I implore you, Mr. President, through your powers of diplomacy, to lift this cloud from our future and that of humanity.

Sincerely yours,

OTTO WANDER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

June 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree with you completely on your stand in southeast Asia. You have a lot of courage and history will

record the sane approach you have in world affairs of 1964.

The U.S. Government is trying to do what the French were unable to do in 1954. I'm afraid that the U.S. Government is heading for a situation similar to Korea in 1952 when our troops approached the Yalu River. The Chinese have millions of soldiers and I'm afraid that we may provoke Red China to attack our comparatively meager forces in southeast Asia.

Keep up the fight. Thinking Americans are behind you.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. MORRIS.

WESLEY METHODIST CHURCH,

Worcester, Mass., June 23, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I commend your efforts, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to make known the state of affairs that exist in Vietnam. Enclosed is a copy of a resolution passed by the New England Conference of the Methodist Church, June 11, 1964.

This resolution represents my own thinking as clearly as I can know it and I send it to you for whatever use it may be to you.

Most sincerely,

L. VANN ANDERSON, JR.,

Minister of the Parish.

[Enclosure]

Amendment to the report of the Board of Social Concerns found on pages 39 ff. Amendment by addition on page 43 under subheading "Direct conflict must be avoided". Amend by adding following paragraph to become paragraph 2.

In reference to the threat to the peace in South Vietnam, we would request our Government to place this dispute before the United Nations. This procedure would help implement the rule of law in international affairs, and would honor our Government's signature on the Charter of our United Nations. It would also enable our Government to keep faith with its professions of believing in the force of law rather than the law of force in settling international disputes.

Submitted by Mr. Dale S. Fair.

PERTH AMBOY, N.J.,

June 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am enclosing a letter in the Times which was designed and I hope succeeded in furthering your position in Vietnam.

Yours very truly,

DAVID MANDEL.

OPEN LETTER TO SECRETARY McNAMARA ON THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The New York Times of April 25, 1964 ran a story headed, "McNamara Agrees To Call It His War." You were quoted as saying, "I don't object to its being called 'McNamara's war.' I think it is a very important war and I am pleased to be identified with it and do whatever I can to win it."

No American should want a war in his own name, especially this one which is not yet licensed by Congress. Here it is worse too because the war is against an entire people. After 10 years of resistance to entire superior weapons, the people want it ended. And we need not fear to leave, for no puppets (not ours or China's) will rule this brave people.

The policy of the open door for investments and free enterprise which is back of our intervention is as dead as the old colonialism. Most of the free world nations under this policy are now dictatorships.

Under this policy we use the usual tools for coercion—bombs, bribery, billions, and

puppets. And our puppets are never George Washingtons—never.

Walter Lippmann (Apr. 9, 1964) compares us in our Asian policy to "one of those prehistoric animals which was all armor and teeth, but had almost no brain." But France learned the futility of trying to suppress a whole people right there in Vietnam. With the guns gone on both sides, our Khanh would not last a day.

Senator MORSE (Mar. 26, 1964) said, "If we are not an aggressor nation now in South Vietnam, we are not far from it * * * there are no Chinese in South Vietnam. There are no Russian soldiers in South Vietnam. The only foreign soldiers in South Vietnam are U.S. soldiers. What are they doing there?"

Senators BARTLETT, GRUENING, and MANSFIELD have all been critical of American policy in South Vietnam.

Prof. Roland Baintin, Yale Divinity School; Roger W. Burnham, Businessman, Milford, Conn.; Dr. Jerome Davis, New Haven; Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, Yale University; Rabbi Robert E. Goldberg, Hamden, Conn.; Rev. Sidney Lovett, Director, Yale in China Association; Prof. John Oliver Nelson, Yale Divinity School; Catherine G. Roraback, Attorney, New Haven; Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, Williams College; Rev. Wayne Shuttee, Unitarian Church, New Haven; Prof. Ralph E. Turner, Yale University; Rev. Wallace T. Viets, First Methodist Church, New Haven; Rev. Loyd Worley, Methodist Church, Milford, Conn.

(Cut out and send this letter to President Johnson.)

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,
New York, N.Y., June 23, 1964.
The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The President, the White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have written already to my New York State Senators urging that they support the policies suggested by Senators MORSE and GRUENING which could lead to a peaceful resolution of the dispute over Vietnam. Nevertheless, I was compelled to write to you at once by the report in the New York Times which stated that the administration's commitment to Vietnam was being viewed as unlimited.

Mr. President, I admire your repeated statements to the effect that you are willing to pursue peace by patient discussion with the Soviet Union. Furthermore, I recognize how astutely you have handled the difficult task of securing congressional support for the civil rights bill. If then, we are to accept your devotion to peace and political sagacity, how would we explain a continued, and indeed increased, commitment to a regime which our newspapers have admitted is oppressive and which can secure the backing of at most a quarter or 30 percent of its people and can control only approximately that proportion in daytime?

As a statesman-politician, you must realize that it is folly to make unlimited commitments to untenable positions. This fact is recognized abroad by our allies and at home by thoughtful Members of Congress. When the costs are apparent, it will be recognized by virtually all our people. Before we are engulfed in a widened war of our own making—which may devour our country in nuclear war—before we alienate all the world by continued pursuit of an ill-considered policy, we urge that you follow a policy worthy of your statesmanship which will lead our Nation to peace, as candidate Eisenhower promised and later carried out in the Korean cul de sac.

Respectfully yours,
EDWIN S. CAMPBELL.

PENNSYLVANIA LUMBER & POST CO., INC.
La Vale, Md., June 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are to be congratulated on almost your lone stand on the southeast Asia situation. You may stand largely alone from a Government standpoint but I venture the assertion if the American people were to vote on it your support would be overwhelming. "A prophet is with honor save in his own country."
Respectfully,

W. H. SOLOMON.
BAYSIDE, N.Y.,
June 23, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your timely warning against deeper involvement in southeast Asia was well taken and to the point. I just hope that it will not remain a lone voice in the wilderness.

We seem to be drifting closer and closer to war and there is an absolute conspiracy of silence. Is there no effective way to lodge a protest against this development, to see to it that the protest is heard in places where it counts? As an example, your latest warning was given absolute minimum publicity in New York—I heard it exactly once on the radio.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN STRAUSS.
WOODSIDE, CALIF.,
June 17, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you on your recent speech opposing our extension of the war in Vietnam. As usual, you have stood up and spoken sense on an issue in which the majority seems to go headlong into an irresponsible path. Your speech was cogent, to the point and full of factual information about a dangerous and explosive situation. To continue on our present course is not only immoral, it is dangerous and almost certain to end in disaster. I most sincerely hope our leadership will pay no heed to the screams of the lunatics on the right who would shoot from the hip without giving any thought to the consequences of their actions. I want you to know that there are many thoughtful Americans who support your position strongly.

With best personal wishes, I am,
Cordially yours,
HENRY MAYER, M.D.
MIAMI BEACH, FLA.,
June 17, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: You are, without a doubt, a great American. I heard your statement on television and read about your views on South Vietnam.

What on earth is Johnson thinking about? I thought he was supposed to be such a smart politician. But he is going to lose the Democrats millions of votes by getting us, at best, into another Korea or, at worst, another bomb war.

Does he really believe he can bluff China and that Russia will not come to China's aid?

If Johnson is going to do what it looks like he is going to do, I cannot vote for him. If I'm still alive and not a victim of an atom holocaust. I hate GOLDWATER but if Johnson persists in this madness, I will not vote.

Again let me tell how much I admire and respect you. You should be our President.
Sincerely,

EWEN FOSTER.
P.S.—I am writing to all my Congressmen, Senators, and the President.

HERMOSA BEACH, CALIF.,
June 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want you to know that we wholeheartedly support your efforts to keep our country from plunging further into war in southeast Asia.

You are performing a great service to the American people in alerting us to the possibility that our Government is preparing a major war behind the scenes.

We know that many other Americans share with you the belief that there must be an alternative to war as the solution to international conflict.

Our best wishes for your courageous work in trying to save our country from this disgrace.

Yours very truly,
MORRIS HOROWITZ,
JOYCE C. HOROWITZ,
WHITTIER, CALIF.,
June 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to enclose a copy of an advertisement which appeared in our local paper last week. We were discussing this and thought that you might like to see it because of your splendid work in trying to end this senseless war in Vietnam.

My husband and I are Quakers and work with the American Friends Service Committee and we often look to you for leadership in so many fields of legislative work. We just wish there were about a dozen "WAYNE MORGES."

Please do keep up your work in trying to seek a creative solution for the Vietnam destruction. What do you think about a neutralization according to the Geneva plan? Would this be possible?

Cordially yours,
DORIS MILLS.

[From the Whittier (Calif.) News, June 17, 1964]

"Two recent South Vietnamese napalm bombings, which fall into the brutal category, have grievously hurt the U.S. image throughout the world. One was widely dramatized by the publication of an Associated Press photograph on March 20 which showed a child in his father's arms, badly burned by air-launched, jellied, gasoline bombs which had fired a Vietnamese village. Publication of the AP photo resulted in the U.S. Defense Department's acknowledging for the first time that napalm has been furnished South Vietnam—under the military aid program, and that it has been dropped by Vietnamese planes provided by U.S. assistance plan.

"[Washington Post, Mar. 29, 1964]
"DO YOU APPROVE?"

"Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, March 25, 1964:

"We should never have gone in there, we should not have stayed in, we should get out now."

"Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska:
"The time has come to reverse our policy of undertaking to defend areas such as South Vietnam. A return of troops to our own shores should begin."

"Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana:
"There has not been and there does not exist today a basis in our national interest which would justify the assumption of primary American responsibility in this situation which might well involve the sacrifice of a vast number of American lives."

"Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, March 30, 1964:

"By what right did the Secretary of Defense go over to South Vietnam and pledge U.S. support for a "thousand years, if necessary," in behalf of the American people. He had no such right. The American people should answer him in no uncertain terms."

"Whittier Peace Council recommends immediate withdrawal of all American forces from southeast Asia and urges settlement of the war by the 14-nation Geneva Conference of 1962 under the auspices of the United Nations.

"Write President Johnson, Senator KUCHEL, Senator ENGLE—today. This message is brought to you by the Whittier Peace Council and the following groups:

"Whittier Chapter American Association for the United Nations, Peace and Service Committee—First Friends Church, Whiteleaf Monthly Meeting of Friends, Whittier Friends Unprogramed Meeting, Whittier Area Women Strike for Peace, Whittier La Mirada Unitarian Fellowship.

