work. The station has opened its microphones to an endless variety of community and educational projects. The facilities 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 the site. The station is now, beautiful, and unique apartment and business complex, built and financed with union funds. Those locations, all within my congressional 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.

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 20

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to meet during 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

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.
LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE 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 COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSIONS 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 MESSAGES 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, and similar to 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 COMMITTEE

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

Faustine J. Ceccon, 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.

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

Mr. 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 theRecord of the Reoan 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 in order 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 for permanent Federal recognition of four brigadier generals--Harrison, Hostetler, Stevenson, and White—for appointments as major generals. Since March of 1963, these four officers have been feder­ally recognized as major generals in the Army National Guard in their respective States. These officers continue to receive two-star pay after last year's committee action. Apparently, the committee's action last year in refusing the two-jump promotions of two-star 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 has had no effect on the current status and appears to have been an exercise in futility. As the committee will recall, these four officers were federally recognized as major generals in the Army National Guard on March 12, 1963, and their nominations for appointment in the Army Reserve were submitted and confirmed in November of that year. Since these officers held only the rank of colonel, the committee indicated it would approve only a one-jump promotion to the rank of brigadier general. The committee's action last year in refusing the two-jump promotions is understandable. At my direction the appointment as major general of these four officers was not confirmed by the Senate. The nominations for appointment in the Army Reserve in that rank are not a part of the Senate's jurisdiction.

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. Consequently, a Guard officer will be given permanent Federal recognition only if he is confirmed by the Senate. His initial Federal recognition will be temporary. Federal recognition under which his Guard rank will be withdrawn unless his appointment in the Reserve in that rank is confirmed by the Senate within 6 months. 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 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. (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 a result of temporary Federal recognition and while awaiting his Reserve appointment in that rank is entitled to pay and allowances for authority of Federal law.

I recognize, however, Mr. Chairman, the success 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 regulations which will in the future provide a 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 23, 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 a State as a general officer 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 confirmed, the Army regulations for temporary Federal recognition will be withdrawn. Temporary Federal recognition will expire 6 months from the effective date if it is 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 16, 1964.

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

Dear Senator Smith: This is in reply to your letter of April 21, 1964, as to the legal basis under which four Army National Guard officers whose appointments as Reserve brigadier generals 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 drill 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 for performing duty under sections 503-505 of title 37, United States Code, is that of his federally recognized grade.

Before the National Defense Act amendments of June 15, 1938 (48 Stat. 153), there was no National Guard of the United States and the only benefit which was granted by the Federal recognition process was the authority for pay and allowances based on the grade of major general. Despite the fact that, between 1933 and 1953 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. Section 204(a) provides "a member of the National Guard ** may wear the uniform prescribed for the Army National Guard and be entitled to full-time training duty authorized by section 503-505 of title 37, United States Code."
transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Marshyhope Creek, Delaware and Maryland, Mill Creek, Georgia, Tunica River, Georgia, and the river and drainage systems on poconol watershed, Missouri (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture, Forestry, and Related Sciences.

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-products, human slaughter of animals, and for other purposes;

2. To amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to require charging of fees, and for other purposes.

REAR ADM. HORACE D. WARDEN

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said:
Mr. President, earlier today, the Senate congratulated Rear Admiral 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 appointment was 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 recognizing that the nomination of Admiral Warden was confirmed.

Admiral Warden is the 14th or 15th of the 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 as­
suring that the individual's federally recognized rank will be overruled by the grade with the grade to which he is to be appointed as a Reserve of the Army.

The situation whereby these four officers were similarly treated in the grade of major general (which entitled them to wear the insignia and to receive pay and allowances) and the like, but without having their nominations for appointment as Rese­

Having consideration by the U.S. Sen­
ate, Committee on Armed Services of the nomination of these four officers for appointment as Reserve major generals of the Army (they had a grade previous occupation, and the like, but without having their nominations for appointment as Rese­

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 is authorized to be entitled to pay, allowances, and to wear the insignia of the federally recognized grade.

Sincerely,

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

REAR ADM. HORACE D. WARDEN

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said:
Mr. President, earlier today, the Senate congratulated Rear Admiral 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 appointment was 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 recognizing that the nomination of Admiral Warden was confirmed.

Admiral Warden is the 14th or 15th of the 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 as­
suring that the individual's federally recognized rank will be overruled by the grade with the grade to which he is to be appointed as a Reserve of the Army.

The situation whereby these four officers were similarly treated in the grade of major general (which entitled them to wear the insignia and to receive pay and allowances) and the like, but without having their nominations for appointment as Rese­

Having consideration by the U.S. Sen­
ate, Committee on Armed Services of the nomination of these four officers for appointment as Reserve major generals of the Army (they had a grade previous occupation, and the like, but without having their nominations for appointment as Rese­
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 Hiawasse 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 an amendment:
S. 1186. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional land (Rept. No. 1122).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:
H.R. 1125. A bill to amend section 138 of the 138, 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) 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 remarks of Mr. Nelson when he introduced the above bill, which appears 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 4126 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. 2956) to amend section 4126 of the Internal Revenue Code, is as follows:

1. (a) sold on consignment, or
2. (b) sold at retail,
3. (c) sold otherwise than through an arm's length transaction at less than the fair market value.

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 article is sold at retail, or (if the lowest price for which such articles are sold to wholesale distributors, in the ordinary course of business, for production or for purposes thereof, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury) be computed on the lowest price for which such articles are sold to wholesale distributors, in the ordinary course of business, for production or for purposes thereof, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate. This paragraph shall not apply if paragraph (2) applies.

(2) Special rules.—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 regularly sells such articles at wholesale to more than one wholesale distributor, at retail, to a retailer, or to a special dealer (other than special dealers) (or (c) the transaction is an arm’s length transaction, the tax under this chapter shall be computed on whichever of the following prices is the lower:

1. The price for which such article is sold, or
2. The lowest price for such articles is sold by manufacturers or producers, or
3. The lowest price for such articles is sold, otherwise than through an arm’s length transaction, at retail, to a retailer, or to a special dealer (other than special dealers) (or the lowest price at which such articles are sold to wholesale distributors, in the ordinary course of business, for production or purposes thereof, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate). This paragraph shall not apply if paragraph (2) applies.

The price is to be determined at the time of the transaction in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed for the implementation of section 4061(a) (relating to automobile sales) or section 4061(b) (relating to sales of other taxable articles). The price shall be determined after the time of the transaction in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed for the implementation of section 4061(a) (relating to automobile sales) or section 4061(b) (relating to sales of other taxable articles). The price shall be determined at the time of the transaction in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed for the implementation of section 4061(a) (relating to automobile sales) or section 4061(b) (relating to sales of other taxable articles). The price shall be determined at the time of the transaction in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed for the implementation of section 4061(a) (relating to automobile sales) or section 4061(b) (relating to sales of other taxable articles)
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, 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 price 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 improved 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: the 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. The 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, livings resources as well— the water we drink and the air we breathe.

Much of our priceless heritage is already lost. The 300 billion board feet of timber in our forests that we 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 Nation— 286,000 miles of them—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 red 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—have caused 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 not replace the millions of trees and scenic vistas and a lot of other things.

Today we face a genuine crisis. To retard any further threatens America with future disaster. If we take the fundamental step of cutting back our consumption, 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 according to a serious water shortage in many parts of the Nation. By 1960, 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, working 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 and the demand is simply more than can be met. The land is being overcrowded—and the more unique, the more desirable an area it is, the more it is being 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 1962.

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.

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 necessary and unacceptable facet of American poverty. There is work to do in this country. Nevertheless, we find men without jobs throughout the land.

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 migratory agricultural worker lost his job 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 $5,000.

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 Federal Conservation Corps with broad authority to utilize unemployed men on much needed conservation projects. In its first year, the Council would have authority to spend approximately one 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 labor to work without further training; it can put the men to work immediately without any 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 timber-stand 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 areas on National and State parks, national forests, and other public lands.

We could establish wildlife habitat and structural improvements on wildlife refuge lands, 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 projects. The Corps of Engineers has 10 million acres of land under its jurisdiction, 20 million acres of which could be used immediately.

Of the 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 improvement, 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 new grazing areas; pasture management and cooperatives; fish hatchery improvement and maintenance.
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 great needs which exist, the Department went on to state:

The direct financial revenues to the Treasury from the national forest, if all of this work were accomplished, would rise to over $900,000,000 annually. Payments

from national forest revenues for county schools and roads would increase correspondingly. The annual value of forage, and lands of the national forests would increase by about $2 billion.

The timber stand improvement and reforestation work is materially to a long-term investment resulting in timber production of $1 billion board feet of saw

mill lumber annually, worth $950 million annually in timber sales.

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

In timber alone, it is estimated that for every dollar of national forest stand improved, the end product will be worth about $20 by the time they reach the ultimate consumer. The estimated employment directly associated with the activities 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 visit 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 one million man-days per year of wild life habitat would put a large share of this man-day expenditure into the local economy.

Forest products available to a youth conservation corps program and the resultant total benefits, the following examples indicate possible benefits attributable to a program of this size:

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 visit to national forests will amount to $2.50 per man-day. Every family recreation visit to the national forests, at an approximate cost of $1,000 per unit, would return approximately $11.7 million annually to the local economy in a year or two.

Millions of acres of young growth timber stands on our national forests or on timber stands that are partially or completely denuded by fire, insects, or other causes will, when culturally treated, produce over $100,000,000 more in 10 years than the $94,000 investment. There are nearly 30 million acres of national forest lands in need of such treatment. A youth corps of 15,000 enrollees could cut at least 12,000 family recreation units annually, which would turn approximately $300,000,000 into the local economy in a year or two.

Millions of acres of young growth timber stands on our national forests or on timber stands that are partially or completely denuded by fire, insects, diseases, or other causes will, when culturally treated, produce over $100,000,000 more in 10 years than the $94,000 investment. There are nearly 30 million acres of national forest lands in need of such treatment. A youth corps of 15,000 enrollees could cut at least 12,000 family recreation units annually, which would turn approximately $300,000,000 into the local economy in a year or two.

Millions of acres of young growth timber stands on our national forests or on timber stands that are partially or completely denuded by fire, insects, diseases, or other causes will, when culturally treated, produce over $100,000,000 more in 10 years than the $94,000 investment. There are nearly 30 million acres of national forest lands in need of such treatment. A youth corps of 15,000 enrollees could cut at least 12,000 family recreation units annually, which would turn approximately $300,000,000 into the local economy in a year or two.
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 all expenses incurred in carrying out such service. The Council shall consult with and advise the Chairman on the selection of applicants for such positions and the criteria for determining the selection of such applicants from individuals deemed appropriate. The Chairman shall administer the provisions of this Act, and shall be compensated at the rate of $20,500 per annum.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5(b) of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1332-3(b)), at any time after June 18, 1964, and 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 the General Services Administration and may appropriate funds for such purpose.

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 designed 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 criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution among the States, as he deems appropriate.

The program will not result in the displacement of Federal workers or impair existing contracts for services; (3) the rates of pay and other conditions of employment shall be reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee; (4) the program is 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 standards are not used to deny employment opportunities for individuals employed 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 shall not exceed 75 per centum of the cost of such program except:

(1) In areas of unusual poverty, as determined by the Council, the Chairman may authorize such funds to exceed 75 per centum; and

(2) where funds authorized in this Act are used in accordance with the provisions of the National Advisory Council on the Human Environment Act of 1964 (5 U.S.C. 83-21a), such funds authorized in this Act shall not exceed 50 per centum of the Federal funds used for such purpose.

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, and shall consider among other relevant factors population, unemployment, and family income levels. Not more than 15 percent 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.

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

(1) appropriate funds for the payment of the salaries of the Chairman and the General Services Administration and consultants or contractors. The Chairman may also appropriate funds for the purposes of this Act for the purposes of this Act, and hire employees as he determines in accordance with section 6(c) and section 6(b); (2) the salaries of the Chairman and the General Services Administration shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 3596); (3) employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof as authorized by section 19 of the Act of August 2, 1945 (5 U.S.C. 3592-3); and (b) the rates of pay for such services shall not exceed $8 an hour.

The Chairman shall determine the qualifications and proficiency of the employee; (2) the program will not result in the displacement of Federal workers or impair existing contracts for services; (3) the rates of pay and other conditions of employment shall be reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee; (4) the program is 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 standards are not used to deny employment opportunities for individuals employed 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 shall not exceed 75 per centum of the cost of such program except:

(1) In areas of unusual poverty, as determined by the Council, the Chairman may authorize such funds to exceed 75 per centum; and

(2) where funds authorized in this Act are used in accordance with the provisions of the National Advisory Council on the Human Environment Act of 1964 (5 U.S.C. 83-21a), such funds authorized in this Act shall not exceed 50 per centum of the Federal funds used for such purpose.

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, and shall consider among other relevant factors population, unemployment, and family income levels. Not more than 15 percent 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.

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

(1) appropriate funds for the payment of the salaries of the Chairman and the General Services Administration and consultants or contractors. The Chairman may also appropriate funds for the purposes of this Act for the purposes of this Act, and hire employees as he determines in accordance with section 6(c) and section 6(b); (2) the salaries of the Chairman and the General Services Administration shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 3596); (3) employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof as authorized by section 19 of the Act of August 2, 1945 (5 U.S.C. 3592-3); and (b) the rates of pay for such services shall not exceed $8 an hour.
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. 5, 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. NIXYBOROUGH. 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, to whom I have already submitted the amendment 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, maintain, and operate a toll bridge 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 commerce with, and provide for the navigation of, the boundary 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;

(b) The Donna-Rio Bravo Bridge Company may sell, assign, transfer, or mortgage 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 Donna-Rio Bravo Bridge Company, of McAllen, Texas, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge 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 commerce with, and provide for the navigation of, the boundary 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 Donna-Rio Bravo Bridge Company may fix and charge tolls for transit over the bridge referred to in subsection (a) of this Act in accordance with the laws of the State of Texas, 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 Bravo 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. 3. (a) The Rio Grande Bridge System, of McAllen, Texas, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge 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 commerce with, and provide for the navigation of, the boundary 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 Rio Grande Bridge Company may sell, assign, transfer, or mortgage 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. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of the Act of March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 494), law shall be null and void as to any bridge authorized to be constructed by this Act unless the actual construction of such bridge commences within one year 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, is hereby rescheduled for Tuesday, June 30, 1964, at 10 a.m., in room 2229 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 THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN MEXICO CITY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it was my pleasure this week to represent 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 that he should make the dedication of the 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 building is approaching completion 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 close relations that exist 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 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, Inc., of Houston, Tex., headed by Mr. Max Brooks and Mr. L. W. Pitts, and to the Constructora Marinos, 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, headed by Mr. Max Brooks and Mr. L. W. Pitts, and to the Constructora Marinos, headed by Messrs. Nicholas and Mariano Mariscal, who were prime contractors for the building.