"For further information—or to help defray cost of this ad—please send requests and contributions to: Whittier Peace Council, 821 East Sunrise Drive, Whittier, Calif."

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept the appreciation of an old lady for your courage. Some of my 82 years I have spent in leisurely, uncondemned travel in all continents except Australia. I remember the political campaign of 1896. I voted Democratic first in 1932. In 1960 I could vote for neither. In 1964? The belief in civil rights and anti-poverty legislation is contradicted by our foreign policy.

Respectfully,

FLORENCE R. SCHOLL.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
June 21, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This headline appeared on the front page of the San Francisco Chronicle this morning: "U.S. Would Risk War in Asia" with the following opening paragraph:

"United Press, Taipei. Adm. Harry D. Felt said yesterday that the United States is willing to risk an all-out war to check Communist aggression in southeast Asia."

Is this top military officer speaking for the administration or making administration policy? No man speaks for us who is willing to risk nuclear war for any purpose whatsoever.

In fact, we consider the continued presence of U.S. military forces in South Vietnam constitutes an immediate threat of nuclear war.

We agree with Senators like MORSE, GRUENING, MANSFIELD, and AIKEN that we should get out of Vietnam—and the sooner, the safer for the world.

Keep up the good fight.

Cordially yours,

Mr. and Mrs. FRANK R. KENNEL.

ROWAYTON, CONN.,
June 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You are a refreshing island of integrity and courage. Please don't lose heart.

I wish, too, that you would emphasize what would be the outcome if we do go ahead with our grandiose and arrogant plans—at best, another Korea; at worst, a nuclear holocaust, and our country thenceforth would make Nazi Germany appear sweet smelling by comparison.

Sincerely yours,

A. I. LEVINE, M.D.

BAYSIDE, N.Y.,
June 21, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I admire your opposition to sending our troops to Vietnam. I am afraid that the troops will be sent in force nevertheless. And I am completely

frustrated not to be able to do anything about it except to write the President.

Perhaps I go beyond your position. Not only would unilateral fighting in Vietnam (South or North) be a criminal act because of the illegality, but the more so since the fighting would be for the purpose of crushing what appears to be a genuinely popular revolutionary movement, if I can believe the long series of dispatches by David Halberstam in the New York Times.

With a compliant populace and a Republican opposition that would applaud such an intervention and with only a handful of persons of conscience like yourself, what is to stop the President?

It seems that a lot of Americans are going to be dying for the incredible purpose of bringing misery and death to an already wretched people and for the purpose of thwarting that people's will.

Yours very truly,

LAWRENCE D. HOCHMAN.

PLAINFIELD, N.J.,
June 24, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was horrified last night when I heard the news that Gen. Maxwell Taylor is to replace Ambassador Lodge, confirming the rumors that we are going to be more belligerent in southeast Asia.

Thank goodness, when you were interviewed, you expressed alarm at this prospect. Before this I've felt I should write to let you know that I highly approved of your recommendation that we seek to keep the peace in that sensitive area by negotiation, not by military might, and find a solution under the United Nations Charter procedures.

More power to you and Senator FULBRIGHT and the others who are calling for a review of our foreign policy. We can't travel two directions at once. If we want peace we must use peaceful means.

Hopefully yours,

KATHERINE VANDERBEEK.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
June 23, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I agree with you thoroughly on the President's choice of General Taylor as the new Ambassador to South Vietnam, and wish you well in your efforts to block confirmation of the appointment.

Respectfully yours,

WALLACE DAILEY.

JUNE 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you on your opinion regarding our present policy in Vietnam. I am in accord with those who feel that any help we give should be economic and that our military forces should be withdrawn. I don't feel that either we or our opponents could win another war.

Sincerely yours,

GRACE M. LEALTAD.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
June 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are so right. We should have never gotten into this dirty war in Laos and Vietnam. There must be some honorable way to stop the fighting and start negotiating and pull back from the brink.

Bless you.

DOROTHY KUNKLE.

JUNE 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I am not from your State, but feel impelled to write you, after reading your statement in Time magazine and hearing you on TV on our involvement in Asia. I,

too, am much concerned and want to voice my protest, although it will be like the "voice crying in the wilderness." How in heaven's name can we cure the many ills of the world—alone at that—in countries so divided among themselves, so indifferent and in such a chaotic state. Many of those countries have expressed dislike for us and want us to leave. To risk a world war for those countries is unthinkable to me, and I resent with every ounce of me, every soldier lost over there. Nothing I've read has made any sense as to why we are there, except for material gain, and even if those countries are lost to the Communists, we can still live. We seem to be getting along, even though we have Russia, Cuba, and other countries in that category.

My husband fought to save Europe in the First World War—my son-in-law in the Second—but I'm blest if I want my grandson trying to save Asia. Let us save ourselves first, and here in this hemisphere. "What profit a man to gain the world if he loses his soul."

Sincerely,

MARJORIE BUCHANAN.

SCARSDALE, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On the radio on Saturday, I heard a commentator state, "We will risk a war with China in order to preserve the peace." How casual can one get about annihilation?

On a David Brinkley 1-hour showing of an average town, three women and a man were asked how they felt about dropping an atomic bomb and the general consensus was, "Sure drop it and let's get it over with." Don't these people know anything? Bless you for your wonderful support of peaceful alternatives in southeast Asia.

Sincerely,

BLANCHE H. POSNER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
June 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D.C.:

Bravo for your statement on southeast Asia. War with China is unthinkable.

Mr. and Mrs. A. TUBARSKY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations strong stand against extending war southeast Asia. Many supporters here. Continue fight for peace.

DONALD FATON.

PARAMOUNT, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: People of this country should not be forced to choose between a Johnson war and a Goldwater war or what have you. A war with Red China which seems to be in the making as you yourself have been quoted to have said could easily accelerate into a East-West thermonuclear war.

B. H. LIVINGSTON.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank heaven for your voice in Congress, long may it be raised.

MIMA STERNE.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We do not support war in southeast Asia.
Urge use of United Nations.

Dr. and Mrs. TED J. GOLDSTEIN.

PASADENA, CALIF.,
June 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your courage in opposing
the war plans in South Vietnam.

Dr. and Mrs. WILLIAM A. MUSGRAVE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Sending this to you because I fear screen-
ing from President Johnson's notice. Am in
full accord with your views on South Viet-
nam. The administration is showing very
blind expediency in reaction to the loud
no-nothings who are trying to change U.S.A.
policy and image.

Mrs. ETHEL D. KING.

JUNE 2, 1964.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR,
Los Angeles Times,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR SIR: Those who think we should
continue the war in Vietnam should have
read the story in the Los Angeles Times
April 16, 1964—"Maimed, Scarred Child
Victims of Vietnam War Horrify Doctor."

Dr. Ellmore, well known in southern Cali-
fornia, tells us that there are only 800
trained doctors in South Vietnam; 600 of
these are in the army, leaving 200 doctors to
serve 15 million people. (By contrast, a pro-
posed community, Laguna Hills, near Los
Angeles, will have 500 doctors for the resi-
dents of 18,000 homes.)

Dr. Ellmore says there is not one plastic
surgeon in the country though many are
needed. We provide white phosphorus,
trinitrotulene, and other kinds of bombs.
If a civilian loses part of his face in a
grenade explosion, or has his skin burned
off he stays that way.

Dr. Ellmore did not say, but it is known
that our military activities in Vietnam cost
us \$2 million a day and that this and 17,000
American troops are not enough, for our
position has become steadily worse. We
have lost the people in that miserable coun-
try. Love and victory cannot be won by
herding millions of people into barbed wire
"strategic hamlets" and bulldozing their
villages and spraying their animals and
crops with insecticides. Our Army advisers
complain that the Vietnamese army does
not fight with spirit and sometimes refuses
to fight at all. I shouldn't wonder.

The policy of Madame Nhu and her hus-
band led us this far. Will the policy of
Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh lead us to world
war III? I believe that this thing we are
doing in Vietnam is immoral and indecent.
I agree with U.S. Senators WAYNE MORSE,
ERNEST GRUENING, and MIKE MANSFIELD that
we should stop it.

WORDEN C. McDONALD.

EL MONTE, CALIF.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
June 23, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator, Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HONORABLE SIR: For several years I
haven't thought too good of you, not since
you became a Democrat and started a boiler
factory noise against the Republicans who
honored you previously.

But, of late I note you are going straight
to the folly of our being in a war in Vietnam,
and letting the President know it. The folly
of our being in about every quarrel in the
world, armies here and there accomplishing
but little or nothing of good, are thoughts
the common citizen should resolve. Our
President and those about him will do noth-
ing other than get more deeply involved.
Also the overdoing foreign aid goes on apace.

Yes, I'm still a Republican and hope to
vote for BARRY come November. I'm not a
"Nervous Nellie" in politics.

Respectfully,

JOHN W. REEVES.

DETROIT, MICH.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Unequivocally support your position on
southeast Asia. Keep the pressure on.

E. J. GEHRINGER.

[From the Plain Dealer, June 18, 1964]

NEED: AN APPROACH TO END THE WAR IN
VIETNAM—AN OPEN LETTER TO THE U.S.
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The United States is a foreign party to a
civil war in Vietnam. Fifteen thousand U.S.
uniformed personnel have been committed
to the battle. Casualties include American
soldiers.

Acceleration of the American war effort in
South Vietnam invites increased aid by
China to the Communist Vietnamese. Step-
ping up the war effort risks the use by either
side of nuclear arms. Nuclear war offers no
victory.

What is the alternative?

Negotiation is urged by Senator Wayne
Morse, Senator Ernest Gruening, Columnist
Walter Lippmann, and others. Recognizing
it takes both sides to make peace, we urge
our Government to initiate a conference of
nations to guarantee a neutral Vietnam.

We support U.S. efforts to insure enforce-
ment of agreements. The United Nations
can assist direct negotiation. Inspection
teams must be free to operate wherever
needed. They can be backed by frontier
patrols.

The best guarantee of enforcement is the
mutual advantage of the agreement. The
goal is a Vietnam whose independence is
guaranteed and respected.

Robert R. Archer, Professor; Raymond S.
Beard, Business Counselor; Marguerite S.
Bellamy, Housewife; Keith C. Bill-
man, Social Worker; Evelyn A. Black-
burn, Insurance Agent; Isabel N. Bliss,
Homemaker; William M. Bliss, Engi-
neer; Edith O. Brashares, College In-
structor; Edwin A. Brown, Minister;
Rilma Buckman, Sociologist; Bronson
P. Clark, Businessman; Sheldon D.
Clark, Lawyer; Lila Cornell, Home-
maker; Marie F. Cotton, Homemaker;
Wendell P. Cotton, Salesman; Natalie
C. Crouter, Housewife; Elfrieda S.
Daiber, Secretary; Alan J. Davis, Min-
ister; Hortense M. Davis, Teacher; Jack
G. Day, Lawyer; Steven Deutsch, Uni-
versity Faculty; Mort Epstein, De-
signer; Gail R. Gann, Homemaker;
Donald S. Gann, Surgeon; Joel M.
Garver, Lawyer; Paul Gitlin, Social
Worker; Henry Gluck, Psychologist;
William F. Hellmuth, Jr., Professor;
Arnold A. Herzog, Lawyer; Fred Husa,
Office Worker; Sidney D. Josephs, Busi-
nessman; Mrs. Harry Kirtz, Home-
maker; Waldo H. Kliever, Consultant;
Dennis G. Kuby, Minister; Jerome
Landfield, College Professor.

Ada N. Leffingwell, Homemaker; George
Levinger, Educator; John P. Marhevka,
Male Hair Stylist; Mrs. Edward A.
Marshall, Homemaker; Charles R.
Miller, Lawyer; Paul I. Miller, Profes-

sor; Hans F. Mueller, Retired; Laura
Mueller, Homemaker; Sarah B. Nenner,
Housewife; James M. Newman, Ad-
vertising; Paul Olynk, Professor;
Clyde Onyett, Public Relations; Wil-
liam W. Outland, Order Analyst;
Samuel Prellwitz, Industrial Research;
Harold J. Quigley, Minister; Willard C.
Richan, Educator; Eldon P. Roe, Mer-
chant; Marian Rosenberg, Social
Worker; Ralph Rudd, Lawyer; Audrey
Sabadosh, Librarian; Nicholas Saba-
dosh, Teacher; Wilmer L. Satterthwait,
Painter; Vera A. Schwartz, Legal Secre-
tary; A. L. Sherwin, Lawyer; Frank
Spigel, Lawyer; Benjamin Spock,
Physician; Sam Sponseller, Retired;
Vera Smisek, Teacher; Oscar H. Steiner,
Businessman; Helen Stewart, High
School Counselor; Edward A. Taubert,
Photographer; Warren E. Thompson,
Educator; Hugh Tyson, Graduate Stu-
dent; Harry O. Way, Bacteriologist.

NEW YORK CITY,
June 20, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I know you are al-
most alone in your efforts to bring a sense
of sanity to the growing bad situation in
Vietnam and to the extreme views being
spread by the Secretary of Defense and his
aids that it is necessary to consider what
further steps we should take so that we may
not "lose the nonactive" war we are con-
ducting in Vietnam, which you have desig-
nated as "McNamara's war."

You may have noticed Mr. Max Frankel's
article on the front page of the New York
Times this morning which is quite disturb-
ing. It would appear that even threats of
war are so close to the actual start of war
that I am at a loss to see where the "as-
sent of Congress is being given any thought by
the administration and its supporters under
the Constitution. The loss of so many
Americans in our "assistance program"—
termed nonmilitary by some—is, as you have
said, unconstitutional.

The support that you deserve in your ef-
forts to bring an end to this situation is
too little.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID LEVINE.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.

SENATOR MORSE: Lately I have been read-
ing very short remarks in the local press
referring to your opposition to the adminis-
tration's southeast Asian policy. I too
strongly oppose our country's position which
is a stupid continuation of the same mis-
takes which cost us such terrible defeats in
China, Cuba, and in countless other areas.
The United States has a revolutionary his-
tory and yet we have become the opponent
to modern revolution. It is time for our
country to recognize that the revolutionary
aspirations of the world's underdeveloped
peoples are not necessarily Communist in-
spired or controlled—these movements do
become Communist controlled after all other
democratic and socialist elements are de-
stroyed by the reactionary governments
which we continue to aid and support.

There seems to be a virtual "blackout" on
your statements—the press has not seen fit
to carry any details about your speeches.
Would you kindly send to me any pertinent
information.

Keep up the good work.

ALAN L. OLMSTEAD.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
June 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR MORSE: I reread your
statement on the war in South Vietnam, and
I would like to express my admiration
and support for your stand. Unfortunately

many people are not familiar with all the facts, and therefore I especially appreciated your informative speech.

I am deeply concerned about the expansion of this disastrous war and the loss of so many lives. I hope you will continue your efforts to bring the question of aggression to the United Nations and so reach a peaceful solution. I also wonder what we, or plain citizens, can do to prevent a further spread of this war?

Respectfully yours,

HERTA MAYER.

OAKLAND, CALIF., June 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is news item in this morning's San Francisco Chronicle which I am sure will interest you. Yesterday's Oakland Tribune owned by William Knowland also carried the same article.

Thank God that we have an outstanding champion in the U.S. Senator who has the courage to speak out against these warmongers, and I wish you would take this article to the floor of the Senate and try to silence these canille—who like the war dogs, trained to war, know nothing except war and are not satisfied until they give the world its last blood bath.

Respectfully,

ALFRED MARTIN.

P.S.—Would you try to ask the President how he can reconcile his noble sentiments for "Peace and an end to the threat of nuclear destruction" (No. 1, right column) with Admiral Felt's declaration that the United States "is willing to risk an all-out war to check Communist aggression" etc.?

I wish these warmongering admirals and generals would speak for themselves only and leave we the people alone.

What's wrong with taking up these matters in the United Nations—which was organized for just such purpose?

Let's stop the military before they stop life on earth.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We applaud your speeches on foreign policy. We also support your every effort, to find a peaceful solution to that unjust war in Vietnam; through negotiations, let us terminate our involvement there.

To save your energy, time and money, we do not expect you to reply.

Yours very sincerely,

MARIA KOVAC.

WEST ACTON, MASS.,

June 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Some weeks ago, your office sent me, at my request, a copy of your speech in the Senate which dealt with the history of the southeast Asia conflict. I have now had an opportunity to read this material in full, and I must say that I am very grateful indeed to you for compiling this most remarkable document. It is certainly unfortunate that your speech went so little noticed in the press.

About the mistakes of the past of course there can be no complete rectification. Secretary Dulles policy of "brinkmanship" made many shudder at the time. But just now, the administration is following this very policy to the hilt; indeed it was clearly delineated as such in the recent article by W. W. Rostow in the New York Times magazine (a singularly depressing document, in my opinion).

We of the public at large can indeed be grateful for the very few voices in Washington, like yourself and Senator GRUENING; but if there are similar voices within the administration, they evidently have been hushed (even, to the dismay of all of us, Ambassador Stevenson). And Senator FULBRIGHT's speech of not very long ago on foreign policy was as weak on southeast Asia as it was good on Cuba.

My thanks again for the copy of your speech.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. BARLOW.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

June 20, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The increasing belligerency of the United States in Laos and Vietnam is terrifying. Can you tell me what on earth is so important down there? Is there some American millionaire who owns real estate there? Is there some great natural resource secretly promised to an American corporation? Is there any conceivable reason why the American people should take a 50-50 chance on their present survival to prevent the development of a million-to-one chance against their future survival? Is this country going crazy or has it always been that way?

For God's sake, you must do more to prevent this. Not that you haven't done plenty, but who else is there?

Sincerely,

ROGER W. BOWEN.

GLENDALE, CALIF.,

June 16, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I was glad to see in today's papers where you had a confrontation with Dean Rusk and Senator FULBRIGHT on the Vietnam situation.

McNamara and FULBRIGHT have been in the area several times, and know that the Chinese are ready to pour thousands of troops into the country, the same as they did in Korea, and yet we continue to give aid in increasing amounts.

You have been urging that we get out and leave the country to the Chinese. We are too far away for our leaders to know what they are doing.

Best wishes in your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

FRED D. GIBBS.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,

June 16, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to wholeheartedly endorse your position on our continued military involvement in South Vietnam and hope you will continue your efforts for a more rational policy in that critical area.

Sincerely,

JERRY FISH.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I wish to commend and encourage you for your brave and courageous stand on the southeast Asia situation. Few have had the integrity to take this much-needed stand. We have been reading your speeches and other sources of information on Vietnam and feel with you that the United States is waging a highly unpopular war which may escalate into a nuclear war.

If that course is hopefully averted, you will have played a significant part.

Sincerely,

MARILYN VITTOR.

ABERDEEN, WASH.,

June 16, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in complete accord with your views on southeast Asia. Under no circumstances must we become involved in a war that's none of our business. Under the United Nations Charter no outside country has a right to interfere in a civil war. We would not permit Russia or China in Mexico or Canada without becoming terribly alarmed and take immediate drastic action. Our present action could provoke similar reaction from them with a serious danger of global war resulting.

Yours truly,

Mrs. P. HANNUK.

P.S.—Keep up the good fight, we need more men of your caliber.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

June 16, 1964.

To the EDITOR, THE MAIL BAG,
The St. Paul Pioneer Press-Dispatch,
St. Paul, Minn.:

I agree with Senator MORSE, of Oregon, that the United States should withdraw its military forces from South Vietnam, and discontinue its aggressive acts in that area. Young American men are being killed there; it is a war without a declaration by Congress as provided by our Constitution. Most of the major countries signed the 1954 Geneva Treaty which provided for free elections. Almost immediately, the Eisenhower administration supported hated Diem family dictatorship who would not allow free elections. After the Diem dictatorship was overthrown, a military dictatorship took its place which the United States is still supporting.

Many freedom loving people in Europe and South America cannot understand why our so-called democracy can support foreign dictatorships all over the world. The answer can be found by examining the interests of big business that controls the Government in Washington. Their greedy plan has but one purpose, foreign markets and profits. If they can control the sea routes and large land areas, they can grab and hold most of the world markets. If a few American boys get killed and the taxpayer gets "soaked" in carrying out his plan does not bother the big capitalist.

J. OSBORNE.

BASKING RIDGE, N.J.,

June 18, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The brevity of this communication does not represent the concern I have about our policy in Vietnam.

I am in full agreement with the suggestions made by you and Senator GRUENING as this situation threatens world peace. As a member of the U.N., it should be placed before that organization. It is a wise and mature man or government that can change its mind when it finds it is wrong.