The joint ingenuity of Mexicans and Americans, in this case, was 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 with great pleasure, indeed, to welcome you to this ceremony. We are honored to have you present at the dedication of this building. We know that your anticipation and intense satisfaction, we have long looked forward to this most delightful and gratifying occasion.

Our assassination of Mexico and Mexico, working together, have constructed this building. Together they have made engineering history in the form of a challenge that Mexico City presents to architects and engineers. The foundation of this building rests on mud and water, 30 feet below street level. It consists of 4,500 concrete columns, which, as you know, has weathered earthquakes since it was built without losing its structural integrity. We are proud of this building, and the 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 that will be noted 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 can share only with the help of Mexicans that this Embassy now stands, or I might more aptly say floats, on the foundations. 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, Inc., form of Houston, Tex., to the subsoll and seismic conditions of Mexico City.

The joint ingenuity of Mexicans and Americans, in this case, was 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 with great pleasure, indeed, to welcome you to this ceremony. We are honored to have you present at the dedication of this building.

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 its way. Let us draw inspiration from the fact that here a challenge was boldly met, so the resources of 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 they can work together to achieve 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. It is the responsibility of the Alliance for Progress to guide the United States to the use of this help. Mexico itself, cannot do the whole job, nor even the major part of it. Progress is only material increased your own production, and there is much that other members of the Alliance for Progress can learn from Mexico's experience.

One of the chief criticisms of the Alliance for Progress in 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-sufficiency in many fields, and has not hesitated, 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 is any man, a mother without a roof, a child without a school, we have much to do. Our permanent revolution is dedicated to broadening for all Americans, material and spiritual benefits of the democratic heritage."

Democratic institutions should be strengthened and broadened, and progress fostered and allowed to operate without undue and unnecessary restrictions. Educational systems must be further developed and expanded.
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 CHAIRMAN 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 farms 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 harvester workers.

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 Members prepare their own meals and do their own housekeeping. The Governor of Oregon, Mark O. Hatfield, has enthusiastically endorsed this program.

There is no doubt many obstacles and delays in this new sense of common purpose arising from the unity achieved through the Organization of American States through the Alliance for Progress. 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 has achieved the new millenium in the economic, cultural, and political matters will meet with their Mexican associates on projects of mutual interest and joint concern. We will work together in cooperation and under the Mexican Government and the Mexican people.

The official home that we have constructed and dedicated is a 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:

"From the unity achieved through the Organization of American States through the new sense of common purpose arising from the unity achieved through the Organization of American States through the Alliance for Progress, the Republic of Mexico, will always be a striking symbol of mutual interest and joint concern."
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farm labor will be needed in the future: Now, of the State of Oregon, sponsored a meeting of agricultural leaders to study the problem of supply of agricultural labor. The meeting was well attended and there has been a continuing need for adequate supply of farm labor is not available and therefore there is a continuing need for foreign laborers. 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. Leaders of the committee were Don Curtis, The Dales; Ross Hukari, Hood River; Everett Taylor, Ontario; Walter Collett, Salem; Orio Carver, Milton-Freewater; Henry Kato, Portland; and Howard Fuji, Salem.

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 viewpoint of the committee. It is that reason which will take him from the farm to the factory," said Henry. It is the reason 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.

Whereas Oregon farmers and the Oregon Agricultural Producers Association has developed a better understanding of the needs of Oregon farmers, and there has been a continuing need for foreign laborers.

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 ensure peak quality for distribution and processing, and 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 grocer associations have conducted a vigorous and active recruitment campaign 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 its farm labor last year.

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 the crops of the State. The peak seasons, such labor has not been available and there has been a continuing need for foreign laborers of an unskilled character.

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 the crops of the State. The peak seasons, such labor has not been available and there has been a continuing need for foreign laborers of an unskilled character.

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 the crops of the State. The peak seasons, such labor has not been available and there has been a continuing need for foreign laborers of an unskilled character. The California executive said the domestic worker wants something better and is influenced by the rewards of the industrial society.
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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, June 15.

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 the 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 send them back at a time when thousands of American farm laborers are out of work and there is an increased shortage of jobs which unskilled workers can do.

More than two-thirds of the Mexican "braceros" work on 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 one year. As many as 367 were used.

One of the arguments used in favor of the bracero program is that the Mexican workers are better protected than the drafts of U.S. migrants. As an illustration of the prevailing local policy, the braceros also enjoy protection a minimum of three-quarters of the days they might otherwise work. As an illustration of the possible mischief a 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 protective measures.

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 migrants 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 elsewhere to do anything else. That 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 the migratory program. The bracero program has 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 elsewhere to do anything else. That 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 the migratory program. The bracero program has 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 elsewhere to do anything else. That 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 the migratory program. The bracero program has 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 elsewhere to do anything else. That 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 the migratory program. The bracero program has 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 elsewhere to do anything else. That 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 the migratory program. The bracero program has 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.
The summer school teachers and administrators found that migrant children needed special help in reading, writing, spelling, arithmetic, and other subjects. For example, they found that the migrant children needed much more practice in reading than the children who attended the regular school year. In fact, the amount of reading that the migrant children needed was twice as much as the amount of reading that the children who attended the regular school year needed. This was due to the fact that the migrant children had been in the United States for a shorter amount of time than the children who attended the regular school year.

The summer schools were designed to help the migrant children get up to speed in their reading and writing skills. The teachers worked closely with the children to help them understand the material and to develop their thinking skills. The teachers also used many manipulative materials which the children could see and feel, thereby developing concepts and relationships.

In addition to helping the migrant children improve their reading and writing skills, the summer schools also provided remedial help in arithmetic. The teachers worked with the children one-on-one to help them understand the material and to develop their thinking skills. The teachers also used many manipulative materials which the children could see and feel, thereby developing concepts and relationships.

The summer schools were successful in improving the academic skills of the migrant children. The teachers found that it was necessary to develop 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.

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.

The teachers also found that migrant children had difficulty in learning to write. Consequently, they developed and used many manipulative materials which the children could see and feel, thereby developing concepts and relationships.

The teachers found that it was necessary to develop 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.

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.

The teachers also found that migrant children had difficulty in learning to write. Consequently, they developed and used many manipulative materials which the children could see and feel, thereby developing concepts and relationships.

The teachers found that it was necessary to develop 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.
Prince William Sound, there lies Mon­

tague 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 scones 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 accom­

plished 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 geo­

logical survey team studying the effects of the earthquake in Prince William Sound. Montague Island was level, there are now sheer vertical cliffs as high as 16 feet.

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

Whether this organization, the Minu­

temen, has many or few lunatic right­

wingers as members is inconsequential. I assume that it is really a paper organi­

zation with very few active members. It is probably a moneymaking "patriot­

ism" affair. I cannot believe that there are enough soft-headed people in the Nation for any large number to be mem­

bers of the Minutemen. But the fact is that any organization which obtains high

deals of ammunition, or any other instru­

ments usable in war, or in acts of vio­

lence or lawlessness, should be investi­

gated by the proper law enforcement agencies.

I refer also to the so-called Paul Re­

vere 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 it was 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—

then the Communist cannot subdue an armed citizenry.

Unfortunately, last year the Army gave away to members of the National Rifle Association 80 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 secu­

rity payments, and making some revi­

sions in the program. Among these revi­

sions is one which I have sought to have included in the bill. This particular provision 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 pay­

ments 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 Adminis­

tration—in an effort to bring about this change by regulation. I believe this can and should be done by revision of exist­

ing regulations. I am therefore grati­

fied that the Congress has belatedly rec­

ognized the injustice of this situation and will take steps to correct it by legis­

lation.

SENeca INDIANS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, earlier this week, the Senate passed the Interior Department Appropriations Bill, appropriating $97,010,000 for the work of the Bu­

reau of Indian Affairs. This was an in­

crease of $100,000 over the budget esti­

mate, and an increase of $1,810,000 over the House allowance. The figure includ­

ed funds for resources management, con­

struction on reservations, roadbuilding, educational grants, a revolving loan fund, tribal funds, and general adminis­

trative services.

It is, however, 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—re­

der 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 construc­

tion 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 decid­

ed 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 Appropriations Committees, the con­

ferences have not agreed on a final bill. The lands, I repeat, are due to be flooded in a few short months. Until a compen­

sation bill is passed, the Senecas can­

not be considered on the same level as the Indian tribes who actually received millions of acres in exchange for their land by treaty. These people were willing to give up their land in exchange for a fair consideration, but the Senecas were willing to give their land only on the terms set down in their treaty.
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 lands taken, 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, see more, to renew a plea for the consideration of this bill to exert every effort to devise a bill which is fair to the Senecas.

SENIOR FONG'S CIVIL RIGHTS ADDRESS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators who have commended 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, 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 sponsor 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 Appalachian 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 industries 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 the Committee and for the breaking of the treaty. There is ample precedent for such compensation in Indian land cases.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FONG CREATING, DEMANDING AND REQUESTING FOR 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 $362 million. I am a co-sponsor of S. 2782, as are 34 other Members of the Senate. The bill is in large part bipartisian. It should, for poverty knows no party lines.

I hope this committee will report S. 2782 favorably. I am convinced that 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., Appalachian poverty is a way of life. The facts presented here are not new; they have only been updated. In 1902 and again in 1933 the Federal Government published extensive reports of this region. Each of these studies brought to light the conditions described in each report are discouragingly similar; their recurrence in these studies is the chronicle of a region by-passed.

A region by-passed, 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 are equal to the rest of the country, when their per capita income is equal to the average American, and when the Appalachian share of 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 use of coal, improved mining practices, and land restoration.

If the war we wage against poverty in the United States today is won decisively, it must have both short- and long-range objectives. We cannot disregard the chronically unemployed adult. Each year we see the breaking of the re-ignition of an economic aid program. We cannot afford to be less generous at home.

Mr. President, our bountiful affluence but this good life does not extend to what President Franklin Delano Roosevelt a generation ago referred to as "a third of the American people," and the gap between the affluent and the poor is growing—ever as we discuss the need for this particular bill.
on the strategic location and potential market which Appalachia represents, must be located in the region. The significant recreational resources must be developed with coordinated effort. If their employment potential is to be realized, agricultural diversification should be accelerated and mining and timber employment must be increased. Private enterprise will be the ultimate employer. * * * But before this can happen, public investment must create the framework 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. Coordinated development of water resources, to end flooding and bring in industry.
4. Livestock industry to help meet the Nation's demand for beef.
5. Processing of timber locally.
6. Use for coal deposits, development of minerals.
7. Reduction of low-cost power. 
8. Utilization of recreational resources.

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 as is proposed in S. 2762 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 ill 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 life of one of the noblest of men, we add a tribute 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, after all, when 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 the words 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. INOUYE. 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 8.—Haoles have become the largest ethnic group in Hawaii. Most 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, but the new arrivals have far fewer qualms about being one of the happiest interracial societies in the world. The islanders, however, are confident that Hawaii will change the Haoles before they change Hawaii.

In any case, the white predominance is only the skimmest sort of statistical triumph. The islanders are becoming so interbred and mixed that the 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 categories will no longer be measured in ethnic terms.

The effect of all this has been startling, the largest ethnic group in Hawaii.

The aboriginal Polynesian Hawaiians assimilated freely with past waves of Haoles. Only a few thousand pure Hawaiians remain in the total population of 600,000.

INTERMARRIAGE RATE RISING

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

The Japanese, until recently the largest group, are becoming so closely knit, are also beginning to lose their identity. One of every four Japanese women marries a nonwhite men, but the rate is leveling at the national average of 25 to 30 percent, while the previously lowest divorce rate of un-mixed Orientals is mounting to that average.

The group known ethnically as Hawaiian and which did much to foster equality and intermarriage here has had the most difficult task. Before World War II Hawaiians still revealed racial resentments often against the large and visibly successful and energetic group of Japanese.

But the preacher of racism who ventured 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.

Oddly though 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 United States.

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 mixed and unmixed marriages are becoming alike. Until a few years ago mixed marriages fared poorly, especially those of white women and Japanese men, but the divorce rate is now at the national average of 25 to 30 percent, while the previously lowest divorce rate of un-mixed Orientals is mounting to that average.

Many Young Hawaiians

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, all top opportunities can no longer be measured in ethnic terms.

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

Douglas S. Yamamura, also a sociologist, puts it:

Hawaiians are more and more living up to the pretense of nondiscrimination that has standing still tended to coincide with ethnic segregation.
taller and brighter and more talented than ever before 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 college in 1964, they will probably have ceased to be an obstacle.

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

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. INOYE. 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, was asked to give his views on this problem in a commencement address delivered at St. Benedict's College, in Atchison, Kan.

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 Hemeny, 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 position, 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 uncertain about their own ability to be great, but 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 College. As a student, I am honored that the Word of the Lord has come to me in the class of 1964.

A doctor of laws is commissioned to teach. It is the function of the law to set before society the concepts of justice and to guard its future through education. As we move into our East-West role, our mission is to conserve and educate and play a leading part in the development of our evolving opportunities. We must insure that in the controversy of child versus machine and between nature and human control there is a balance, and we must recognize that the world is, likewise, by its very learning made the more prone to disease and degeneration, and that our problem is the awakening of the 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 shivering. What is of ultimate worth? The schools in fact promote selfishness.

Phenix advocates a curriculum with a moral content that is the ideal of sexual purity as one method of fostering 'dedication to standards of worth.'

"To build conscience, Phenix would teach respect for all forms of life. Geography, for example, would go far beyond maps and atlases to include the names to the responsible uses of air, earth, and water. Lessons in health would illustrate abuses in everything from alcohol to industrial waste. Since sex 'provides the crux 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 would keep as one of the advantages 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 worthful is not finite or limited but transcends all human comprehension and every human achievement."

"That the supreme is not human or human-like, but exists outside the life of selfish ambition, the struggle for autonomy, acquisition and success, and attachment to finite goods, lead and end to misery, guilt, despair, boredom and frustration.

"That every individual has a personal calling to turn from, following after desire, to found and sustain a faith and a dedication to what is of ultimate worth."
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"To build conscience, Phenix would teach respect for all forms of life. Geography, for example, would go far beyond maps and atlases to include the names to the responsible uses of air, earth, and water. Lessons in health would illustrate abuses in everything from alcohol to industrial waste. Since sex 'provides the crux 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 would keep as one of the advantages 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.'"
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"That the supreme is not human or human-like, but exists outside the life of selfish ambition, the struggle for autonomy, acquisition and success, and attachment to finite goods, lead and end to misery, guilt, despair, boredom and frustration.