Sincerely,

WINIFRED J. HEARN.

PRESQUE ISLE,

June 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I understand there is serious discussion of extending the Vietnam war to North Vietnam, which would be a terrible thing to do.

You have consistently fought against unwise and unnecessary war through all the

years, and I appeal to you to do your utmost to help prevent this unnecessary extension of the terrible war in Vietnam. More power to you.

Yours sincerely,

GRACE S. HUSSEY.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
June 17, 1964.

DEAR SIR: It was a breath of fresh air to hear your views of southeast Asia. It was a courageous and intelligent statement in my opinion. With the air so full of hate and ignorance, your views stand out as forthright and wise. You may take some abuse for your statements now but the future will show your wisdom, I am sure.

Sincerely,

CHARLES RISHIER.

CHARLESTON, W. VA.,
June 19, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Just a note to tell you I have up until recently been a registered independent Republican politically, but I want to say to you I stand 100 percent with you in your fight to cut out this foreign aid gimmick which the executive branch of the Government is always wanting.

It's time we quit allowing the President to engage in wars without the constitutional provision which gives Congress this authority alone. Congress has abdicated in many respects its duties and responsibilities to the people. It's time we quit making our boys sitting ducks for enemy snipers. It's time we cut off all aid to our enemies abroad whose only interest is what they can get out of us. It's time we made other nations stand on their own lazy bottoms. How much longer our people are going to pour their money into Washington, no one knows. Most of us hope a revolt if it comes will be a peaceful one but we may need a police state in many ways if these giveaway policies are continued.

Keep up the fight to stamp out this damnable racket before we become bankrupt ourselves. The American people need some consideration, which is and has been woefully lacking in the past.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH W. BURTON.

DEMOCRATS OF NEW YORK,
June 19, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SIR: The people of our country are against sending groundtroops (our boys) to Asia. We agree with you to get our boys out of Asia lock, stock, and barrel, where it is none of our business. The people of our country depend upon smart Senators like yourself to see that we do not get into traps such as Vietnam and Laos, etc.

Respectfully,

DEMOCRATS OF NEW YORK.

CUERNAVACA, MORELOS, MEXICO,
June 16, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I cannot begin to tell you how grateful I am to you for sending me the reprints of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS containing your speeches in the Senate on: "McNamara's War in Vietnam," "The Foreign Policy of the United States," and "Is An American Protectorate in Asia Worth War"?

I only regret that it was not printed in the entire U.S. press throughout the country because many millions were deprived of access to the truth.

I cannot begin to tell you how much I admire your courage as an apostle of the truth. It is indeed a pity that the two Washington newspapers did not have the courage to bring your message of truth at least to the people of Washington. It is a pity too that there is not even one among the wealthy magnates of the United States who could see the need of using some of their tax-free money, as does Hunt of the Life Line, to counteract his pollution of the air with poisonous propaganda, by bringing to the people, at least from time to time, excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of the speeches of Senator WAYNE MORSE on the vital issues of world peace and the needless sacrifice of American youth in South Vietnam.

If only the American people had access to your messages of the truth beyond the boundaries of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS. If only there was an organization to undertake mailing millions of reprints of your messages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, over the heads of the newspapers' "cordon sanitaire" who do not find it "fit to print" the truth.

The Life Line will die a slow death in years to come but your message, dear Senator MORSE, will continue to embrace more and more people and will remain a living monument through the future historians for generations.

May God give you many, many years of good health to carry on your apostolic work in the U.S. Senate. May all your nights of sleep be, as you said in your speech: "I sleep much more comfortably knowing that I have raised my voice again in a plea for taking the problem to the United Nations."

However, even if your speeches should only reach a small number of people who apply for it to your office, they all must become inspired by you, as I am, to carry your message and reach as many others as possible, either by word of mouth, by sharing the obtained text from you, or both.

Sincerely,

BERNARD DOHN.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I are very glad that there is someone of your stature who will speak up and express the opinions of most of the people who concern themselves over our country's action in South Vietnam. You are so very right.

We do not seem to have a Senator in our State who will favor international law and order through U.N. action.

I feel a bit safer knowing that there is one Senator who is unafraid of the military and willing to go along with the feelings of the majority of Democrats.

Sincerely,

Mrs. H. PACKARD.

SKOKIE, ILL.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Your brutally frank statement Tuesday regarding the United States and world peace may meet with much public disapproval, but it was a needed jolt.

You are not my Senator, but I sincerely wish you were. If I ever move to Oregon, you will be the reason.

Sincerely yours,

WILFRED COUZIN.

WESTERN SPRINGS, ILL.,
June 24, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Again (yesterday) you spoke out warningly against our growing military involvement in Vietnam. I can only commend you for your vision and

try to speak the same truths in my own circle of acquaintances. May power develop from the repeated expressions of these truths. And may enough time remain.

Sincerely yours,

AMY C. MERZ.

EVANSTON, ILL.,
June 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree with you wholeheartedly on the South Vietnam situation and am writing a letter to the President to say the same. It is ridiculous to be in this thing on our own and heading toward war when the U.N. is the proper agency to handle these things and keep peace. It looks as though the administration is letting the Goldwater-type Republicans bug it into this type of action—and the trigger-happy Armed Forces.

Please exert all your influence to put this where it belongs.

Sincerely,

MARCIA K. TATE.

WESLEYVILLE, PA.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I heard you on "This Is Today," Hugh Down's program. You were so right about South Vietnam. John Foster Dulles was a fake as Secretary of State. You mentioned England, Australia, New Zealand, France, and other countries who got out. Why not the United States? I for one want you as Senator to press your voice in this matter, because of Red China and Russia. They will intervene if the going gets tough. You mentioned Australia doubling their force from 30 to 60 men, what about the United Nations handling this delicate situation? You mentioned France losing 240,000 men in southeast Asia. They got out. Why? Because you said the United States wants to police Asia. It can't be done. So you are so right about our troops in that troubled area. Yes, they could knock the Vietcong out of business but then you got Red China to deal with. Please advise President Johnson of the peril. You also said they put Max Taylor in as Ambassador and he will stir things up because of his war record.

Thank you Senator MORSE for your splendid speech. I knew you would be for getting out of Vietnam.

Yours respectfully,

M. R. SULLIVAN,
A Veteran.

MOUNT JOY, PA.,
June 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The views you expressed today on the NBC "Today" program were like a breath of fresh air on a muggy day. We are very concerned over the increasing power of the Pentagon in domestic and foreign policy. We heartedly endorse your sane ideas in this matter.

Respectfully,

Rev. and Mrs. WM. W. LONGENECKER.

HARTSDALE, N.Y.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Heard you on TV program "Today" and just want you to know that I am (and I am sure millions of other U.S. citizens) with you in your attitude toward the southeast Asian situation and our involvement in it. I greatly admire you

for your courageous stand. More power to you.

Sincerely yours,

WM. F. STROBEL.

SHARON, MASS.,
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard you this morning on the Today show, and all I can say is "Thank God" for you. All the women I talk to are very frightened at the escalating war threat, and I know hundreds of thousands of mothers are praying that the insane trends will be reversed.

Do you think that the women of the country could appeal to the United Nations somehow?

I pray that you will get the response to your appeal, in the millions.

We mothers dread to think that we raise our sons, send them to school to train them to be useful members of society only to have them die in some jungle thousands of miles away, for what we don't know.

Please Senator MORSE continue to speak out. You seem to be our only hope.

Sincerely,

JEANNE R. LANDEY.

BRIGHTON, MASS.,
June 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bravo for your position in attacking the appointment of General Taylor in South Vietnam. This furthers the militarist image of the United States. Please continue your stand on other controversial issues also. You have a brave spirit.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. TARPEY.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

HON. SENATOR MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Please accept my deepest gratitude and respect for your courageous statement against the war in South Vietnam and that the problem be handed over to the U.N. where it belongs. This country has never been in greater need of men like you than at the present time.

I feel like moving to Oregon so I could vote for you in the next election.

K. A. ELIASSEN.

GLENDALE, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for speaking out strongly against our Government's reckless and rash policy in Vietnam, Laos, and the other Far Eastern countries. I feel so deeply that it is aggressive, and morally wrong for our country to take such a step. It is very frustrating to be one of the masses in days such as these, with no alternative but to stand idly by and watch our Government make such a tragic ill-advised decision. Aside from writing letters which I am sure in many cases never get read, what can we do? Thank you again for always speaking out clearly and without party bias. If we had more men with your honesty and wisdom, we would perhaps not be standing at the brink of world war III.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. MARILYN ELLIS.

BRONXVILLE, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Whenever I hear you speak I feel like the sun has suddenly come out from behind a dark, thick cloud.

I hope you will read my letter.

You are so right about Asia. I have wondered about the military and our foreign policy too.

Since our son will soon be drafted, I have watched with horror—U.S. people being killed in Asia. Whenever I speak about how

angry I shall be if he is sent to Asia, everyone speaks up with the same feelings. People are frustrated about our policy but afraid to say anything. There is a slow rising anger developing.

If we must use the Army for a WPA, let's use it at home. They can build swimming pools, recreation centers for the middle class, better housing for the aged, bicycle paths, etc.

Armies are used for peace needs in other countries, let's do it here. The boys can learn Army discipline and defense methods but they can improve many needs too.

Boredom is a great developer of misdeeds. We are going to have great chaos and delinquency very soon if we do not do something about opportunities for body development and just plain fun.

Automation will soon rob men and youth of employment. Its coming so fast the readjustment period cannot be handled without all-out effort now to channel energies toward physical and emotional outlets of another kind.

Keep up the good work. You are a brave man.

Mrs. MYRTLE TJERANDSEN.

EAST ORANGE, N.J.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your clear remarks on the "Today" program concerning Vietnam.

We should bring all our troops home from that postage-stamp-sized country immediately. Any who wants war with China is an idiot.

We should declare a month of mourning for our young men who have died in that country and should hang all flags at half mast during that period. These men have died for nothing.

As you say, our intervention in Vietnam is against our Constitution and the United Nations.

There is just one point on which I disagree with you. If the Republicans win in November, the intervention in Vietnam—if it is not by then a war—will not get worse.

Remember, World War I, World War II, and the Korean war were all the fault of a Democratic administration.

It was a Democratic President who ordered the nuclear bombs to be dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the only atom bombs, up to this point, that have ever been dropped on people.

I am a Republican—as you used to be—and I hope that BARRY GOLDWATER gets the nomination. He is the only one who has a chance to beat Johnson.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. M. D. CLAUDER.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

HONORABLE SIR: We saw you this morning on the "Today" show and were very much impressed by your views on our foreign policy. Yours is the only right and honest attitude. We want peace and we won't get it unless more of our Congressmen back up your position.

How can the people help?

Respectfully yours,

THELMA and DAVID KAGAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I have just watched the "Today" show and listened with respect to your remarks. We support your position and know you are correct when you say that the majority of

Americans object to the prospect of a war in Vietnam where we do not belong. May you continue to use your lonely voice to acquaint more people with the truth of the situation and it is our fervent hope that millions rally to your side. Again, thank you for speaking for us. I would vote for you for President, believe me.

Cordially,

DORIS J. SIEGEL.

HATHOME, MASS.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon:

Today on television you put your finger on the whole trouble in Vietnam as far as the United States is concerned—that is—that we are fighting without having declared war and therefore each soldier is being forced to fight a war on his own initiative.

By all means I say that the U.S. President should take the issue to the United Nations. If this policy continues we could have more of a dictatorship in this country than we think.

Sincerely,

MAURICE QUIMBY.

JACK'S HEALTH CENTER,
West Palm Beach, Fla., June 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: We want you to know that we are very happy to have heard you so earnestly and effectively express the opinions relative to South Vietnam this morning on the "Today" program.

We have written to President Johnson to this effect and hope and pray that more Americans are doing the same.

Much can be said but we shall stop here, in deep gratitude to you.

Sincerely,

JACK SOLOMON.
ROSE SOLOMON.

MONTICELLO, N.Y.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I saw you on TV ("Today" program) this morning and liked what you said and how you said it. I almost wish you may be a candidate for the Presidency.

Sincerely,

JACK FRANK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your courageous stand on our war in southeast Asia arouses our admiration. If our country continues to do what it is doing, we fear that it will eventually destroy itself and the world, besides the moral issue involved.

Keep up the good work, and we will inform as many people as we can of your position on this question.

Respectfully,

JACK and SYLVIA R. PRIMACK.

GLENDORA, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I applaud the forthright stand you are taking and have taken against our dangerous policy in southeast Asia.

I hope one hundred million Americans feel as strongly as you put it that we are launched on a Hitlersque venture.

Democracy, self-determination, human considerations are all going by the board. We are hiding murder and aggression under the false label of freedom and covering all with so-called aid.

I tremble for my country and for the safety of all mankind when the backlash of retribution sweeps over us.

Sincerely yours,

STELLA FALK.

CROTON-ON-HUDSON, N.Y.,
June 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I were very much impressed and moved by your presentation of your views on the war in southeast Asia during your appearance on the "Today" program this morning. We want to take this opportunity to express our wholehearted support of your stand against stepping up the war and in favor of referring the problem to the United Nations. We are writing accordingly to President Johnson and to our Senators, KENNETH KEATING and JACOB JAVITS.

Sincerely yours,

B. A. BOTKIN.

DETROIT, MICH.,
June 25, 1964.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am fully in agreement with your opposition to the appointment of Gen. Maxwell Taylor as Ambassador to Vietnam. Without question, the evidence of a military buildup in southeast Asia is clearly established by this appointment. I hope your efforts to resist this appointment will meet with some success.

I am attempting to make known your opposition to the appointment of Taylor, as the focal point of the expansion of the "war effort" in Asia. I would like to know the names of other U.S. Senators who may oppose this appointment, so that I may write to them, and influence others to do so. If possible, will you let me know if there are other Senators who share your view on this appointment.

I am curious, also, regarding the background of Alexis Johnson. What ambassadorial or military positions has he held in the past?

Please let me know if you have suggestions about what else can be done by private citizens in resisting the haste toward expansion of the war in southeast Asia.

Very sincerely,

VERONICA LYONS.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
June 25, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Your courageous forthright warning against the full scale war brewing on the Asian mainland gives us hope that there are some sane voices in the land, who are trying to save the American people and the world from horrible destruction.

Gratefully,

Mrs. MILLICENT SAPOLSKY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You seem to be just about the only voice of sanity in the Senate—and in fact, in our entire Government—these days; yet your speeches are buried in our great metropolitan newspapers and quoted briefly, if at all, on the air.

I have written letters to my own Senators, to the President, to newspapers, etc., etc., on our dangerous course in Vietnam—and the results seem nil.

You say it is up to the American people to make their voices heard. I cannot believe

our people want to start world war III, but they seem so brainwashed that they are completely immobilized and mute.

Do you see any way out of this hopeless situation?

As far as foreign policy is concerned, it seems to me that our next presidential election offers us no alternatives at all; both candidates mouth "peace" but actually promise war.

Again, I cannot believe in a nation being totally blind, and it is doubly tragic that it should happen in a nation with the great tradition ours has.

What can be done?

Sincerely yours,

PHYLLIS J. THOMAS.

REDLAND, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

HONORED SIR: You voiced my growing conviction that we in America are bearing the burden alone.

Further you have emphasized the technical legal aspect of our position: Violating the Constitution of the United States; also violating the letter and spirit of the articles of the United Nations.

I have not those documents at hand. Kindly forward to my address checking the ones you referred to in this morning's TV interview.

We of our household admire your confidence and courage in voicing your convictions. We are very much impressed with the timeliness of your speech.

Very sincerely yours,

JOSEPH R. WARNICK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I pray that your voice which now seems to be so alone, will be able to prevail upon our President and the Pentagon to stop their thirst for war.

France nearly bled to death trying to force her will on North Vietnam and was forced to give up. Are we going to be next? War has never accomplished anything in the past and I don't think war will settle anything in the future.

A peace-loving citizen.

Respectfully,

ESTHER NEWMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Again cheers and congratulations for your unwavering and courageous fight for peace, and your insistence for a peaceful solution to the southeast Asia situation. Keep up the good work.

An admirer.

GERTRUDE REED.

CATSKILL, N.Y.,
June 25, 1964.

SENATOR MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Heard you on the "Today" show and God bless you.

The people of the United States do not know what is going on; all they know is what they read in the newspapers.

Keep up the good work. We need men like you who are not afraid to speak out.

Keep on talking—only louder; maybe those busybodies in Washington will stop trying to rule the whole world.

A Democrat, but will vote for GOLDWATER as he is not afraid to call a spade a spade.

CULVER CITY, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: We read a small article on page 6 of the Los Angeles Times of your statements in the Senate on Tuesday, June 23.

You are the only man in the Senate brave enough to tell the Americans the truth.

Today we have written our Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, our two Senators. Tell us what else we can do. (Our President, also.)

We almost always agree with your statements, that we hear.

What in the world is the matter with the Nation that cannot see this folly?

Thank you very much for your good work.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. CLYDE CLANTON.

(Democrats).

P.S.—We are calling our friends, reading your statements and asking them to write.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: We, a group of people assembled at a City Terrace Open Forum on Wednesday, June 24, 1964, voted to congratulate you on your gallant stand against the U.S. involvement in southeast Asia.

Too many facts prove that the present U.S. policy is fanning the fires of unrest and conflict in that unhappy territory and that this policy is threatening the peace of the world.

It is up to you and people like you to save the reputation and dignity of our Nation, which is fast becoming the most feared and hated land.

The grateful people of this country will remember your courageous fight to preserve peace in the world.

Sincerely yours,

S. FEINBERG,

Chairman, City Terrace Open Forum.

M & M FEDERAL SAVINGS
& LOAN ASSOCIATION,
Springfield, Ohio, June 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your outspoken interview on the NBC Today show June 25, 1964.

I usually can go along with Democratic policy, but what you said regarding South Vietnam, President Johnson and our Defense and State Departments has long needed to be said.

Keep up the good work.

Yours truly,

LEO F. FISCHER,

Secretary.

PEEKSKILL, N.Y.,
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SIR: I support your stand on our pulling out of South Vietnam. You can save the world from a holocaust.

Yours truly,

ELSA WEXLER.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.,
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks for your stand on Vietnam. You are the only one who seems to make sense on the subject. Let's try the U.N. approach. Keep up your talk on this subject.

Sincerely,

MARIAN B. DAVISON.

FAYETTEVILLE, N.Y.,
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SIR: Please continue to urge a peace-keeping by United Nations in Vietnam. The airing of this evil which is going on is one step in the right direction. Thank you for speaking up.

Sincerely,

ALICE M. ARINACOST.
EAST ORANGE, N.J.,
June 25, 1964.

Heard you on "Today" show. We should indeed get out of Vietnam. Why should any more of our men die for that tiny no-account country? And as you say, our intervention is illegal.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA.
DEAR SIR: You are right; it looks as if State Department have lost their heads, starting little wars all over the world. Why are we in Vietnam, anyway?

CIA? Not so good.

W. L. MILLER.
UNADILLA, N.Y.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I want you to know how much I appreciate your opposition to our war in Vietnam.

Do keep on speaking out against it until the whole thing becomes a matter for negotiation. We must not continue to make the mistake of thinking that today a military solution can be any kind of a solution.

Sincerely yours,

MARION C. FRENYEAR.
P.S.—I'm also writing to the President about this.

WHITE PLAINS, N.Y.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Keep up the good fight. Your stand on Laos and South Vietnam makes the only sense coming out of Washington these days.

Neutralize and share with all comers. There is more than enough to keep us busy here, getting our own house in order.

Respectfully,

W. J. JACOBSON.
MASSILLON, OHIO,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Saw "Today" show. Hurrah for your stand about South Vietnam. Am wiring YOUNG and LAUSCHE for support.

PAUL TENNIS.
NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Have repeatedly written, wired President, supporting your position. Am horrified and terrified current activities southeast Asia.

Mrs. ELSA CLAY.

READING, PA.

MR. MORSE: I heard you on the "Today" show and I'm glad somebody speaks up. But they have maybe no sons to send and they don't care about others. I have a wonderful grandson in training and he and all of us are worried. Why send our boys over there? I also say McNamara has too much authority, as did Dulles. Eisenhower couldn't think for himself, and Johnson thinks too fast.

I predict after we are busy across, the Communists in Cuba will start on us, so why

didn't they start on them? They do too much lying to us people, but we can think also, that's why they are fighting. GOLDWATER, he will tell the people what's going on, and they won't tell us. Keep up the good work. So you say this was in the making a couple of years.