"That every individual has a personal calling to turn from, following after desire, to found and sustain a faith and a dedication to what is of ultimate worth."
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and generates vital force to make it live and move, and never die. If the human soul were a resource, then a comprehensive value structure would be relatively simple matter. But in public education the need for unity and the fact of plurality; of academic freedom versus philosophical coherence.

Dr. Phenix may have put his hand on the greatest problem in modern public education, but it is also the most controversial. It is important not to lose sight of the fact that there are many who believe that the unity and coherence of our nation's curriculum could not be assured, and the tenor of the court's decision will be relatively simple matter. But when many of these same men wrote the Constitution the provisos of distrust and tension has been felt in court and Congress. But secularism is a kind of parochial education being religious, public education is therefore secular. Some have followed this line with great zeal, and the violation 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 safer distance.

Nevertheless, the fact of the matter is that in the kind of democratic structure being questioned by us and others, and the debate has opened. Ideas must be distill themselves 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 as a matter of course 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 minority report: "Our concern is with moral and spiritual values. The question is: What is that dynamic living process of the richness of 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 dimension 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 user. It also follows that we cannot address ourselves effectively to the needs of our youth as long as we continue to regard responsibility for the development of values and ideals as everybody's business."

Here, then, is * * * the formation in each county of a permanent, continuing, representative citizens' group, including representatives of churches and schools, and 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 could issue statements of concern, publicize information about significant programs and developments, commend worthwhile activities, suggest possible or necessary improvements, and initiate whatever process of evaluation and revaluation 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 sulliying fears of participating in a dialog that we cannot dominate, of tackling a problem that we cannot master 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 conflict, perhaps you 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 arts 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 men was not only possible but also fruitful.

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

You graduates, as you commence your 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, and your institution.

If you are so inclined, I pose to you this question: to whom shall we assign the question of values and ideals?

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 connected out of two of that, essays by which, your faith, your contribution, and most important of all, your participation.

TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. INOUYE. 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 Capitol.

I submit that we find comedians, including many of Ukrainian descent, memorize 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 the entries 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 they 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 dictate that for a democracy to exist and function, freedom may not be unlimited by the state. If freedom is to be secure, the people must control their government. If 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 doubt he would be more fitting for the 20th century American than this.

To make democracy work better we must elevate the standards of character associated to American ideals. They must be freedom-loving, wise, courageous, and have high ethical standards. We must elect officers who express a deep interest in order to serve a wide group of interests not related to, and often opposed to, the political party one belongs to. We can elect men to office who understand that economics are not divorced from political or ethical consideration. We Americans must be educated on the average, and finally, 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 later in life the ability to think. They can do this through self-education and through adult education courses.

Making Democracy Work Better

(By Richard Vonburg)

Through my experience as a young American citizen, I find that you cannot make democracy work better by vapidly elaborating the very basic rule which democracy is based upon. Therefore, when I use the word "make," the meaning is exceedingly liberal.

In early history democracy was synonymous with mob rule. Essentially it is a mob rule, because the crowd is the mass—the people are the whole people. Democracy is much like love, continually growing, going through many changes, and new forms and standards are created by Justice William Hastie. "Democracy is a process, not a static condition. It is becoming rather than remaining. It can be fully lost; it 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 improvement to be a "progressive". We should 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 the government. DeWitt wrote, "Democracy is much broader than a special political form, a method of conducting government, of making laws, and carrying on the administration of the nation. It is a 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 fulfille the needs and wants of the people. No man is elected to an office unless the people feel he will pass legislation they want. In the political party one belongs to, in the prohibition amendment, the strength of the people provided woman suffrage, the will of the people created income tax, the people created Social Security. The states every 4 years—all of these things and countless more have been accomplished because the people wanted them. This is what the citizens can do in a great possibility within themselves 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. Since democracy is more than a government, including people, we can make democracy work better through people. A citizen has a duty to his nation, no matter whether he be a father, mother, sister, or brother, a responsibility of fellowship, love, understanding, faith, hope, compassion, etc., is born in the family relation and extended to the nation. Every American should be a "good American." 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

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. Since democracy is more than a government, including people, we can make democracy work better through people. A citizen has a duty to his nation, no matter whether he be a father, mother, sister, or brother, a responsibility of fellowship, love, understanding, faith, hope, compassion, etc., is born in the family relation and extended to the nation. Every American should be a "good American." 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.
WATER POLLUTION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, water is a natural resource of inestimable worth. Every level of government, and industry, agriculture, and our 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 support that I believe the measure embodied in 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. A tribute to its success is 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 the Federal enforcement power has been involved, 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. To put this view in perspective, it is not an adversary proceeding. It is a meeting of the Federal and State conferences, 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 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, drains the wastes of city and factory. It was at the urging of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ruircorl], the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, that the present Secretary called a conference on the matter. 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 conferences 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 yet under conference. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the State and interstate authorities, and the Senator from Connecticut may take pride in this splendid result.

But the effort for effective 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. Their size was markedly reduced 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 study, 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; and, 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 an immediate pollution, and will require further study; fifth, that the presence of minute endrin concentrations in the treated water of the Vicksburg, Mss., and New Orleans water supplies is a matter for concern, for while accidents in the treatment plants 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 vicinity of large water bodies 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 conclusion of this subcommittee report 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 source had not been the causative factor in the fish kills. To review the whole matter is entirely 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 Organization has been reviewing the increasing size of the new area of governmental policy respecting pesticides. Its hearings, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Connecticut, have resulted in better inter-agency 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 reasonable response to the Government's consideration of 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 dying in the rivers, 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 ever dying fish examined. To establish endrin concentration in blood after a lethal exposure, laboratory tests were conducted on channel catfish, a fresh-water 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 were found to have 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.

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.

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 1962.

He said he was 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 held 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 118-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 conferences. 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 conferences, 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, aldrin, or dieldrin, but made use 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 and its leadership in the arts. Massachusetts citizens combine an awareness and appreciation of our State's heritage with a determination to maintain the high standards which made that past so glorious. The 13th annual Boston Arts Festival which opened last June 29 should afford an opportunity for clarification of the issues. 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 he is under the care of skilled medical authorities. I am sorry to say that we have kept 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 red tape, 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 approved, Senator Ervin's proposal makes it easier for persons voluntarily seeking commitment with the traditional safeguards of trial by jury-a historic achievement of this legislation.

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 20, 1963, Admiral Sharp assumed duty as 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 direct control of all naval forces in the vast Pacific and to keep open the life line 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, on 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 regarding 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:


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 a most eloquent, moving, erudite, and scholarly address to the Senate on civil rights. It is to this end that all Americans owe a debt of gratitude to the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina.
sage-spoken man who covered the golf course in lawn shoes, 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 have won him the loyalty of the customer on the golf course. He is known as an extremely able but not spectacular officer. He is regarded as a tactician who always has 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 practical answer.

CAUGHT MCNAMARA’S EYE

He began his career in the traditional way—by serving in and commanding destroyers. The first major command he held was one of many highly ranked military figures, August 1960. His pragmatic, no-nonsense work at the Pentagon brought him to the attention of many highly ranked military figures, as Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. Only he was close enough to command in chief of the Pacific Fleet, and promoted to a full admiral. He now succeeds as head of the Far East Command.

As with many other military and naval officers, he naturally shot 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. Milham of Los Angeles, Calif.

Grant A. Sharp, Jr., 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. Milham of Los Angeles, Calif. 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. Milham of Los Angeles, Calif.

He was named after his aunt’s husband, Gen. Milham of Los Angeles, Calif. 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. Milham of Los Angeles, Calif.

Academy. Upon receiving his commission as a midshipman, he began his career in the traditional way—by serving in and commanding destroyers. The first major command he held was one of many highly ranked military figures, August 1960.

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. With the Navy on the Korean, South Vietnam, and China, and has commanded its waters, right up to the edge of the Asian Continent, ever since.

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. With the Navy on the Korean, South Vietnam, and China.

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 by rescuing 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 in shore, 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 first fleet planning officer for the Inchon invasion.

Before his appointment to the Pentagon in 1960, he held a number of staff jobs with the Central Intelligence Agency and the Office of the Secretary of Defense. He has been chief of staff to the 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 P. Milham of Los Angeles, and a son, Lt. (j.g.) Grant 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 why he is known as an expert in the field of military strategy.

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 Newport-to-Bermuda race, which was won by the Burgho, which made the trip in a corrected time of 80 hours 50 minutes 7 seconds. Although this comparatively small 37-foot yawl was the winner, and the big ocean racers 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 the big ships.

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 Mr. Robert 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 paragraph is taken from a newsletter regarding the inadvisability of maintaining military installations no longer needed for the defense of the Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was referred to in this editorial, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

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.

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 McGovern’s office by which the Daily Capital Journal agrees. It can be argued that the man who pours concrete into a silo does 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 just spending 10 percent of all workers in the country out of work. I point out that it should be possible to provide employment for a lot of people who now are employed...
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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 Winooaski, 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—whom the graduates have to aid them in facing such 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, Winooaski, 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 of St. Michael's College, not only for having me here, but also for honoring me with the privilege of delivering the commencement address to the graduating class join in the choice of a Commander in Chief who is to the welfare of the country-north, south, east, and west.

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 answer comes 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 gap 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, producing a sense of oneness, of purpose. Brotherly love is a natural human instinct. Pope John's vision was a more loving, more secure world, with no room for racism and bias.

On this very day, we are being reminded of the importance of brotherhood. The recent death of the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. is a reminder of the importance of building bridges of understanding and respect between people of all backgrounds.

In conclusion, let us remember the words of Pope John: "Let us be one in the prayer, 'Our Father'..."
hatred of communism can be confused, and can combine to produce extremes of behavior which add virulence to the Nation’s bloodstains and abrasiveness to our American communities.

Let us resist the temptation to find scapegoats for the failures of the past. Our country needs a leader, not a buck, as President Kennedy 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 celebrate diversity as well as of the left. Let our voices sound in support of reasoned democratic views.

The political challenges of our day—the ecumenical spirit with its call to brotherhood, racial understanding, preserving personal integrity, avoiding bigotry, joining in the quest for our common future. At the same time, Ben Bradlee made it clear that President Kennedy was the first President who had a personal regard for great leaders at home as well as abroad.

**LEADERSHIP AND PRESIDENT KENNEDY**

Within a brief span of time, the Catholic religion provided such leaders—Pope John XXIII and President Kennedy. Pope John’s enormous contribution, which I touched on before, has been felt throughout the history of the church, and women of all races and creeds. To paraphrase another Pope, only once in many centuries is such a Pope granted to the church.

In his own words, 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 us a man, with extraordinary intelligence and vitality. His friend, Ben Bradlee of Newsweek, described him as a Renaissance man. John Kennedy was an astute student of government and its various institutions. He possessed an unusual sensitivity to the close link between the branch of government and the aspirations of a free legislation. Legislation was not an abstraction to him. Each proposal was seen in the context of its specific purpose, but also in terms of its overall impact on society.

Thus, in calling for an end to expensive accomplices, and sound government for the next century, he said: “This is a matter of national concern, affecting not only our public revenues, our sense of fairness, and our very wealth, but our moral and business practices as well.” Corrective measures, he believed, would “strengthen both our tax structure and the moral code 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 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 of us have a public duty to conduct our public lives in terms of 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 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 understood that 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 just come back from 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 be 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 abandoned, but let them guide you.

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 abilities to inform and to help mold public opinion, and to suggest sound courses of action to others. I urge you to give careful thought, too—somewhere during your career—to serving your local, State or National Government. John Kennedy emphasized at Vanderbilt University that ability to inform and to help mold public opinion, and to suggest sound courses of action to others.

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 has left us, in a generation and a generation of Americans. Let us hope that the graduates of 1964 will have the vision and sense of personal commitment to make our nation great, 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;

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 you, your Senate colleagues, to use your influence to do everything possible to right these injustices.

The resolution was passed unanimously at the semiannual business meeting of the Vermont Jewish Youth Council, May 31, 1964.

NAOMI WALT, Secretary.
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 the qualities that give it meaning.

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 opposed 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, and the Salvation Army.

Margaret Hasebroock is the perfect answer to the questions 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 Scranton, Neb., Woman's Club, Mrs. Hasebroock has been doing her part. Meanwhile, she has enjoyed a full and rich family life. Her husband, Senator William H. Hasebroock, is a successful business man 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—or do we want to—recreate the old frontier, with all its challenges and opportunities. But we can combine, as Margaret Hasebroock has, in new ways, 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 lead 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 73rd annual convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs elected Mrs. William H. Hasebroock of West Point, Neb., to a 2-year term Wednesday as president of the organization which represents 11 million women in 54 countries.

She 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 take 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 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; 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 land, waterfront, and water body.

In addition to Mrs. Hasebroock, who succeeds Mrs. Dexter Otis Arnold, of Concord, N.H., and Saugettiques, N.Y., officers named were Mrs. E. D. Pierce, of Miami, Fla., first vice president; Mrs. Charles M. M. O'Keefe, of Pittsburgh, Pa., third vice president; and Mrs. Kermit V. Haughan, Minneapolis, Minn., recording secretary. All won uncontested races.

[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 first president of the general federation, said, "When legislation is required to serve freedom's causes, we shall move at the grass-roots 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 right to ask that our past and present candidates respect our past and present support. We have the right to ask that minority voices be heard in the voting participation of women to a level commensurate with our numerical strength. It's a challenge, but we can do it."

Mrs. Hasebroock's remarks in an address after she was installed as president of the federation. At the ceremony closing the 73rd annual convention of the federation were Gov. and Mrs. Frank Morrisson, Senator and Mrs. Roman Hruska, and
REPRESENTATIVE AND MRS. RALPH L. BEERMAN, OF NEBRASKA.

Mrs. Hasebroock told the clubwomen, "Our mandate is clear. We must become still more of a force in the many fields necessary to discharge our role as citizens in a free world, foster continued progress, and build on our country's momentum. "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, both in the United States and the other countries where they are active.

Mrs. Hasebroock and her husband, members of the Nebraska Legislature, have devoted their efforts to the good of the State of Nebraska.

The election of Mrs. Hasebroock as head of the General Federation of Women's Clubs is well deserved. Nebraska 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 Nebraska 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 problems together to try to solve them in the United States and the other countries where they are active.

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 as 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]

NEBRASKA TO LEAD 9 MILLION CLUBWOMEN

(From Mary McGrath)

Thirty-six years ago a young bride sat in her Sorbiren, Nebraska, 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 State senator from West Point. Her busy husband is now the State senator from West Port. And because of that long ago evening, Mrs. Hasebroock was the first Nebraskan to head the General Federation of Women's Clubs—the world's largest women's organization.