Respectfully,

Mrs. KLECKNER.
BISHOPS HEAD, MD.,
June 14, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: How happy I am to find you in the forefront of those who fervently desire peace in southeast Asia.

I am disappointed and grieved that President L. B. Johnson has surrounded himself with military leaders and their followers. I have read enough to know that Maxwell Taylor is a man who thrives on war and makes it his business. His followers in the Pentagon and the munition dealers must be rejoicing while thousands await the death knell.

The pity of it all that we must rely on men who do not hesitate to plunge our world into darkness.

On my TV screen I have seen the horrors of men, women and little children trudging through fields and swamps, leaving behind them their straw huts set ablaze by men who call themselves Christians. They are often herded like cattle behind barbed wire enclosures without shelter or food. Others die by the wayside of malnutrition and disease, old and young alike. No mercy is shown because such creatures that drive them on have no feelings for anyone but their own.

And we are told to go to church and pray. Is there a God who permits such things to happen?

Many thanks and best wishes and may you always be on the right side.

Sincerely,

MAY HECKMAN.
KANSAS CITY, MO.

DEAR FRIEND: God bless you and keep you safe—and all along the way—infold your life with His infinite good, everywhere, every day.

Sincerely,

JACK and ZULA REARDON.

FEARS TO MEET TAYLOR IN ASIA—SOME AMERICANS IN VIETNAM UNSURE OF MILITARY WAY—NOTE POLITICS LACKING—OTHERS BELIEVE THE DIPLOMATIC ASPECT WILL NOT BE IGNORED

(By Malcolm W. Browne)

SAIGON.—Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, U.S. Ambassador-designate to South Vietnam, will face tough sledding as he takes over leadership of America's war effort here.

Some of his trouble will come from his own staff.

Some U.S. civilian officials here have said recently they feel America's involvement is beginning to look too much like "McNamara's war," with insufficient emphasis on political aspects.

President Johnson's appointment of Taylor will add fuel to this argument. Taylor and Robert S. McNamara, U.S. Defense Secretary, have been key architects of the Pentagon role in Vietnam's war so far, but have not directly controlled civil matters.

Taylor will be the first career soldier to serve as American Ambassador here, although his predecessor, Henry Cabot Lodge, holds the Reserve rank of major general.

"The trouble is," an American official with long experience in Vietnam said, "the Communists have cadres who are neither soldiers nor politicians in our sense—they are both. We have nothing to match these multithreat cadres, and this deficiency is hurting us badly in Vietnam."

"McNamara is a brilliant man and many of the U.S. military advisers in Vietnam are extremely capable. But the Pentagon is not capable of building and executing the kind of politico-military war plan needed."

Taylor's appointment underscores the growing American military involvement in southeast Asia and the probability of increasing armed conflict with the Communists.

Taylor's supporters note that he is more intimately familiar with all Vietnam's problems than almost all other military officers. They say that an ambassador here must be more of a field marshal than a diplomat, and that Taylor meets the test.

Certainly, Taylor has the prestige that Lodge brought to the job, and a diplomatic power vacuum is unlikely.

At the same time, some Americans are worried about the confusion they feel will result from inevitable organization changes after Taylor arrives. They note that Gen. Paul D. Harkins has just turned over the U.S. Military Assistance Command to Lt. Gen. William C. Westmoreland, and that the whole command recently was reorganized.

The Vietnamese Armed Forces and Government have been in a continuous state of reorganization and confusion since the coup November 1, and the effect of this on the war effort is still felt.

DETROIT, MICH.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am in agreement with your reaction to the appointment of Gen. Maxwell Taylor as our Ambassador to Vietnam.

Your efforts to prevent the confirmation of this appointment are praiseworthy.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM HIMELHOCH.
DARIEN, CONN.,
June 24, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last evening, on television, Senator WAYNE MORSE said, as nearly as I can remember his words, that he had just come from a private briefing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and he left with the opinion that the United States is today the biggest threat to world peace. I have for some time been of that opinion.

On the same program, Senator AIKEN, again as nearly as I remember him, said that the administration's decision (appointment of General Taylor as South Vietnam Ambassador) seemed to indicate a stepping up of the war and that war would not be very popular throughout our country. I not only agree with Senator AIKEN, but I condemn any stepping up of the war in Asia with all my heart and soul. We should get out of there entirely.

I am 67 years old. I am not a Communist nor a pro-Communist. I have only one son, 21 years old. He has just finished a 3-year hitch in the Army (101st Airborne), but he is on reserve for the next 3 years. I think I am just as patriotic as the next guy, but I would cry out to Heaven if my boy were to be called back to fight and maybe die half way across the world for a cause so vague as "not letting the Communists take over southeast Asia." I am quite willing to ship any of these governments all the arms they need to defend their freedom, a quite dubious term in several countries I can think of. But if they don't value their freedom enough to fight for it, I do not believe that we should force our own boys to go over there and die for them—if any Americans want to volunteer for that kind of business, let them do so.

We have enough to do right here at home to maintain freedom. How about the three missing youths in Mississippi. Is this freedom?

I think the whole southeast Asia thing is first a moral question. Morals aside for the moment, however, and to talk about the practical—when are we going to get our boys out of Korea? Ever? Are we going to get bogged down that way in southeast Asia? And after that, are we going in with troops to all parts of the world, including vast Africa, to maintain freedom? It doesn't seem very sensible to me.

I know, Mr. President, you know far more about all these things than I do, but you may not be quite as free to speak up about them. I voted for Mr. Kennedy, and, at this time, would certainly vote for you. Please do not let the political criticism, especially of the Goldwater variety, cause you to act against your conscience.

Finally, I wonder, to what extent do the forces of the industrial-military complex, against which President Eisenhower warned, act upon you and perhaps cause you to do things that you do not in your heart believe in?

I do not think we have been getting the real truth about Asia, and other places. If it ever came to a choice, which God forbid, between patriotism and morality, I would not hesitate to side with morality.

Please forgive this long letter, which I am sure you personally will never read, but I had to get these things off my mind.

Respectfully yours,

CONGER F. SHUR.

Blind to Senator MORSE: I am grateful that we have a man of your courage in the Senate.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

June 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hear that you have been making daily speeches opposing the Vietnam war. The news tonight of the declared intent to move in with U.S. bombers openly, and probably to attack North Vietnam is just almost unbelievable.

Can't there be forced in the Senate by some of you on the Foreign Relations Committee a challenge on the basis of war without declaration or consent of Congress?

Or does Congress give its consent—with the exception of nine (I am told) of you non-subservient ones?

Does the President and Mr. Rusk really think that we are so successfully brain-washed? That we have swallowed the old worn-out line of the danger of communism? It is sickening to think what our country has sunk to. The viciousness of the whole affair makes me ashamed; breaking international agreements, intervening with force in a small country's affairs.

Are we then committed to warring on ideology? That a small helpless country that has freed itself by herculean sacrifice from a colonial master shall not be allowed to follow its own leaders?

Maybe you Senators who see, must start a demonstration on the White House steps? You could call up a few thousands to support you. In Greece they had a peace march of 300,000 souls. This was not published in our free press.

We are worse than a nation of sheep; we are a nation of criminals, who are demonstrating the failure of so-called democratic government.

What can we do? Are we totally lost? If the Senate does not act?

I congratulate you for your courage, Mr. MORSE, but apparently the power that is ruling the President also holds down the free press. Never a line do we see, or a word on the air, about your speeches—not one word.

Most sincerely, but downhearted,

MARIANNA SCHULTZ.

BEST, OREG.

WASHINGTON COLLEGE, TENN.,

June 24, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: During the centuries of constant intermittent warfare between France and England, probably no statesman on either side had the courage to say, "Our country is the world's greatest threat to peace" (at least not publicly).

Voltaire said something like, "It is not to those who would destroy the universe that we owe our reverence, but to those who understand it."

We must then wonder how many liberals there are in the U.S. Senate with courage, understanding, and intellectual integrity. If mankind is to survive, it is to you (plural, I hope) that history will pay tribute.

Cordially yours,

HOWARD McCracken.

P.S.—Will the administration (consciously, subconsciously, or unconsciously) try to out GOLDWATER the Republicans between now and November?

BURLINGTON, MASS.,

June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: While watching the "Today" program this morning, I was deeply touched by the position you are taking on Vietnam. You see, my husband and I were discussing the war in South Vietnam just before you appeared on the TV screen and I was deeply touched by your convictions, as our sentiments are exactly the same as yours.

You see, Senator MORSE, we have one boy in the U.S. Army, training as a fixed wing pilot and another son in college in the ROTC Air Force and naturally I'm deeply concerned about their future. These two boys are the only children I have. My husband was called into the Army when these children were mere infants. I realize there are millions of other families in this same situation and I'm sure they must feel the same way as I do. I'm a hundred percent for our boys fighting to protect our freedom and our beloved country, but to send these young boys into South Vietnam to fight, especially when they don't want us there, is beyond reasoning, in my estimation. You can be assured that I am a very worried mother as I understand my son is being trained to pilot planes over Vietnam in this war.

I have to admire your stamina to be able to project your convictions as a Democrat, especially now as we have a Democratic President in office. This is a wonderful country, especially where we're allowed to disagree with our colleagues. We are very lucky to have such a clear-thinking Senator such as yourself occupying a seat in our Senate, and I do hope that the citizens of Oregon value your guidance and will reserve that seat for you for many years.

Thanking you for taking the time to read this letter.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARION HARPER.

COLUMBIA, MO.,

June 23, 1964.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This letter is to express my dismay at our expanding involvement in the war in southeast Asia. I have the uncomfortable feeling that such actions as the construction of the big airbase in South Vietnam and the sending of new stockpiles of weapons to Thailand will only tend to cause the war to spread and increase the risk of an all-out war with China. Such

a war would, I believe, be most unpopular with most Americans.

It seems to me that we would be much better advised to follow the alternate suggestions of Senators WAYNE MORSE and ERNEST GRUENING that we make a real attempt to settle the problems of southeast Asia at the conference table.

Won't you please work for peace in this part of the world rather than for an expanded war?

Sincerely,

JOHN C. SCHUDER.

LANCASTER, CALIF.,

June 24, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Praise to you. You are definitely speaking for millions of us who understand the situation in southeast Asia and know the United States is fully to blame for the explosive condition there.

Placing General Taylor in the responsible position of carrying on the war without limited conditions most certainly means proceeding to the point of no return.

The peasants, intellectuals, religious leaders, and other factions are determined that the invaders must be removed even at the cost of losing all their lives.