"When my Bluffs native recounts 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 organization for the Sorbiren Women's Club and—by accident—Mrs. Hasebroock was the first to sign the charter. Since then, she has become a leader in an organization with 11 million members in 54 countries and 84 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 and recording secretary, and as first and second and third and second and third vice presidents. Now the former schoolteacher is an organizational leader for president of an organization with 11 million members in the United States and 54 other countries. In- stallation on June 11 will climax the convention in Atlantic City, N.J.
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Mrs. Hasebroock was the first to sign the charter. Since then, she has become a leader in an organization with 11 million members in 54 countries and 84 other countries.

In 1950 Mrs. Hasebroock received a good neighbor award from the World-Herald and the Knights of Ak-Sar-Ben.

WHAT 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, Linda, and Robert, 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?

"I guess the 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 need of adult education and adult improvement and adult education," Mrs. Hasebroock said.

The months ahead will find the Nebraskan making a nation-wide survey of neighborhood headquarters, attending both political conventions and planning such projects as the 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 experience of 500 Washington, Ind., who 2 years ago became concerned with the school dropout problem.

Today they've involved 50,000 citizens in a project which has sent almost 100,000 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 frown 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 have been barred from national, regional, 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. However, the Jews have taken to gathering in private homes, for services. 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 have been barred from national, regional, 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. However, the Jews have taken to gathering in private homes, for services. 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 have been barred from national, regional, 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. However, the Jews have taken to gathering in private homes, for services. 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.
This 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 vilified 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. Therefore, 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 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 numb as 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 communism, 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 unprinted business, which has been studied and perfected by the best fiscal experts in the Government. I have introduced it nine times in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and should convert the forthcoming fifth Congress 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 a confidential request for constructive use. It is based on careful analysis of every expenditure item in the Federal 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 Skubitz, of Kansas.

The proposals I am making are 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 appropriation. 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 the start of the current Congress, and the near half of the Members of the Senate have been patrons on the bill. The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Anderson), in the Finance Committee 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 this 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 we as Government do not have to be made. If effective effort to get off 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 justitied. My attitude against the excesses which have produced the current debt situation and need 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 secure 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 is needed for the coming 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 ceiling of $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, $28.7 billion has been added in the past 4 consecutive years since the $275 billion was reduced; 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. Deficit financing plans to preempt 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 the Federal Government is under no compulsion to "restrain" expenditures and that the policy to "restrain" expenditures is no longer a practical possibility.

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 many years hence. 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 heard this before. What have 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 long ago. 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.

The rate today 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 $322 billion now.

Fifth, a planned deficit approaching $325 billion 2 years from now.

Sixth, no plans for either balanced budgets or debt reduction.

Conforming with the congressional policy for "restrained 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, 123, and 319 of the budget document.

These references are to the spending estimates of the 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 bonds or bonds.

The budget proposes to pool Government-held 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 they interest meanwhile on the certificates.

The $1 billion of budgeted proceeds expected from these loans by the public to the Government agencies—which are actually not reductions 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 debt and reduce the deficit 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 the proposed Increase in the debt limitation.

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, 123, 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 undertaken to reduce the size of its charter powers, and that legislation is to be proposed for FNMA and VA. It would be greatly appreciated if you could 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 Federals?

What would be their duration;

Would they be negotiable;

Would the proceeds of the loans go to agency coffers? if so, for what purposes could and would they be used; would they be used to pay off agency debt to the Treasury;

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 counted in the statutory debt limit;

Would such loans compete with Treasury operations;

Would, or could, such operations affect interest rates;

By what amount is it proposed that expenditures in fiscal year 1966 would be reduced by the pool operation in all agencies involved;

In view of the fact that proceeds from the sale of such certificates would show in the budget as reductions the expenditures be counted as a "reduction" in expenditures;

would it follow that expenditures for redemption of the certificates at maturity would show as an increase in expenditures and interest payments.

With my very best wishes,

Faithfully yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
ExHIBIT 1,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. Gordon: In your letter of January 21, 1964, you have asked for an explanation of the so-called "pools" of mortgages which is underway on the Export-Import Bank handled by the Secretary of the Treasury. The pool operations were in relative peace and prosperity.

The Export-Import Bank expects to follow the general procedure used in earlier years. In 1957 and 1958, 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 semianual installments over a 10-year and a 7-year period, respectively, together with interest at specified rates (4¾ percent, including credit on the unpaid principal balance).

The Bank unconditionally guaranteed principal and interest payments in the event of default. It reserved the right 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 on Federal 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 pools operated under the proposed legislation. As a trustee, FNMA 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 amount of these blocks would be large enough to provide coverage equal to at least 12½ percent of the principal amounts
of the outstanding certificates of participa-
tion would not constitute loans from the po-
gee but to new sales to individual investors.
edgers would obtain certain specified owner-
ship rights in a portion of the assets in the
pool.
1. Would they be backed by the full
faith and credit of the Government or carry
faith and credit of the Federal Government,
but, are, or would be, guaranteed by Export-
Import Bank in the one case and by the Fed-
eral National Mortgage Association in the
other.
2. What would be their duration?
In the case of the Export-Import Bank, the
certificates issued in May 1963 were
payable in 20 semiannual principal install-
ments beginning November 1, 1963, and
those issued on May 1, 1963, were payable in
14 semiannual principal installments begin-
ing November 1, 1963.
3. What would they be negotiable?
The certificates of participation issued by
FNMA would be negotiable, since they would
be issued in certificated form and would be
transferable on the books of FNMA. The
participation certificates issued by the Ex-
port-Import Bank, however, have not been
transferable, except to a limited extent for
the 1962 certificates.
4. Would the proceeds of the loans go
to agency debt to the Treasury 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 certifi-
cates 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 liquidat-
ing 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
principal and interest to FNMA
ship rights in a portion of the assets in the
pool.

Under present plans, the FNMA would sell
the certificates at a price equal in the aggre-
gate 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.

3. Would the sale of certificates be in
the nature of loans from the public to the re-
spective agencies?
The sale would constitute loans from the
pool to the public; but to new sales to
individual investors.

Under present plans, the FNMA would sell
the certificates at a price equal in the aggre-
rate 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 RANGE of maturities to be offered is a
factor which would appeal to the same investor
as direct obligations of the Treasury, but
would make a corresponding amount of bor-
rowing by Treasury unnecessary. The net
interest cost of such debt, therefore, should be
almost neutral.

The certificates of such operations would be
negotiable and would affect interest rates, etc.
In the volume anticipated, these opera-
tions could not have a significant effect on
the market level of interest rates.

The certificates of participation would be
guaranteed 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.

The certificates of participation issued by
FNMA would be negotiable, since they would
be issued in certificated form and would be
transferable on the books of FNMA. The
participation certificates issued by the Ex-
port-Import Bank, however, have not been
transferable, except to a limited extent for
the 1962 certificates.

Would the proceeds of the loans go
to agency debt to the Treasury 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 certifi-
cates 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 liquidat-
ing 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
principal and interest to FNMA
ship rights in a portion of the assets in the
pool.

Under present plans, the FNMA would sell
the certificates at a price equal in the aggre-
rate 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.

3. Would the sale of certificates be in
the nature of loans from the public to the re-
spective agencies?
The sale would constitute loans from the
pool to the public; but to new sales to
individual investors.

Under present plans, the FNMA would sell
the certificates at a price equal in the aggre-
rate 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 RANGE of maturities to be offered is a
factor which would appeal to the same investor
as direct obligations of the Treasury, but
would make a corresponding amount of bor-
rowing by Treasury unnecessary. The net
interest cost of such debt, therefore, should be
almost neutral.

The certificates of such operations would be
negotiable and would affect interest rates, etc.
In the volume anticipated, these opera-
tions could not have a significant effect on
the market level of interest rates.

The certificates of participation would be
guaranteed 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.

The certificates of participation issued by
FNMA would be negotiable, since they would
be issued in certificated form and would be
transferable on the books of FNMA. The
participation certificates issued by the Ex-
port-Import Bank, however, have not been
transferable, except to a limited extent for
the 1962 certificates.

Would the proceeds of the loans go
to agency debt to the Treasury 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 certifi-
cates 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 liquidat-
ing 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
principal and interest to FNMA
ship rights in a portion of the assets in the
pool.

Under present plans, the FNMA would sell
the certificates at a price equal in the aggre-
rate 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.

3. Would the sale of certificates be in
the nature of loans from the public to the re-
spective agencies?
The sale would constitute loans from the
pool to the public; but to new sales to
individual investors.

Under present plans, the FNMA would sell
the certificates at a price equal in the aggre-
rate 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.
when he enumerated $6% billion of un-
necessary obligations that could be post-
poned or completely eliminated.

With due deference, I should like to
add that the junior Senator from Vir-
ginia, in a speech last March, indicated
at least $4 billion of current spending
that should be either eliminated or post-
poned.

The senior Senator from Virginia went
on to say:

If effective effort to get off of the deficit-
debts, and by that, he mean the public
debt limit, it would appear that a
meaningful temporary provision for debt
already contracted.

In the absence of such an effort, I am vot-
ing against the bill.

I congratulate him for that statement.
I intend to join him in that position, be-
cause 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 under-
mine our traditional system of pri-
vate 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 distin-
guished 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. Presi-
dent, 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,
July 1, the public debt limit is sched-
uled to drop to its permanent level of
$285 billion.

If debts could be erased or reduced sim-
ply by not approving 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 conse-
quences that would swiftly beset us if the
United States suddenly had to de-
fault on its obligations.

To avoid such a calamity, the admin-
istration is recommending that 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 al-
ready passed this bill. The Finance
Committee has reported it favorably. It
is now up to this body to face its responsi-
bilities clearly. 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 author-
ized the expenditures, we have appropri-
ated the funds for them.

It is totally irresponsible, with the bills
for these expenditures coming due, to pretend they are somebody else's obliga-
tions. 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 bor-
rowing 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 bil-
ion 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
is greater emphasis on the amount of
credit that the law allows Congress to take
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 in-
crease in borrowing even when the
budget is in balance or surplus and,
finally, the need for a margin of flexi-
bility to enable the Secretary of the
Treasury to finance the outstanding pub-
lce debt. Let none of us forget, sir, that
the same is true when we compare the
borrowing needs that will arise in
fiscal 1965.

In establishing a new, fully adequate,
and wholly responsible debt limit, there
is greater emphasis on the amount of
credit that the law allows Congress to take
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 in-
crease in borrowing even when the
budget is in balance or surplus and,
finally, the need for a margin of flexi-
bility to enable the Secretary of the
Treasury to finance the outstanding pub-
lce debt. Let none of us forget, sir, that
the same is true when we compare the
borrowing needs that will arise in
fiscal 1965.
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and wholly responsible debt limit, there
is greater emphasis on the amount of
credit that the law allows Congress to take
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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 in-
crease in borrowing even when the
budget is in balance or surplus and,
finally, the need for a margin of flexi-
bility to enable the Secretary of the
Treasury to finance the outstanding pub-
lce debt. Let none of us forget, sir, that
the same is true when we compare the
borrowing needs that will arise in
fiscal 1965.

In establishing a new, fully adequate,
and wholly responsible debt limit, there
is greater emphasis on the amount of
credit that the law allows Congress to take
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 in-
crease in borrowing even when the
budget is in balance or surplus and,
finally, the need for a margin of flexi-
bility to enable the Secretary of the
Treasury to finance the outstanding pub-
lce debt. Let none of us forget, sir, that
the same is true when we compare the
borrowing needs that will arise in
fiscal 1965.

In establishing a new, fully adequate,
and wholly responsible debt limit, there
is greater emphasis on the amount of
credit that the law allows Congress to take
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 in-
crease in borrowing even when the
budget is in balance or surplus and,
finally, the need for a margin of flexi-
bility to enable the Secretary of the
Treasury to finance the outstanding pub-
lce debt. Let none of us forget, sir, that
the same is true when we compare the
borrowing needs that will arise in
fiscal 1965.

In establishing a new, fully adequate,
and wholly responsible debt limit, there
is greater emphasis on the amount of
credit that the law allows Congress to take
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 in-
crease in borrowing even when the
budget is in balance or surplus and,
finally, the need for a margin of flexi-
bility to enable the Secretary of the
Treasury to finance the outstanding pub-
lce debt. Let none of us forget, sir, that
the same is true when we compare the
borrowing needs that will arise in
fiscal 1965.

In establishing a new, fully adequate,
and wholly responsible debt limit, there
is greater emphasis on the amount of
credit that the law allows Congress to take
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 in-
crease in borrowing even when the
budget is in balance or surplus and,
finally, the need for a margin of flexi-
bility to enable the Secretary of the
Treasury to finance the outstanding pub-
lce debt. Let none of us forget, sir, that
the same is true when we compare the
borrowing needs that will arise in
fiscal 1965.
...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 the 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. Today at much higher prices and that prices of these stocks continue to go up...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Administrative budget</th>
<th>Civilian labor force</th>
<th>Individual tax</th>
<th>Gross national product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(in millions of dollars)</td>
<td>(in millions)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(in billions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>$855</td>
<td>$825</td>
<td>$88</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>$855</td>
<td>$825</td>
<td>$88</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>$855</td>
<td>$825</td>
<td>$88</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>$855</td>
<td>$825</td>
<td>$88</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>$855</td>
<td>$825</td>
<td>$88</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE.—Variations in totals result from rounded figures.

Source: Budget, fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, p. 422.

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 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
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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, showing that the debt, subject to limit, will actually amount to $312 billion on June 30. This will come to approximately $312 billion—about $3 billion above the statutory limit for that day, and about $37 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 affected 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 issues 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 if asked at the end of fiscal 1964, the deficit was $25.5 million higher than if the Government had been allowed to borrow money itself in the normal manner. 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 market 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, the position of the Treasury on June 30. Savings bonds sales would have to cease immediately. Inasmuch as the savings bonds program is a key-stone to the sound management of the fiscal affairs of the Government, the Treasury has on hand $3 billion worth of bonds or payroll deductions for their purchase, even for a brief period, would be disastrous to the program for years ahead.

If Congress 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 interest, or buying marketable issues in the market. This would deplete the Treasury's cash and have a severe effect on the Government securities market.

To 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.

To 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 the broadest possible 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 not misplaced.

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 of Article One, and I believe, was voted.

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 tenderhooks. We are told that the country has been 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 1938, 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 to possibly 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 1940, when Hitler swept through the Low Countries and France, and attacked England. At the end of World War II, the debt was $276 billion, or an increase, due to World War II, of $290 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 War, supported by the Chinese Communists, 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. Tyield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not good that we have about $34 billion of 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 $50 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 owned by the Federal Reserve Board to the Government, the entire remaining debt is in effect a debt that was incurred in war?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

Now let us see what the assets of the Federal Government are, in comparison to our liabilities. When a 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 report that is issued by the Federal Government, both real estate and so-called personal property.

The true value is not 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 on June 30th, 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, at acquisition cost, exceeded the debt by $8.7 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator 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. Royal rights to the Federal tidelands 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 lose complete title to all tidelands, on the pretense 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 the Rural Electrification Corporation to the Federal Government, if anything, are understated. But even if the income-producing properties are not included, the assets of the Federal Government exceed its debt.

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 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 $313.2 billion, made up of $235 billion in personal property and of $80 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.

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 $364 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, 1964, the present time, the national debt is only slightly more than 50 percent of the gross national product, or $308 billion as compared with a $606 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. That 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 $89 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 670 percent.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Has the Senator noticed the extent to which the corporate debt has increased?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. 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 companies that have held 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.
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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 any 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 that, 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 artifically 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 until someone came up with a Government check. If the check was big enough, they suddenly realized they were distressed. So they take the 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. 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 Federal Government debt increase, 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 homes of the people of the 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 expenditures 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. 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 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 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.

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. Mr. President, will the Senate pass, conceivably it could pass, a resolution 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 resolution that the Senate should not pass, or at least that the Senate should not pass in favor of the resolution.

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, 1865, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I continue to believe that the measure which would authorize the Treasury Department to increase the debt of our Government, if I may say so, I do because I believe that practically annual lifting of the limit renders the necessity of 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 philosophy of the U.S. Congress applied to maintenance of current operations, if the philosophy of the U.S. Congress applied to maintaining current operations, if the Government as much as you possibly can. The movement ought to be stopped.

One word to the members of families who might be listening: In your homes, heaped upon the Members of Congress who believe that something should be done to reduce the debt. The net implication of the present course will be stopped. The evidence is not existent 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 extant to contemplate voting to authorize an increase in the indebtedness.

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 the situation, I do not contemplate voting to authorize an increase in the indebtedness.

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. MOTION (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 withdraw 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. Stimson). 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. ALLOTT (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 "yes." 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 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.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Brewster), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Curney), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Gore), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Hartke), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. Hayden), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Lone), 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. Bayar), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy) are absent to vote.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Anderson), the
Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. EDMONSON] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BAYH] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. DWEY], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McGOVER] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. SYMINGTON], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MCCHEM] is detained on official business.

The respective pairs of Senators from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] would each vote "aye.

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 Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] would each vote "aye.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] would each vote "aye.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McGOVER] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. SYMINGTON], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MCCHEM] is detained on official business.

The respective pairs of Senators from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWE] have been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MCCHEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "aye" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yea 48, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—48

Bennett, Miss—Cannon, Utah
Bible, Mont—Carson, Idaho
Boggs, Ky—Case, W. Va.
Burdick, N. D.—Clark, Calif
Byrd, W. Va—Clement, Tenn
Byrd, W. Va—Cooper, Va
Bennett Bible—Douglass, Ky
Bennett Bible—Dodd, Conn
Bennett Bible—Douglas, Tex
Bennett Bible—Fong, Calif
Bennett Bible—Fullbright, Ark
Bennett Bible—Gruening, Alaska

NOT VOTING—31

Allott, Okla—Anderson, Mont
Bayh, Ind—Byrd, Ky
Beall, Ala—Brewer, Okla
Brewer, Okla—Brown, Ariz
Church, S. C—Chavis, Miss
Dirksen, Ill—Dodd, Conn
Eastland, Miss—Douglas, Ariz
Eastland, Miss—Douglas, Ariz
Eastland, Miss—Douglas, Ariz
Edmonson, Tenn—Engle, Ohio
Engle, Ohio—Evans, Ga

So the bill (H. R. 1137) was passed. Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMMERY. 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 and the President of Gallaudet held a formal banquet. This was the first—...
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 to the life of the deaf in 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. You are young. You are vigorous. You are willing, at considerable effort, to go out and get as good an education as is available. In the process, you will have already established yourselves as outstanding citizens, and you deserve the congratulations from all of us.

As you leave this world of silence, you will go into the world which, because of the education you have received, because of the opportunity you have been given, will make just a little more contribution to make the world as good a home 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 Negroes, and other groups, some very simple rights: the right to vote, to go to school, to get a job, to get in a restaurant. These rights have been denied to many Negroes because they are different. They labor under a handicap often more difficult than your own: the handicap of prejudice. But I sometimes feel that people who discriminate—whether it is against another race or another religion, or another sex, or organic defects—have a great handicap of their own. There is a handicap of mind and spirit, that makes it impossible for them to appreciate all these other senses more because of their own handicaps.

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 more Negroes among friends 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 men.

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 as you graduate today I want to wish you the best of luck and success. I know each of your careers will be another chapter in our history. As you write your history, I know that some of the most outstanding contributions have been made by people with handicaps greater than your own. Henri Toullius-Laurec, the French painter, was hunchbacked, but his works of art are admired to the present day. Paderewski was blind, yet he was one of the greatest musicians of all time. Franklin D. Roosevelt was crippled, but he was one of the greatest Presidents that this country has ever had. And most of these people are making their mark. They are building dams and bridges; working on atomic projects which will help in the battle against cancer. They are active in the arts, in business, in many other fields, and so I hope that all of you will be able to contribute in a constructive way to your family 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 was always very interested in the problems of the deaf. He visited your school. He recognized, as Senator Kennedy always did, 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 educational opportunities, and the responsibilities as they could assume, and he believed the Nation should make just a little more contribution to make the world as the home of all of you to live useful and happy lives.

And so as you leave this wonderful college, and go into the world which, because of the education you have received, because of the opportunity you have been given, will make just a little more contribution to make the world as good a home for all of you to live useful and happy lives.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 1051, House Joint Resolution 1041.

Mr. STARKMAN. 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:

MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES PARTNERS FOR PROGRESS

Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. President, Mexico 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. SMITH] 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 Mexican 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. Our two countries are working together based on firm foundations and is all the more remarkable because of the difficult years of troubled relations which beset our two countries in our early days. It is a strong symbol 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 Mexican progress and the land 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.

IT IS RESOLVED, That in recognition of the importance of the United States to our National security and the importance of the United States Mexican relationship and the material and moral benefits to both nations of the United States and Mexico Foreign Agricultural Service, and the United States Department of Labor, in connection with the Mexican-American border, and in accordance with the authority vested in the President by the Congress, the President is hereby authorized to enter into such agreements with the United States Mexican border to promote agricultural, commercial, economic, and other programs, and for the benefit of the people of the United States, and the people of Mexico. This resolution shall expire on June 30, 1964.
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 1942 as an amendment to the Housing Act of 1949.

Under this authorization insured loans may be made to individuals, corporations, associations or cooperatives 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 communities of less than 2,500 population. These loans are being made at the present time at 5¾-percent interest rate covers contributions to the insurance fund and administrative expenses, as well as the return to the private lender, so that the net cost of financing is largely the taxpayer. The insurance fund, authority, and procedures provided under the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1949 (Bankhead-Jones) are used for these loans.

The 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 farm families.

The extension 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 farm families 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. Out of these, 37 applications that were in process would require an estimated $3,250,000.

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 end of the fiscal year. The President requested a similar extension the proposed Housing and Community Development Act of 1964, S. 2469.

A copy of the report of the Secretary of Agriculture's joint resolution, S.J.Res. 180, a companion measure, is set forth below as part of this report.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar order No. 1052, H.R. 11499.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES. The motion will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11499) to extend for 2 years, under title 12 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 PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES. 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 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, to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and that the motion be placed on the Unfinished Business Calendar.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES. 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 print 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:

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 1965 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 present 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 over the years. 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 can provide a margin of safety necessary to meet anticipated increases in flow of Government expenditures, 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 be confined within the bounds of the Government's monetary policy. The use of the power over 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 committee, therefore, agrees that a 2-year extension should be granted. Whenever the power is ever actually used 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 issuance of a report 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 PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES. The bill (H.R. 11499) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

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 makes 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 the total of such new purchases and commitments, including contingencies, 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 make loans and purchases to build up our defense capacity and assure supplies of defense materials and to carry out existing 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; and it would add 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 make loans and purchases to build up our defense capacity and assure supplies of defense materials and to carry out existing contracts; and 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 make loans and purchases to build up our defense capacity and assure supplies of defense materials and to carry out existing contracts; and 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; and 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; and 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; and 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; and 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; and 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; and 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; and 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; and 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; and 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; and 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; and 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; and 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; and 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; and authority to guarantee loans made in connection with defense contracts; author...
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 to postpone 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 Historical Site, N. Dak., and for other purposes.

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 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. 167, 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 bill (S. 187) was ordered to engrossment for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

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, Byrd, and Burke, is the acquisition of approximately 400 acres of land.
in North Dakota and Montana, and the establishment and maintenance there of a national historic site.

The Secretary of the Interior designated Fort Union as a national historic site. Further authority is now needed to preserve its historical values. S. 187 would authorize, under section 712 of title 38, United States Code, as now in effect, payment of premiums on such insurance.

Under section 712 of title 38, United States Code, as now in effect, payment of premiums was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, the bill.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of Mr. Humphrey. 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. 1068, H.R. 3941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1068, H.R. 3941.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senate 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 $500 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 which 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 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 congressional report accompanying the bill authorizes benefit payments if the insured becomes totally disabled before attaining age 65. The new provision could be issued upon application on or after January 1, 1965, proof of good health, payment of an extra premium, 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.

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 bill amends subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to 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.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1060, House bill 6455.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The bill amends subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to 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.
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. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I strongly support the bill (H.R. 2664). However, I support it because it is necessary to make it stop the existing loopholes, and to make larger the benefit of the small families as compared to the large families.

Mr. KUCHEL. 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.

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.

Under the bill, the labor union or labor unions, and agricultural or horticultural organizations which operate a retirement home for their members shall not be subject to the unrelated business income tax provided by the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the committee amendment be adopted.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the objection and the third reading of the bill.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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 PARENT 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 CLEVER. A bill (H.R. 2664) to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to exempt from involuntary induction in the Armed Forces of the United States, 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:

"(o) Except during the period of a war or a national emergency declared by the Congress after the date of the enactment of this amendment to the 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 in the line of duty in the service of the United States, or disease incurred during such service, the sole surviving son of such family shall not be inducted for service under the terms of this subsection, unless 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 in the line of duty in the service of the United States, or disease incurred during such service, the sole surviving son of such family shall not be inducted for service under the terms of this subsection, unless 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 in the line of duty in the service of the United States, or disease incurred during such service."
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 extension, not a creation, and was not objected to by either the Department of Defense or Selective Service System.

But instead of extending the exemption this bill would only extend 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 prospect that we may 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 when 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 on the local organization. However, 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 ordered 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 shall be stated.

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 as it 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 watershed protection, flood prevention, and recreational opportunities.

Watershed projects under this act must be initiated on the local level by sponsoring organizations, which in many instances 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 when 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 on the local organization. However, 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 ordered 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.

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:

"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, excluding 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 Monroe, Virginia: 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, $7,785,000.
Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $2,064,000.
Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Operational facilities, $1,900,000."
(Third Army)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational facilities, and administrative facilities, $5,429,000.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Troop housing and community facilities, $5,655,000.
Fort Gordon, Georgia: Training facilities, and troop housing, $11,792,000.
Fort Jackson, South Carolina: Training facilities, and troop housing, $15,383,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas: Administrative facilities, and troop housing, $2,994,000.
Fort Stewart, Georgia: Training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $2,077,000.

(Fourth Army)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $721,000.
Fort Hood, Texas: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $11,792,000.
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, $5,207,000.

(Fifth Army)

Fort Carson, Colorado: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and real estate, $18,268,000.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Utilities, $1,120,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and real estate, $18,692,000.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Training facilities, and medical facilities, $4,217,000.
Fort Sheridan, Illinois: Medical facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $4,217,000.
Fort Ord, California: Training facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, $777,000.

Presidio of Monterey, California: Training facilities, and medical facilities, $303,000.

(Military District of Washington, District of Columbia)

Fort Myer, Virginia: Medical facilities, and troop housing, $4,052,000.
United States Army Medical Center (United States Army Medical 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, $6,943,000.
Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey: Production facilities, $3,965,000.
Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Colorado: Administrative facilities, $329,000.

(United States Army Supply and Maintenance Command)

Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $268,000.
Letterkenney Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Utilities, $43,000.
Savanna Army Depot, Illinois: Supply facilities, $446,000.
Seirra Army Depot, California: Maintenance facilities, $590,000.

Sunny Point Army Terminal, North Carolina: Utilities, $6,154,000.

(United States Army Test and Evaluation Command)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, $2,685,000.
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, $387,000.
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, $14,306,000.
Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia: Training facilities and utilities, $1,016,000.

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, $1,944,000.

Vint Hill Farms Station, Virginia: Operational facilities, $597,000.

Army Component Commands

(United States Army Air Defense Command)

Various locations: Operational facilities and troop housing, $1,016,000.

(Alaska Command area)

Fort Richardson, Alaska: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,370,000.

Fort Wainwright, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $743,000.

(Pacific Command area)

Allamano Military Reservation, Hawaii: Utilities, $247,000.

Scholof Barracks, Hawaii: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,350,000.

Fort Shafter, Hawaii: Administrative facilities and utilities, $1,370,000.

Trijper Army Hospital, Hawaii: Medical facilities, $109,000.

Outside the United States

Army Materiel Command

(United States Army Missile Command)

Kwajalein Island: Research, development and test facilities, hospital facilities, and troop housing, $221,119,000.

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, $8,500,000.

Okinawa, various: Utilities, $1,064,000.

Taiwan: Utilities, $26,000.

(Germany)

Germany: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $35,922,000.

(United States Army Forces Southern Command)

Fort Kobbe, Canal Zone: Troop housing, $943,000.

Secretary Heights, Canal Zone: Utilities, $890,000.

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, it is consistent 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 "Peary Harbor, Hawaii, $812,000", insert in place thereof "$91,000."

(b) Public Law 88-174 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "$164,976,000", and "$199,633,000" and inserting in place thereof "$14,965,000", 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 land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Bureau of Ships Facilities

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, Camp Pendleton, California: Utilities, $328,000.
Naval Facility, Nantucket, Massachusetts: Community facilities, $162,000.
Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $4,541,000.

Headquarters, Commander-in-Chief, Atlantic Fleet, Norfolk, Virginia: Administrative facilities and troop housing, $1,550,000.

Naval Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida: Utilities, $150,000.

Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory, San Francisco, California: Research, development, and test facilities, $763,000.

Fleet Base Facilities
Naval Station, Boston, Massachusetts: Troop housing, $360,000.
Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities and community facilities, $2,509,000.
Naval Command System Support Activity, District of Columbia: Administrative facilities, $816,000.
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, $149,000.
Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee: Utilities, $594,000.
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities, $100,000.
Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $3,271,000.
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Operational facilities, $165,000.

(Naval Facilities
Naval Air Station, Chase Field, Texas: Operational facilities, $268,000.
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingville, Texas: Operational facilities, $149,000.
Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Operational facilities, $819,000.
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $4,818,000.
Naval Air Station, El Centro, California: Troop housing, $329,000.
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Operational facilities and medical facilities, $490,000.
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 facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $2,916,000.
Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $2,916,000.
Naval Air Station, San Clemente Island, California: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $870,000.
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, $170,000.
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, $132,000.
Marine Corps Auxiliary Landing Field, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, $150,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational and training 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 Facility, New River, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, $926,000.
Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Operational and training 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: Utilities, $325,000.
Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Utilities, $1,105,000.

(Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Stations)
Naval Weapons Evaluation Facility, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Research, development and test facilities, $500,000.
Naval Ordnance Test Stations, China Lake, California: Research, development and test facilities, $1,080,000.
Naval Air Station, El Centro, California: Research, development and test facilities, and real estate, $2,540,000.
Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, $360,000.
Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Maryland: Operational facilities, and hospital and medical facilities, $2,453,000.
Pacific Missile Range, Point Magu, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development and test facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $1,988,000.

Supply Facilities
Naval Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina: Administrative facilities, $500,000.
Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California: Administrative facilities, $500,000.
Naval Supply Depot, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Utilities, $600,000.

Marine Corps Facilities
Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $114,000.
Marine Corps Supply Center, Bartow, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $5,143,000.
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, and utilities and ground improvements, $5,143,000.
Marine Barracks, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Training facilities, $195,000.
Marine Corps Supply Facility, Balboa, Panama: Utilities, $176,000.
Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, San Clemente Island, California: Supply facilities, and troop housing, $857,000.

Service School Facilities
Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,333,000.
Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Maryland: Troop housing, $1,051,000.
Fleet Anti-Air Warfare Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia: Supply facilities, $449,000.
Naval Station, District of Columbia: Community facilities, $103,000.
Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,011,000.
Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia: Training facilities, $328,000.
Fleet Training Center, Mayport, Florida: Training facilities, $587,000.
Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California: Troop housing, $350,000.
Naval Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational and training facilities, $2,011,000.
Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island: Training facilities, $333,000.
Naval Officer Candidate School, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing, $350,000.
Fleet Training Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, $116,000.
Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare School, San Diego, California: Troop housing, $584,000.
Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Troop housing, $2,760,000.

Medical Facilities
Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing, $680,000.
Naval Hospital, Jacksonville, Florida: Hospital and medical facilities, $7,400,000.
Naval Hospital, Oakland, California: Hospital and medical facilities, $14,300,000.

Communications Facilities
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, $1,000,000.
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: Utilities, $1,000,000.
Naval Communication Station, Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,279,000.

Various service corps activities, $8,111,000.

(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, North west, 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, $1,076,000.

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, $6,628,000.

Naval Training Device Center, Mitchel Field, New York: Research, development and test facilities, $450,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Naval Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, $1,666,000.

Naval Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, $190,000.

Naval Construction Battallion Center, Port Hueneme, California: Utilities, $529,000.

Outside the United States

Bureau of Ships Facilities

Atlantic Test and Evaluation Center, Andros Island, Bahamas Islands: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, and ground improvements, $4,882,000.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines: Community facilities, $489,000.

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, $257,000.

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, E户口kusin, Japan: 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, $299,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Futema, Okinawa: Operational facilities, $90,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Galeta Island, Canal Zone: Troop housing, $226,000.

Naval Radio Station, Isabela, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, $109,000.

Naval Communication Station, Londonerry, North Ireland: Operational facilities, $1,100,000.

Fleet Communication Station, Savanah Sea, Puerto Rico: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $195,000.

Naval Communication Station, San Miguel, missile defense, community facilities, and utilities, $456,000.

Various locations: Utilities, $3,396,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Naval Public Works Center, Guam, Marianas Islands: Utilities, $112,000.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines: Utilities, $465,000.

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 $94,208,000.

Sec. 203. 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 development and research and development requirements, or (c) improved production schedules, if the Secretary certifies that such construction or such conversion for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be consistent with interests of national security and necessary for the national defense.

Kincheloe Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $3,269,000.

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, $5,628,000.

Newark Air Force Station, Newark, Ohio: Maintenance facilities and administrative facilities, $6,000,000.

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, $2,100,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California: Operational facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, $2,145,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $2,546,000.

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, $8,994,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and administrative facilities, $6,946,000.

Air Force Systems Command

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $800,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $945,000.

Clark Air Force Base, Clark, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, $6,085,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Operational facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $4,832,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, $337,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Operational facilities and test facilities, $665,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,800,000.

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 utilities, $8,600,000.

Air Force Public Works Facilities

Naval Construction Battallion Center, Port Hueneme, California: Utilities, $529,000.

Naval Construction Battallion Center, Mobile, Alabama: Administrative facilities, $1,300,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $2,100,000.

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, $5,628,000.

Newark Air Force Station, Newark, Ohio: Maintenance facilities and administrative facilities, $6,000,000.

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, $2,100,000.

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, $5,628,000.

Newark Air Force Station, Newark, Ohio: Maintenance facilities and administrative facilities, $6,000,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and hospital facilities, $4,454,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $8,994,000.

Ontain-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and administrative facilities, $6,946,000.

Air Force Systems Command

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $800,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $945,000.

Clark Air Force Base, Clark, California: Research, development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, $6,085,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Operational facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $4,832,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, $337,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Operational facilities and test facilities, $665,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,800,000.

Various locations, Atlantic Missile Range: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, $1,854,000.
Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and real estate, $8,497,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Administrative facilities, and utilities, $215,000.

Easley Air Force Base, Biloxi, 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 community facilities, $159,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,435,000.

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, $388,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $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

Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska: Operational facilities, and utilities, $1,389,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $3,910,000.

Galena Airport, Galena, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $490,000.

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, $5,000,000.

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, $1,845,000.

McCook Air Force Base, Ashland, Nebraska: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $587,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Operational facilities, hospital facilities, and troop housing, $8,137,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Maintenance facilities, $201,000.

Pacific Air Force

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Troop housing, $626,000.

Strategic Air Command

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Utilities, $475,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,165,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $231,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $135,000.

Carwell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $348,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $616,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, $108,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $338,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $715,000.

Grosig 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: 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, $442,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $805,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $11,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Real estate, $320,000.

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, $1,402,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Maintenance facilities, $361,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, hospital facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $1,880,000.

Peace Air Force Base, Portmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $193,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $197,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Maintenance facilities, $182,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $617,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Utility facilities, and community facilities, $675,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, $51,000.

Wurtemburg Air Force Base, Osos, 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, $2,100,000.

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, $1,804,000.


MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $583,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $3,743,000.

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, $493,000.

United States Air Force Academy

United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Cadet housing, community facilities, and utilities, $18,880,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, utilities, and real estate, $1,026,000.

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, $50,000.

Pacific Air Force

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $13,526,000.

United States Air Forces in Europe

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $9,925,000.

United States Air Forces Southern Command

Haward Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $3,698,000.

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, as amended by section 301, utilized for the establishment or development of Air Force installations and facilities made necessary by changes in Air Force missions and responsibilities, new or unforeseen security considerations, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen public works projects concerning national 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 amount or amount or amounts of "$158,685,000" and "$491,622,000" respectively.

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 Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the National Association of Home Builders, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If the Secretary and the Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, are of the opinion that the costs of construction, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $5,500,000.

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.

TIT 15 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 Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the National Association of Home Builders, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If the Secretary and the Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, are of the opinion that the costs of construction, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $5,500,000.

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.

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 Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the National Association of Home Builders, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If the Secretary and the Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, are of the opinion that the costs of construction, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $5,500,000.

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 Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the National Association of Home Builders, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If the Secretary and the Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, are of the opinion that the costs of construction, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $5,500,000.

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 Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the National Association of Home Builders, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If the Secretary and the Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, are of the opinion that the costs of construction, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $5,500,000.
shall not exceed—

$34,000 for generals or equivalent; $19,800 for colonels or equivalent; $14,700 for majors and/or lieutenant colonels or equivalents; $15,400 for all other commissioned or warrant officer personnel or equivalent, except that for family housing units authorized by sections 1715(f), 7574(e) and 9774(g) of title 10, United States Code, the authority shall construct at a cost not to exceed $17,000.

$13,200 for enlisted personnel, except that four-bedroom housing units authorized by sections 1715(f), 7574(e) and 9774(g) of title 10, United States Code, may be constructed at a cost not to exceed $17,000.

(c) 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.

(d) The cost limitations provided in subsections (a) and (b) shall be applied to the following units:

(1) For the Department of the Army, Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities 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, $1,350,000;

(2) For the Defense Agencies, $971,000.

Sec. 504. Section 518 of Public Law 84-161 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Title VI—General provisions

Sec. 601. The Secretary of each military department, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, are authorized to construct family housing units and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities in the amount of:

(a) For the Department of the Army, $2,350,000;

(b) For the Department of the Navy, $1,250,000;

(c) For the Department of the Air Force, $1,350,000;

(d) For the Defense Agencies, $971,000.

Sec. 504. Section 518 of Public Law 84-161 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Title VI—General provisions

Sec. 601. The Secretary of each military department, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, are authorized to construct family housing units and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities in the amount of:

(a) For the Department of the Army, $2,350,000;

(b) For the Department of the Navy, $1,250,000;

(c) For the Department of the Air Force, $1,350,000;

(d) For the Defense Agencies, $971,000.

Sec. 601. The Secretary of each military department, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, may construct family housing units and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities in the amount of:

(a) For the Department of the Army, $2,350,000;

(b) For the Department of the Navy, $1,250,000;

(c) For the Department of the Air Force, $1,350,000;

(d) For the Defense Agencies, $971,000.

Sec. 601. The Secretary of each military department, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, are authorized to construct family housing units and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities in the amount of:

(a) For the Department of the Army, $2,350,000;

(b) For the Department of the Navy, $1,250,000;

(c) For the Department of the Air Force, $1,350,000;

(d) For the Defense Agencies, $971,000.

Sec. 601. The Secretary of each military department, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, are authorized to construct family housing units and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities in the amount of:

(a) For the Department of the Army, $2,350,000;

(b) For the Department of the Navy, $1,250,000;

(c) For the Department of the Air Force, $1,350,000;

(d) For the Defense Agencies, $971,000.

Sec. 601. The Secretary of each military department, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, are authorized to construct family housing units and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities in the amount of:

(a) For the Department of the Army, $2,350,000;

(b) For the Department of the Navy, $1,250,000;

(c) For the Department of the Air Force, $1,350,000;

(d) For the Defense Agencies, $971,000.

Sec. 601. The Secretary of each military department, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, are authorized to construct family housing units and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities in the amount of:

(a) For the Department of the Army, $2,350,000;

(b) For the Department of the Navy, $1,250,000;

(c) For the Department of the Air Force, $1,350,000;

(d) For the Defense Agencies, $971,000.

Sec. 601. The Secretary of each military department, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, are authorized to construct family housing units and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities in the amount of:

(a) For the Department of the Army, $2,350,000;

(b) For the Department of the Navy, $1,250,000;

(c) For the Department of the Air Force, $1,350,000;

(d) For the Defense Agencies, $971,000.

Sec. 601. The Secretary of each military department, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, are authorized to construct family housing units and the proportionate costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities in the amount of:

(a) For the Department of the Army, $2,350,000;

(b) For the Department of the Navy, $1,250,000;

(c) For the Department of the Air Force, $1,350,000;