Complete disregard for responsibility to U.S. citizens, and to people everywhere, is being shown up by the lack of speaking out against this terrible move of the administration by the majority of the legislators.

All power to you in your efforts.

Sincerely,

PEARL R. GOODING.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.,

June 24, 1964.

President LYNDON JOHNSON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Is it not rather unusual for our country to appoint a military man as our ambassador to a foreign country? We think it was a very bad choice, as it is being interpreted in the press as a truly beligerent move.

We are very much opposed to the war in Vietnam and we feel that you and your advisers have gone too far in that you have been bombing military installations in Laos and in North Vietnam. We thought it had been decided that war is unthinkable in this atom bomb era.

Yours most sincerely,

W. LeROY GARTH, M.D.

(Copy to Senator MORSE.)

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you so much for standing up on your hind feet and telling the administration off.

The people of the world are unalterably opposed to war, and you are smart enough to know it.

Your friend,

ROY GARTH.

TRENTON, MO.,

June 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I heartily endorse your stand against a war with China, or any other conflict in Asia.

Sincerely,

V. C. ROSE,
Attorney at Law.

GOVERNEUR, N.Y.,

June 24, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I entirely endorse your position in regard to Vietnam. It is preposterous to regard Asians as "outsiders" and ourselves as "insiders" with a mandate to occupy Vietnam.

I would like someone to tell me where and when the people of that country invited us to overrun their land.

It is deplorable that your's is the only voice in Congress to speak out against this travesty of justice and humanity.

Yours truly,

S. H. AUDERMAN, D.D.S.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for speaking out on the situation between our country and Vietnam.

We are with you and appreciate being informed. Good luck and God bless you.

Sincerely,

MARY R. D. CRISPINO.

VISTA, CALIF.,
June 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SIR: Please accept my congratulations for having the courage and honesty to stand up and tell the American people the truth about our involvement in Vietnam.

I agree with you 100 percent that we (the United States) do not have vital interests in South Vietnam and I also agree that U.S. troops should be withdrawn.

The United States would have more friends and respect in the world if we would turn toward peace. The people of the world do not want the United States to lead them into a possible nuclear disaster. Most of the people of the world want to live, not die.

Thanking you again for your honesty and leadership, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

J. E. KELLY.

WELLESLEY, MASS.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Keep your voice of reason speaking on Vietnam.

Mrs. D. C. ARNOLD.

ORLANDO, FLA.,
June 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The news last night was most distressing. It seems that the Government has decided to make war on China. I have been convinced for sometime that they meant to do so, but I had no idea it would come so soon.

The only bright spot is your protest. I have written the President; he will not see it, but someone will—if only a great many would write it might have some effect, but not many will.

At least you, Senator MORSE, will lead a few who see the awful implications in such a move.

Thanks for standing up to the issue, as you always do.

Sincerely,

BERTHA E. DAVIS.

ELLCOTT CITY, MD.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I felt I had to write to you and congratulate you for your courage in speaking up about the Vietnam situation on the "Today" show. It is really a shame that more of our Congressmen don't have your courage and foresight. Our policy of supporting tyrannical governments against the people in Vietnam and elsewhere, on a unilateral basis has really gained us nothing but contempt around the world. We should, by all means, make more use of the United

Nations in these critical situations. It seems that the only way we can be forced to do this is by repealing the Connally reservation in order to make the U.N. more effective for all of us. Of course, our military will not agree—they can retain their prestige only when there's a war, and right now, Vietnam is the only war we have.

Please continue your attempts to educate the public—we certainly don't get accurate information from the newspapers or from our other sources of education. Thank you.

Sincerely,

MERCEDES J. PHILLIPS
Mrs. Mercedes J. Phillips.

GREAT FALLS, MONT.,
June 22, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I think it's wonderful you can speak up as you do about this country's being so mixed up with affairs in Far East. I just can't make out just what we are doing in South Vietnam or Formosa.

It seems as the administration would like to or is trying to get us in a war in a part of the world. We have nothing to gain, everything to lose.

I always listen to you. I have never seen you take the wrong side.

Best wishes to you in all you do.

Yours truly,

R. D. EATON, Sr.

BETHESDA, MD.,
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Again I admired your insight and courage as you spoke on the TV this morning regarding our position in Vietnam. The U.N. should be our forum.

To identify myself, you very graciously spoke for the International Outlook section of the 20th Century Club a couple of years ago when I was chairman.

Recently, Mrs. Scott, Mrs. Morse, and your gentle granddaughter had fun at a club picnic. Life has to have this type of balance amid such a serious world.

Sincerely,

GERTRUDE G. PERRY.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
June 24, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I hope you will do all you can to keep us out of another war, why can't we stay home and mind our own business? Let's try to make the United States safe for its own people, like what's happening in New York and the South. Why are they so worried about Vietnam they don't seem to care about Angola or the slaves in Spain and Portugal or the slaves in Haiti and Dominican Republic? They don't seem to care that democracy took a setback in Brazil. Why can't these countries have the form of government that they want? Why do we have to force our way of life on them, when they don't want it? Have we got a bunch of morons running our State Department? Do they like to cause misery and woe?

Do what you can to get the United States back to sanity and morality; maybe it isn't too late, but I am afraid so.

May God continue to bless you with a keen mind and a compassion for your fellow man.

As ever,

MORGAN HILL, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We salute you with very full hearts on your uncompromising

stand on the terrible situation in Vietnam, or perhaps the most terrible part is right here in our country, where the truth is so stifled.

We hope to write your name in for President.

Sincerely,

RAY and BETTY ANDERSON.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to express my wholehearted approval and gratitude for your outspoken opposition to the administration's outrageous policy re southeast Asia. Is there nothing that can be done to stop it? Certainly the Constitution does not give the President power to declare war, and the sending of an Army general along with many threats seems tantamount to that—just about. If a sufficient force in Congress favored it, could not President Johnson be impeached? Does he think that he is not going to get a devastating response to his avowed intention of dictating to foreign powers for not following our way of life? (In Mississippi?)

Granting that the President has favored many forward-looking policies, the Vietnam attitude can easily bring a holocaust that will bring an end to them and the human race at large. Are there no voices in Congress but your own to protest and understand?

Again, with appreciation,

EDITH I. COGGINS.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 25, 1964.

The Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This morning it was my good fortune to see and listen to you on the "Today Show."

I congratulate you on your forthright exposé of the situation of our foreign policy and admire you for stating so clearly the "mess" we have made of it.

I have "no ax to grind" and am no member of any organization, but as a retired Foreign Service officer, I have some knowledge of the things of which you speak. Do, please press the issue. It is later than most people think.

With Senator FULBRIGHT, I hope that you will be able to make the American public aware of the dangerous path our Government is taking in the field of foreign affairs.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM G. VALE.

SECOND GENERAL HOSPITAL,
APO 180, N.Y., June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HON. SENATOR MORSE: You are to be congratulated on your intelligent stand against expanding hostilities in southeast Asia. There are many of us, including Mrs. C. B. Luce, who believe that we must come to at least a talking arrangement with the leaders of over 500 million people. President de Gaulle has already made the step, and since we recognize the governments in Moscow and Belgrade, perhaps we should give more serious consideration to it too. Our surplus grain can fill the bellies of China's millions just as well as the products of Indochina's rice paddies, and with our grain China's leaders could probably be convinced that their present aggression in Laos and South Vietnam is unnecessary.

Yours very truly,

LEWIS A. JOHNSON,
Major, M.C., U.S.A.

JUNE 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is my second letter thanking you for opposing the aggression our country is now committing, and the full-scale war being contemplated, in southeast Asia. It takes real courage to buck the leadership of both parties and most of the press on this issue. This Nation is being marshaled to commit a crime against humanity, and you are one of the few who both know it's wrong and says so.

I see little difference between the Johnson administration and the Republican on this issue. I will be voting for the first time this November, and I see no reason for trying to make a choice where there is no choice. Instead, I will write in your name for President of the United States, with Senator ERNEST GRUENING for Vice President.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM RUSSELL ROTHMAN.

ROCKPORT, MASS.,

June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For many years I have admired your honesty and great courage but never more than now.

I am sure that many people feel as you do about the war in Vietnam, but we feel helpless. We have written to the President, but our letters are ignored. For the first time in my life I feel I cannot vote this year. Not unless we have a candidate with vision and courage, such as yours.

Gratefully and sincerely,

VIRGINIA BATE.

NORTH TONAWANDA, N.Y.,

June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This morning I had the pleasure of listening to your comments on the "Today" program on television.

In this day of jingoism, of far rightism, of ultraconservation and of the "Let's land the Marines in Cuba" school of thought, it is refreshing and reassuring to hear the voice of reason in high places on occasion.

Of course, it doesn't make sense for us to give the United Nations lipservice as well as financial backing and then to disregard it completely when an important crisis arises on the international scene. I refer, of course, to our unilateral handling of the problems of southeast Asia as mentioned in your TV talk. One would imagine that what happened to the French would serve as an object lesson yet we appear to be blundering into the same trap that cost France so dearly.

No doubt I am naive about this but I still can't understand what there is in the jungles of South Vietnam or Laos that would cause the French to sacrifice so many of their finest young men and to drain their treasury.

Please keep up the good work. Many of us are with you.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES GUZZETTA.

SEARSPORT, MAINE,

June 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I wish to thank you for reminding the people of a one-time free nation that we have degenerated into a nation of outlaws, waging undeclared war in South Vietnam without the consent of Congress.

May I suggest that Congress impeach the President of the United States for taking the law into his own hands.

Sincerely yours,

J. ERNEST BRYANT.

NICE, FRANCE,

June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are attending a business convention here and are appalled at the increasing military moves by the administration in Vietnam, and the appointment of General Taylor as Ambassador. Congratulations on your efforts in getting the facts to the American people, and wish you success for all our sakes, in stopping the escalation.

Sincerely,

JUDITH FRIEDMAN.

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, N.Y.,

June 25, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I commend you for your timely and penetrating comments on the situation in South Vietnam. Millions here and in our allied countries will agree with you. Actually some of the Vietcong guerrillas are South Vietnamese peasants who are tired of being exploited by the feudal regime of South Vietnam. Why do we not hear the truth about this situation?

Sincerely,

WALTER H. MOHR.

WINCHESTER, MASS.,

June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: My husband and I wish you to know we are in accord with your views as expressed on "Face the Nation" in regard to the U.S. Government's unilateral action in Vietnam.

It is heartening to hear a statesman attack the political expediency which appears to be dictating our Government's policy in foreign affairs. No information we ordinary citizens can gather explains to us why we as a nation level a military assault on communism in Vietnam, assent to it in Cuba, and assist in such countries as Rumania and Yugoslavia.

As far as we are concerned our military involvement in Vietnam is uncalled for.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET H. HANDY
(Mrs. Gardner W.).MEYER MANAGEMENT CORP.,
New York, N.Y., June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your address of June 23 on the situation in southeast Asia.

Providence be praised that I read the RECORD every day. The metropolitan papers do not print such items or distort them.

I hope you will make converts in the U.S. Senate, including Senator FULBRIGHT. Our foreign policy—or lack it—is something unbelievable. It is zigzagging and lacks rhyme and reason. This goes for President Johnson as it did for President Kennedy and President Eisenhower. Only Truman had some horse sense.

The Pentagon should take note of your admonitions—and that very fast. I would have bounced Admiral Felt for his Formosa statement. As you so aptly express my own feelings: Soldiers carry out military orders, they do not determine foreign policy.

A large sign carrying that admonition, should be hung in each and every room of the Pentagon.

Thanking you again and with all good wishes from an admirer of your clear logic (who does not always see eye to eye with you, but is fully attuned to the Morse formula).

Sincerely yours,

J. H. MEYER.

DENVER, COLO.,

June 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: All the world can be thankful to you for warning that our Government which talks about being peace loving, will be a most serious threat to the peace of the world if the policies advocated in Vietnam and that region by our militarists are carried out. Surely this Nation should be smart enough and moral enough not to involve humanity in a nuclear war.

Gratefully yours,

HELEN W. FORD.

FALLS CHURCH, VA.,

June 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your recently expressed suggestion that we turn over the mess in South Vietnam to the United Nations is the only realistic course of action left open to us in southeast Asia.

I have served in that country recently and retired from the Army in disgust at our inept handling of affairs in that part of the world.

There is little point in wasting both men and money to assist a people who are not interested in assisting themselves. We cannot win their war for them and we can't afford to lose a war there or anywhere else.

Please continue your efforts to awaken our own people to the naive handling of affairs in Vietnam.

Yours truly,

FREDERICK W. COYKENDALL.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1062, House bill 10314.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10314) to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities thereunder and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have asked that the bill be made the pending business for the purpose of having a bill before the Senate when it convenes on Monday.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

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

VISIT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD TO SENATOR KENNEDY AND SENATOR BAYH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the Senate adjourns, I should like to state that I had a visit with Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY today in Northampton, Mass., and also with Senator and Mrs. Birch Bayh. Also, I had the opportunity once again to meet with the wife of Senator KENNEDY and to notify them of the best wishes of President and Mrs. Johnson for a speedy recovery and also of the best wishes on the part of the many Senators who had approached me when they learned that I was going to Northampton, wishing for Senator KENNEDY and Senator and Mrs. Bayh a full and speedy recovery. They were pleased to get this word.

I found Senator KENNEDY in excellent spirits and, according to the best information I can get, on the road to recovery. He is no longer being fed intravenously, but is now on semisolids. He is not in an oxygen tent.

Dr. Corriden, Chief of Staff of Cooley-Dickenson General Hospital, informs me that his condition is quite satisfactory and they expect him to progress in the weeks and months ahead.

Senator BAYH and Mrs. Bayh are both doing very well. It is anticipated they may be discharged from Cooley-Dickenson General Hospital in a matter of a week or so. They are in good spirits. Senator KENNEDY and the Bayhs asked me to convey their thanks to the many Senators who have sent telegrams or called them for thinking about them at this particular time.

It is a matter of deep sorrow that the pilot of the airplane, Mr. Zimny and Senator KENNEDY's administrative assistant, Mr. Moss, were lost. We send to their family our deepest condolences, regrets, and sympathy.

It is to be hoped that Senator and Mrs. Bayh will be discharged within a week or 10 days. It is anticipated that Senator KENNEDY may well be transferred to another hospital in several weeks.

Cooley-Dickenson General Hospital, in Northampton, Mass., where our colleagues are at the present time, is a first-grade institution and they are receiving the very best of care.

I thought I would relay these words to the Senate because of the interest shown.

Speaking personally, I am very happy that they are so far along on the road to recovery.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, to Monday, June 29, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 26, 1964:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Sam P. Gilstrap, of Oklahoma, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malawi.

UNITED NATIONS

Franklin H. Williams, of California, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 26, 1964:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

John T. McNaughton, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.
Solis Horwitz, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Daniel M. Luevano, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Robert Warren Morse, of Rhode Island, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Leonard Marks, Jr., of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be general

Gen. Joe W. Kelly, 612A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Francis H. Griswold, XXXX (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Lt. Gen. Edward H. Underhill, XXXX (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Lt. Gen. Robert H. Terrill, XXXX (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code.

To be general

Lt. Gen. Howell M. Estes, Jr., XXXX (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Waymond A. Davis, XXXX Regular Air Force.
Maj. Gen. Keith K. Compton, XXXX Regular Air Force.
Maj. Gen. Henry Vicellio, XXXX Regular Air Force.

Lt. Gen. William H. Blanchard, XXXX (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations under the provisions of section 711, title 10, of the United States Code.

U.S. ARMY

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Donald Nicholas Anderson, XXXXXXXX

To be brigadier generals

Col. Richard Charles Kendall, XXXXXXXX Adjutant General's Corps.
Col. Edward Donald Walsh, XXXXXXXX Infantry.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Kermit Levelle Davis, XXXXXXXX U.S. Army.
Brig. Gen. Woodrow Wilson Stromberg, XXXXXXXX U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. David Bennett Parker, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frank Wade Norris, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Edward Pickett, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Martin Cone, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Henry Chiles, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Nels Redling, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Chester Lee Johnson, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Delk McCorkle Oden, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Raymond Peers, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Gines Perez, XXXXXXXX U.S. Army.
Brig. Gen. Walter Brown Richardson, XXXXXXXX U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Wendell John Coats, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Theodore Henderson Andrews, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Walter Martin Higgins, Jr., XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Burton Robert Brown, XXXXXXXX U.S. Army.

Col. John Joseph Hayes, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Richard Henry Free, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Wilbur Eugene Showalter, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Walter Ferrell Winton, Jr., XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Merle Fondren, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Lloyd Brinkley Ramsey, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Morgan Prosser, XXXXXXXX U.S. Army.

Col. Osmund Alfred Leahy, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Phillip Buford Davidson, Jr., XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles Carmin Noble, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Belrne Spragins, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Leonard Burbank Taylor, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (major, U.S. Army).

Col. Donn Royce Pepke, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, secs. 3284, 3306, and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Victor James MacLaughlin, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ellsworth Ingalls Davis, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard Davis Myer, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Thomas Honeycutt, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Chester Arthur Dahlen, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Ralph Yancey, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Gines Perez, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.
Maj. Gen. John Joseph Lane, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Frederick Thorlin, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ethan Allen Chapman, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard John Meyer, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Carl Darnell, Jr., [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harvey Julius Jablonsky, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Richard Winn, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Oliver Clark Harvey, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Julian Alexander Wilson, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Wythe Gleaves Rich, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Walter August Jensen, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Thomas Powers 3d, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Elmer John Gibson, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frank Joseph Sackton, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Walter Brown Richardson, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Bruce Edward Kendall, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

To be brigadier general, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. James Bowdoin Stapleton, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Byron Ludwig Steger, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Estes Blount, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joe Morris Blumberg, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Alfred Carlisle Harrison, [XXXXXX], Adjutant General's Corps.

Brig. Gen. Erwin Case Hostetler, [XXXXXX], Adjutant General's Corps.

Brig. Gen. Robert Louis Stevenson, [XXXXXX], Adjutant General's Corps.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Roberts White, Jr., [XXXXXX], Adjutant General's Corps.

The following-named cadet, graduating class of 1964, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 4353:

To be second lieutenant

Giordano, Frank R.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be generals

Gen. Paul Donal Harkins, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. William Childs Westmoreland, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

U.S. NAVY

The following-named officers of the line of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade indicated subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be rear admirals

William C. Abhau	Donald G. Baer
Walter V. Combs, Jr.	Richard G. Colbert
Earl R. Crawford	Walter L. Curtis, Jr.
Walter F. Schlech, Jr.	John E. Dacey
Thomas S. King, Jr.	Woodrow W. McCrory
Ed R. King	Nathan Sonenshein
Richard L. Fowler	Philip A. Beshany
John J. Lynch	Robert W. McNitt
John P. Sager	Raymond F. Dubois
David B. Bell	Ralph Weymouth
Emery A. Grantham	Evan P. Aurand
Donald M. White	Vincent P. de Poix
Roger W. Mehle	Thomas J. Walker, III
Frederick H. Schneider, Jr.	Frederic A. Bardshar
Ralph W. Cousins	Lawrence R. Geis
	Clarence E. Bell, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade in the staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

To be rear admirals

Herbert H. Eighmy	Robert O. Canada, Jr.
Joseph L. Yon	Horace D. Warden

SUPPLY CORPS

To be rear admirals

Harry J. P. Foley, Jr.
Jack J. Appleby
Winston H. Schleaf

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

To be rear admirals

William M. Heaman

DENTAL CORPS

To be rear admirals

Maurice E. Simpson

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

James A. Washington, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years expiring June 30, 1967.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Charles W. Abbott to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Arthur E. Zink to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 1, 1964.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Russell L. Allen to be captain, and ending James W. Fagan to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 22, 1964.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Basque People of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 26, 1964

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, only last week a group of Basques visited Washington, and presented some of

their native dances in the rotunda of the Old Senate Office Building, thrilling an appreciative audience. The Oinkari—meaning “fast of feet”—dancers had performed at the New York World's Fair on Monday, visited New York, and then flew to Washington for their appearance here.

Since then, my office has answered numerous questions about this dance group, and about the Basques, a most wonderful people. Both are unique and invite attention.

Idaho is proud that it has the largest Basque colony in North America, a people loyally American, hard working, independent, talented and one which has contributed generously to the history, economy, and social fabric of Idaho.

The Basques come from the Pyrenees, the magnificent mountains between Spain and France, although their origin beyond that is shrouded in much mystery, and authorities seldom agree as to the source of the race. Scholars have listed as their ancestors such divergent