(d) For the Defense Agencies, $971,000.
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201, under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF \nNAVY," is published "Naval Weapons \nFacilities" of the Act of July 27, 1962 (76 \nStat. 229); community facilities in the amount \nof $476,000 for the Naval Air Station, Lemoore, \nCalifornia, that is contained in title II, sec­
ction 201, under the heading "Naval Weapons \nFacilities" of the Act of July 27, 1962 (76 \nStat. 229); (1) community facilities in the amount \nof $26,000 for the Naval Ammunition \nDepot, Concord, California, that is contained \nin title II, section 201, under the heading \n"Naval Weapons Facilities" (Navy Readiness \nProgram) of the Act of July 27, 1962 (76 \nStat. 229); (2) community facilities in the amount \nof $409,000 for the Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, \nPuerto Rico, that is contained in title II, \nsection 202 of the Act of July 27, 1962 (76 \nStat. 230); (b) Effective fifteen months from the date \nof enactment of this Act, all authorizations \nfor construction of family housing which \nare contained in this Act or any Act \napproved prior to November 6, 1965, are \nrepealed; authority to acquire real estate for \nfamily housing projects as to which appropriated \nfunds have been obligated for construction \ncontinues in whole or in part before such date. \nSEC. 607. None of the authority contained \nin titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed \nto authorize any building construction \nproject inside the United States (other than Alaska) \nat a unit cost in excess of— (1) $1,850 per man \nfor permanent barracks; (2) $8 per square foot for \ncold-storage warehousing; (3) $32 per square foot for \nregular warehousing; (4) $8,500 per man for \nbachelor officer quarters, unless the Secretary of \nDefense determines that, because of special circum­
cstances, application to such project of the \nlimitations on unit costs contained in this \nsection is impracticable. \nSEC. 608. Notwithstanding the provisions \nof section 9 of the Act of April 1, 1954 \n(Public Law 933), as amended, no funds \nmay be appropriated after the date of \nenactment of this Act for construction at \nthe Air Force Academy unless appropriation \nof such funds is authorized in this Act or any Act \nenacted before the date of enactment of \nthis Act: Provided, That funds are \nhereby appropriated for the accomplishment of \nminor construction project inside the United States \nthat are not otherwise authorized by law. \nSEC. 609. Notwithstanding the provisions \nof section 2674 of title 10, United States Code, \ntitle 10, United States Code, section 2674, as \namended, (1) for Department of the Army— \n(a) Army National Guard of the United \nStates, $5,500,000, \n(b) Army Reserve, $45,000,000, \n(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval \nReserves, $6,500,000, \n(3) for Department of the Air Force— \n(a) Air National Guard of the United \nStates, $12,000,000, \n(b) Air Force Reserve, $4,800,000. \nSEC. 702. The Secretary of Defense may \nestablish or develop installations and facilities \nunder this title without regard to section \n928 of the Revised Statutes as amended \n(31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774(d) and \n9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The \nauthority to place permanent or temporary \nImprovements on land includes authority for \nthe acquisition of real estate, and even though \nthe land is held temporarily. The authority to \nacquire real estate or land includes authority to \nmake surveys, administration, overhead, planning, \nand supervision incident to construction. \nWhen the land is approved under section 355 of \nthe Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. \n230), and even though the land is held tem­
porarily. The authority to acquire real estate \nor land includes authority to make \ncontracts or land acquisitions in whole or \nin part before such date. \nSEC. 703. This title may be cited as the "Re­
serve Forces Facilities Authorization Act, \n1965." UNVEILING OF STATUE TO \nMEMORIALIZE FREEDOM FIGHTER \nTARAS SHEVCHENKO, A POST OF \nTHE UKRAINE \nMr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as we celebrate this month the 150th \nniversary of the birth of Taras Shevchenko, as well as the unveiling of a \nmemorial statue in his honor, we are reminded of the ideals of freedom, \nlove and patriotism. His works continue to inspire all of us. Let us \nremind ourselves of the ideals for which this Ukrainian poet and freedom fighter \nstood. \nA statue in honor of Taras Shevchenko \nwill be unveiled Saturday, June 27, at 1 \np.m., at 23d and P Streets NW., \nWashington. \nAt a time when the Ukraine was undergoing \nthe oppression of Czarist autocratic power, Taras Shevchenko won his \nfreedom from serfdom and then dared \nto risk it through his actions and his \npoetry. He wrote brilliantly and brave­
lly, but he was a man who lived his words. \nFor this reason, I ask unanimous consent that \nwe stop to pay homage to Taras \nShevchenko—a symbol of hope and \nfreedom for the entire world. \n
At a time when throughout the world \nso many are enslaved by prejudice, \npoverty, and ignorance, it is only fitting \nthat we remember those who have \nachieved, I believe this bill has served its \npurpose which S. 5 is accumulating through­
out the country. Despite the length of \ntime which has been waiting to be \nconsidered, the public has not been content to sit and wait for the bill to be \npassed, as the Senate has been content to \ndo. Instead, the citizens of our Nation \nare taking steps to make the cause of action in pledging \ntheir unwavering support. \nAs with any just cause, this bill's \nmerits have not been affected by the \nmere passage of time, or the change of \ntemporal surroundings, but it stands firm as an inspiration to the \npeople of all men. Although I realize the cause of justice often takes a long time to be \nachieved, I believe this bill has served its \nsentence and need no longer be handi­
capped by the indecision of men. In \nthe interest of the future of this Nation, \nand in the name of justice, I believe it \nis now time to lend our ears to the voices of \nour citizens and listen to their pleas for the \npassage of this bill. As an illustration of the persuasive arguments for the cold war GI bill, I ask \nunanimous consent that a resolution \nadopted by the Pennsylvania department \nof veterans affairs of the Pennsylvania \nElks at their recent convention and the \nletter from their State commissioner Dennis \nWhite, both be printed at this point in the \nRecord. \n
Pennsylvania Elks lodges, in \nSTATE CONVENTION, CALL ON \nCONFEREES TO PASS GI \nEDUCATION \nMr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the cold war GI bill, S. 5, has been on the \nSenate Calendar since July 2, 1963, and we are now approaching the first \nanniversary of inaction by this body on the \nmost urgent measure pending before the \nSenate or in the committee. I wish to \ncall attention to the phenomenal sup­
Whereas our Nation has found it necessary to its armed forces, and 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 GI bill of education, as well as the additional benefits for servicemen resulting in increased tax revenue to the U.S. Government so that the cost of the program is largely repaid by the taxes, the following resolution be it

Resolved, That the Pennsylvania Department of Veterans Affairs, Improved Benevolent and 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, 1956, and that such additional benefits be extended as long as the provisions of the draft law exist and this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, President of the Senate, President of the House of Representatives, and each Member of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation.


DENNIS C. WHITE,
State Commissioner.
WILLIS A. FOLLIS,
Department Adjutant.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I shall not read the entire resolution, but I should like to call a portion of it to your attention.

Resolved, That the Pennsylvania Department of Veteran Affairs, Improved Benevolent and 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, 1956, and that such additional benefits be extended as long as the provisions of the draft law exist and this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, President of the Senate, President of the House of Representatives, 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 Senator Kennedy from Texas has said in support of his education bill for GI's.

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 the Senators 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. I am strongly opposed to the war.

When guests accept invitations to appear on NBC programs, they should have the right to be treated with respect. I am convinced that NBC Media will be willing to correct this error under the appeal of the NBC Commentator Scherer in interview with Senator Frank Church on "Today" show of June 26.

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 those items that we felt were essential, and to take out of the bill, it fell in the general pool of 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 delete them 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 therefor. 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 the 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 bases whose 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 units for Polaris systems 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 alert 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 officers 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 extraneous items were found. It appeared that existing facilities were adequate for the present, and those of low priority 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 unnecessary; and the committee, in making its recommendations, referred to the fact that they were replacements. We did defer for further consideration some relatively small additions to existing hospitals and minor medical support items.
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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 Appropriations. But let us consider the remarks made by the Senator from Mississippi a few minutes ago. 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 this purpose 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 the 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 use.

To my knowledge, President Kennedy, through his special aid whom he assigned to 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 feeling at times that the Senator has not even made $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 temporary schools 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 reactivated 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 to the continuance of any legislation 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 that time I heard this administration immediately took up with the administration the desirability of using it for other Federal purposes.

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 pocket in the poorest community in America. I am fighting for some relief for the deepest 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 by the Congress for Tongue Point, 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 pocket in this 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 "When are we out?" column 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. I yield.

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 defense of this hospital. I urge the Senate to keep it as a naval hospital. It should not be converted into a general hospital to take care of large areas.

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 to hope 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 Senator Morse on $320 million gain, 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 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.

These 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 manpower, trained and qualified by continuing education in all the sodistinctive 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, the Navy has been the first to tell 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, 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 worked out 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 delete that portion 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, these 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 agreed to for the conversion was, of course, approved by the Senate committee.

I want to develop the background information on the second item. As a constituent of creating additional BQ's, it is necessary to mention to the Congress 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 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 not be provided for in the bill at 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 curriculums is unique in this Naval postgraduate school, and the courses 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 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 concerning the request 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 of 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 marked his efforts, given due 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.

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.

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 now 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 schools as fast as we could. For example, 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 extraordinary requests. Even though there is only $2.4 million in the item that the Senator has requested here, that is just part of a $66 million program that is planned for the Naval postgraduate school.

Mr. KUCHEI. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may comment on that statement?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEI. 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 because there is a limit to the buildings that are 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 far flung Navy, who serve the people of the United States. 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 think 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 me the most from 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 were forced to give the 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 $15 million; second, the academic and the postgraduate naval school in Monterey, Calif., at $214 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 $85 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 I pointed out earlier, 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 so intently will 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 mighty well. We have invested in capital investments in the great State of California about $4 billion.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator. 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 am grateful to my able friend from Massachusetts for these important figures to remember, 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 $179 million for an administrative and classroom building for the Defense Intelligence Agency at Arlington Hall, a former girl's school located on Route 60 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, I wish to point out that there is further proof on why the personal 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, or 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 $339 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 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.

Of the 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 facilities, that have remained undepicted in this bill. There has been noticed to increase the academic facilities of various types, and over $96 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 Mr. President, is anxious to have this activity be stopped, because the War College and the Industrial College operate side by side at Fort McNair. The committee allowed $2 million, striking out funds for an underground communications center since we felt it was not needed.

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 were in items that we consider important. 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 whether joint use of existing buildings is feasible. An example of this is a reduction at the Army War College and the Industrial College of the Army, and the Industrial 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 necessary 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 36 miles and a request of $33.3 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.

Those are important figures to remember, because when we are spending on military structures here and overseas, 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 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.

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, or 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.
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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. Most of the 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, concerned 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 Committee 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. As a result, we have proceeded to reduce the amount 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 reach 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 appropriations subcommittee 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, the 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 do-overs, the unnecessary, and left out what was really needed. 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 in the Armed Services Committee, 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 were 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 Senator from Mississippi, 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. It includes 380 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 think we might say 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 Armed Forces. The Senate has been kind 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 many seems an unnecessary amount of land for sale.

Mr. Keating. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer, but before offering it I wish to state that about the Brooklyn Navy Yard, which has been a continuing one in New York State, and to express some puzzle over the substantial amount authorized in the bill for naval shipyards.

I believe the Senate, having 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 $1.5 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. It would not, in any event, mean that the 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 has gotten 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's amendment, as I understand the situation.

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that, having discussed the subject with our administration, it has been 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 purview 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 subject.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is not talking about that subject?

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 Secretary of Navy 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 Secretary of the Navy 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 mean 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 insta­ tion that, if closed, 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 quarters and the 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, 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 quarters and the additional buildings for the navy yard in Charleston. The housing is necessary to go with the navy yard.

Mr. KEATING. It would have no effect on the item for the transfer of 5th Army Headquarters from downtown South Chicago to Fort Sheridan?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I beg the Senator's yield.

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. 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. KEATING. 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 spent, in the construction of military facilities, and this year is no exception. The purpose of my amendment is to prevent the use of funds for the construction of new facilities in other States to replace facilities at installations ordered closed by the Secretary of Defense, as stated, for economy reasons."
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 replace facilities in other States 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 from New York would see no objection to it.

Mr. STENNIS. There were several items. There were 5 or 6 in the bill that would be affected by the original version of the Senate's amendment, but they were taken out by the committee. They are the only ones that are present. Therefore, there are only two items in the bill which the Senator's original amendment would affect. One of those would be in the State of New York, and the other is 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 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 construction or a building 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, which is quite simple. 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 statutes is consistent 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 and saving 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 $6 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 money to be paid out 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 a transfer of the Oakland Army Terminal Center, a $2 million item. If the Senator's amendment were included, that would preclude this item, unless the conferees rejoin.

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 built 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 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, 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 not have a Senator 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 should 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. KEATING. As modified, I appreciate it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The question is on adoption of the amendment to the amendment, as modified.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table the table was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. As modified, I appreciate it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The RECONCILIATION OFFICER. Mr. Keating, Mr. President, I should add an unanimous consent have printed in the Record a joint statement which was made by my colleague the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], Representative Payne, and myself, and my colleagues, 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 PINNICK AND S. R. KERR

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 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 report demand particular attention:

1. Of the estimated savings of $11.5 million for closing the Roama area, the 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 $8.6 million for constructing new facilities at the air materiel area and transfer its functions from Rome Air Material Area from Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y., the 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 underestimates 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. If we do not have full and fair reevaluation, then no one would be opposed to the curtailment of operations of any of these military installations. If true, the economies for the benefit of our Nation were to be obtained.

Whether the closing of all the installations announced by the Air Force Department will result in economies is, in my view, very much open to question.

Yesterday, the Comptroller General re­nounced his earlier dis­agreement with the Defense's plan to close the Rome, N.Y., Air Material Area and transfer its functions from Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y. to the Rome Air Materiel Area in N.Y., would save the Federal Government $11.8 million for fiscal years 1965 through 1968. Three other items in the report demand particular attention:

1. Of the estimated 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.

2. Of the estimated annual savings of $9.9 million beginning with fiscal year 1968, the GAO reported that it had uncovered the detailed justifica­tion of their estimates.

3. The disclosures of the Comptroller General's report are quite disturbing to me for several reasons. It appears that the Air Force argument for the transfer of the Rome Air Materiel Area, but they raise ques­tions 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 PUNSTEIN, the dedicated Congressman of the Rome area, Senator KEATING, and I will continue to fight for a full and fair reconsideration of the closings of this installation until claims of savings by the Air Force are proved.

The amendment to the pending military construction appropriation bill, which I have introduced, would prohibit the authorization of funds to construct facilities at replacement sites proposed by the Department of Defense. 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.

With respect to the Rome Air Materiel Area closing, Representative ALEXANDER PUNSTEIN, the dedicated Congressman of the Rome area, Senator KEATING, and I will continue to fight for a full and fair reconsideration of the closings of this installation until claims of savings by the Air Force are proved.

The amendment to the pending military construction appropriation bill, which I have introduced, would prohibit the authorization of funds to construct facilities at replacement sites proposed by the Department of Defense. 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.

S. R. KERR

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAVITS

I should like to express my support of the amendment introduced by my colleague, Senator PINNICK, and to endorse his position. The Defense Department announcement of military installation closings throughout this country have deeply affected all of us. The_weight of personalities that no one would be opposed to the curtailment of operations of any of these military installations. If true, the economies for the benefit of our Nation were to be obtained.

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 insert, 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 PINNICK, SENATOR JAY­ ITS, AND SENATOR KEATING: In commenting on your report on the Department of Defense plan to transfer the functions of the Rome Air Materiel Area to the Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y. We have analyzed the Air Force estimates which provide for funds for construction at two Navy yards included under authorization for Bureau of Ships facilities. This expendi­ture was authorized in the 1967 Defense Department Appropriations Act.

The Air Force has 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 estimated that economies are to be obtained, starting with fiscal year 1968 and reaching a peak of $9.3 million in fiscal year 1970.

The Air Force anticipated that these estimated savings would be offset by the costs of altering, building, or modifying facilities at the locations receiving the additional facilities, which were estimated at about $6.3 million.

The Air Force has estimated that, after the transfer is completed, savings of about $9.0 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 personnel which would be eliminated from the Logistics Command's authorized strength and the anticipated reduction in the number of military personnel.

We have analyzed the Air Force estimates of savings anticipated as a result of transferring the functions of Rome Air Materiel Area to the Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y. We have analyzed the Air Force estimates of savings anticipated as a result of transferring the functions of Rome Air Materiel Area to the Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y. We have determined that the Air Force estimates of 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 re­
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.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Tthe Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. 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 there. 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 produced by closing the headquarters of the 5th Army from Chicago, 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 believe that we should seek to defend the existence of any unnecessary locations, or to stand in the way of desirable economies. Secretary 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 city jobs 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 $8,323,000 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 would be 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 claim 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 is correct. There has been a considerable change in order to bring this matter here. I want to especially thank him. He is a member of the subcommittee. He took several trips and rendered a fine service in the performance of his duties, and also attended the committee meetings, and has been most helpful.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am certain that Secretary McNamara's intentions are the very best. But he must work through a system that is very much 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 from 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 deceptive arguments of economy.

Mr. STENNIS. I am certainly willing to do that. I wish the Senator would continue the Seniors 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 California (Mr. JOSEPH CAMPBELL) 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 he will make some recommendations. They may not be 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, the Senator mind if, when we come to appropriating money, we check closely on these arguments for economy?
a Member of the House of Representatives sent me a memorandum on the subject. He has followed it very closely.

Mr. MCCLORY. I ask unanimous consent that this letter from Representative MCKINLEY DUNN, 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:

HON. EVERETT D. MCCLORY, House of Representatives, Office Building, Senate.

Dear Everett: The statements on the new headquarters for the 5th Army appearing on pages 110 through 115 and pages 702 through 704 of the hearings of the Senate Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and in my testimony, seem to me to be quite well covered on pages 110 through 115 and pages 702 through 704 of the hearings.

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 located in a city.

2. At the present time only 60 military families occupy the Wherry (Twin Towers) private military housing located near the old 5th Army headquarters at the old Chicago Beach Hotel. More than 150 military families are present living at Fort Sheridan are accommodated daily by buses to the present Chicago Beach Hotel headquarters.

3. No new on 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 related to existing 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 $3 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 $8.5 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 46 Negro families, all of the Negroes which require such housing.

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Chief of Staff, I am sending 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 whole country. 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.

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

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Chief of Staff, I am sending a second announcement with unusual satisfaction. Both of these developments occurred in a meeting of the Joint Committee today.

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 taxpayers.

The high caliber of his work has made him a man of exceptional influence in the Congress, throughout the Government, in 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 1952, and the Tax Foundation 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 that 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 field of Federal 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 recommended 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 1963 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.

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, 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 Rockefeller Public Service Award, 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. 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, 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 Rockefeller Public Service Award, 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.

We have Mr. Stam to thank also for the excellent staff he has developed in the field of Federal 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 recommended 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 1963 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.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

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, 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 Rockefeller Public Service Award, 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 be able 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 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 been able 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 have had the opportunity of working with and 1964 fully appreciate his knowledge of that field. He has been under good tutelage 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 Joint Committee, I think I can 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 very 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 my successor and counselor, who is equally well qualified.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, over 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 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 express to 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 able successor in Laurence 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, I am certain that the 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 the joint committee is concerned. However, we should rejoice with Mr. Stam in his retiring to the tranquility 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. The joint committee, in the Internal Revenue Service, 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 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, he has given 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 Mr. Stam on 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 unwavering 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 all 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 measurement revenue staff only 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 and 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 P. 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 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 and I am very well acquainted 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.

AUTHORIZED OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.R. 6300) 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, you
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 en-
grossment of the amendment and the
third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be en-
grossed 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. LAUSCH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONKNEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RICKOFF], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. LAUSCH], 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. GOLDFIEX], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWERS], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER],
is detailed on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from
Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from
New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator
from Texas [Mr. TOWERS], would each
vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 70,
nays 1, as follows:

[No. 452 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Aiken Gruening Muskie
Allott Hayden Nelson
Barrett Ehrlichopfer Pascrell
Bennett Hill Pearson
Bible Holland Pell
Boze Brooks Prouty
Brewer Humphrey Proxmire
Byrd, Va. Ingersoll Randolph
Byrd, W. Va. Jackson Russell
Cannon Johnston Saltonstall
Carlson Jordan, N.C. Simpson
Case Jordan, Idaho Smith
Chambliss Kean Springer
Clark Long, La. Strawbridge
Cooper McCrady Talmadge
Curris McClure Walters
Dodd McGee Williams, N.J.
Dominick McIntyre Yorkborough
Douglas Mecachem Young, N. Dak.
Blender McElvain Young, Ohio
Fong Morton Young, Va.
Fullbright Murphy

NAYS—1

Morris

NOT VOTING—29

Anderson Hart Monroney
Bayh Hartke Moss
Bentsen Javits Nemerger
Burdick Kennedy Ribicoff
Eastland Lausche Robertson
Edmondson Long, Mo. Seegers
Engel Magnuson Simington
Evans Mansfield Thurmond
Goldwater McNamarai 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 conferences 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 con-
feres 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 tem-
pore. Without objection, it is so or-
dered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am about to leave
the floor to take a plane to Seattle on
official business. The plane leaves Wash-
ington 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. Budget prior to that
time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is my intention
to call up the nomination this afternoon.
I have consulted with the Senator from
Wisconsin and the Senator from Mont-
tana, and it appears that there will be no
yea-and-nay vote, but there will be some
speeches on the nomination.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the
Senator's statement. If I am not pres-
tent, and am on my way to Seattle when
a voice vote is had, or when a yea-and-
ay vote is had, on the confirmation of the
nomination of Mr. Budge, I wish to be
registered in opposition to the nomi-
nation.

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 circum-
stances 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 uncer-
tain how much time will be spent on it,
but I would like to have the Senate
provide an opportunity to consult with the
able Senator from Texas [Mr. TAYLOR]
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 Sen-
ator from Texas [Mr. TAYLOR] before we
leave for the Fourth of July weekend.

On Tuesday other items on the calen-
dar 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 con-
sider the pay bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the acting
majority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-
pore. What is the will of the Senate?

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move
that the Senate proceed to the con-
sideration of executive business.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-
pore. If there be no reports of com-
mittees, the nomination on the Execu-
tive 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 a regulatory agency which protects the interests of the public have added 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 or enforcement is a troublesome and puzzling nomination.

The Washington Post also strenuously questioned this nomination, and said, in part:

The Washington Post also strongly questioned this nomination, and said, in part:

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 an invitation to resist further proposals from Washington. And within the SEC, which will testify next week, Mr. Budge, whose 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.

Mr. Budge's nomination has unleashed a whole new generation of maladies. A couple have been rendered obsolete, or partly so, by technological change. And in others a failure to define specific operations that are 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 or enforcement is a troublesome and puzzling nomination.

The final reference I have to his appearance before the committee was when Mr. Budge said, in answer to a question: 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 present: it now holds the trial bench.

Mr. President, the Washington Post's position will be strengthened. Mr. Budge said, in answer to a question:

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 processes of raising 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 simple to have a Commissioner 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 are the life blood of a 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. He has qualifications for the positions. But it is also important that a Commissioner have imaginative zeal to provide pertinent information for the investing public, so that the public is protected, 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 Capitol Hill, during the discussion of the new 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 Securities Act. I would probably do the same thing 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, in which it is necessary to carry out the mandates 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:

Mr. President, the Washington Post's 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 very fast.

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 any prospectus which he may classify and require the filing of prospectuses.

Furthermore, section 19 of the Securities Act of 1934 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, 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; 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 client. Many people think that the client is in an advantageous position requiring a degree of regard for the public interest.

The law also provides that the Commissioner, the nominee, shall have power, if approved, over the financial responsibility and ability 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 membership.

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 exercise 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. The SEC, in a recent opinion, had a 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. This is a matter of discretion, of the judgment of the person, with an 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 exchange. Mr. Budge would have the power to make such a decision.

Rules relating to transactions on foreign security exchanges.

Budge will have additional rulemaking powers under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, the Public Utility Holding Company Act and the Trust Indenture Act. All of these acts are administered by the Commission.

This is certainly a discretionary act. Whether to exempt a security, 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.

There is a constant area of judgment as to whether to change the NASD. 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 brokers. This trade of brokers 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 or not.

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.

Yes, is a "front end load" fair? Or a "front end load" an investment in securities?

Some of those now require that as much as 85 percent of the amount an investor will invest in a mutual fund shall go in commission, and only 15 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, and act if he deems it the greatest 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. These, I believe, 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, Mr. President? 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 whether the 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 exemptions in a way 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, underwriting fees paid to IDS, and other types of securities. Yet there are really no rules over such items as stop orders, quotations, underwriting fees paid to IDS, and other types of securities. Why should we have rules for all of these items and none for others?

The question before the SEC and the courts in 1962 was whether the Murchison's acquisition of control of Allegheny and Investors Diversified Services, Inc.—which incidentally represents the largest short-selling device in the world, and constitutes $4 billion—would 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 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 16, 1962, April 20, 1962, and May 31, 1962:

That a change of control of a corporation (Allegheny) which controlled a corporate adviser (IDS) whether by transfer or as the result of a proxy contest would affect an assignment of the advisory and distributing contracts. * * *

The Division urged that the question of judgment is involved, as well as a serious question which requires a person who has the zeal to protect the public interest. These, I believe, can be demonstrated on the basis of his record.

The Division also urged that the brief assert that no distinction was intended by Congress by the effect of a transfer of control of an investment adviser of 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 a question of judgment, as to whether the practice should be curbed.

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 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 the forces 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 which the SEC and the Division, under Chairman of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, will have to reconsider. The Division urged 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 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 which the Division urged for the brief be limited to the position urged by the General Counsel.

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 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, 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 and down. He understood every facet of the stock market as well as any man. He showed his wealth by his 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 feasible, but a man who had 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 had the privilege of working. 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 legal 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.

Mr. President, 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 have the gravest reservations about Mr. Budge. He 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 President in 1964.

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 such appointments the responsible, careful, discriminating scrutiny that they deserve.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McGURK: 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 Javits have expressed.

Mr. BUDGE. 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.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin that in my 25 years of association or affiliation that you have which would prevent you from carrying out the duties of this office in the manner of spirit and with the philosophy which is represented by your answers to Senator Proxmire 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. Proxmire] 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 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 given him 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 appointed.

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. 10689. 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 prerogatives against President Johnson and Secretary of Defense McNamara in their war which is being paid for 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 support, Senator Morse. Please continue. (I know you will.) We are behind you.

Yours,

Mrs. IRVINE H.OGlUND.

Cleveland, Ohio.

Dear Mr. Morse: In response to your request, I have read your excellent speech in the Senate on March 29, 1964. Thank you for your courageous opposition to the extension of the war in southeast Asia. In particular, I 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.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE M. MORSE:

Washington, D.C.


The Honorable Wayne Morse, U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: 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 disregard for all practical purposes 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-term 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, anger, and despair.

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 studies at Yale University this September. Yours sincerely, RICHARD D. WOLFF.

[From the New York Times, June 20, 1964] SCIENTISTS SUPPORT UNITED STATES ON CHEMICAL AGENTS

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 the inadequacy of the field use of chemical weapons in Vietnam. Reports that defoliating agents have been used to destroy protected areas have been contradicted by representatives of the Department of Defense. "These charges give rise to the broader implication that the United States is using the Chicago agenda as a cover for the war against the civilian population of the southeast Asians. This is not the way to assure self-determination in that area. In the present stage of their social, political, economic, etc., development, it is best represented by a nonmilitary form of government. "Indeed, it is hard to understand our policy in southeast Asia. Is the effort to assure self-determination in that area? Is the effort to halt the Chinese and the Communists an inseparable part of the effort to assure self-determination? Some of the questions which perplex us are:

1. Would the peoples of Laos and South Vietnam determine a form of government which is the "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 to accept our democracy? Is it in our interest toward international understanding and harmony to nurture hate (compare characteristics of "the Great White Father", "the only true believer"); or does our determination breed less hate than respect?

3. 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).

4. In any case, the administration seems to regard a gun as better than a bayonet, and we can derive from public media. We feel bewildered in our ignorance, and concerned to know the facts as they are available.

5. What information have you available which may clarify and substantiate your position on southeast Asia? We would appreciate any printed materials on 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.


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 Asia. It is unspeakably awful. Thank you. P. KLINGHOFFER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

June 20, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are grateful in our cause to call upon our citizen and/ or representatives of the Department of Defense, "This is not the way to assure self-determination in that area. "In the present stage of their social, political, economic, etc., development, it is best represented by a nonmilitary form of government. "Indeed, it is hard to understand our policy in southeast Asia. Is the effort to assure self-determination in that area? Is the effort to halt the Chinese and the Communists an inseparable part of the effort to assure self-determination? Some of the questions which perplex us are:

1. Would the peoples of Laos and South Vietnam determine a form of government which is the "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 to accept our democracy? Is it in our interest toward international understanding and harmony to nurture hate (compare characteristics of "the Great White Father", "the only true believer"); or does our determination breed less hate than respect?

3. 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).

4. In any case, the administration seems to regard a gun as better than a bayonet, and we can derive from public media. We feel bewildered in our ignorance, and concerned to know the facts as they are available.

5. What information have you available which may clarify and substantiate your position on southeast Asia? We would appreciate any printed materials on 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.


SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: 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.

Respectfully yours, DAVID BERNSTEIN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

June 20, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: 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.

Respectfully yours, DAVID BERNSTEIN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

June 25, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I hereby 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, RUTH H. POOL.

SEATTLE, WASH.

June 22, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: 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 BERNSTEIN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.


SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: 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.

Respectfully yours, MICHAEL SAMBERG.

Senator Wayne Morse, Washington, D.C.: Thank you for your courageous and factual presentation on "Today." We are grateful, please, again and again and 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 in which we are headed. I pray you make it your immediate duty to rally all the millions who agree with you that are speeches. May you have continued strength and wisdom. Gratefully, Gertrude Temer Willke.


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. It is certainly the case that 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. Atkens.


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.

Kevin Schuman.


Senator Wayne Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

For the silence of necessity, I envy the Oregonians their Senator Morse, a 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.


Rosemary Lushers.

Los Angeles, Calif., June 24, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.: Beg you continue your opposition to war in Vietnam. America will be proud of you.

Albert Math.


Dr. Wm. M. Goldberg.


Senator Wayne Morse, Senate 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. Oune, Ph. D.


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. Anderson.


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.


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 Perl­man to arouse public opinion.

H. F. Rempert.

Dayton, Ohio, June 25, 1964.


C. Conover and T. Smallwood.


Senator Wayne Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.: Heard you on "Today" show. Agree in every respect. If you could get signatures of most everyone in America on a petition. Please tell me what I can do.

Marg Winkel.


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 hopes 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 people of the British are 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 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. Brener.

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 President Johnson to confront 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 Geneva conference and the 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 am not supporting because 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. Lotthorp.


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 Cambodia before sending the United States the world's leading threat to peace.

Our approach should be a political one based upon a decision to negotiate the issue with the interested parties. The defeat of the Geneva conference and the demonstration that the military approach is doomed to failure and weakens the United States' position 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,

Milham Kelber.


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 he insinuated 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 pretense warlike policy.

The nomination today of General Taylor to succeed Henry Cabot Lodge as Ambassador to Vietnam most distasteful. 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.

Very truly yours,

Floyd Mulkey.
CHICAGO, ILL., June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I wholeheartedly agree with your stand on Vietnam and applaud our Ambassador to Vietnam. How do you think ordinary citizens such as myself assist you?

Sincerely, SHIRLEY LENS.

MILITARY AID GOES TO BANGKOK
WASHINGTON.—Four cargo ships bearing tanks, multiple rocket launchers, 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 Feit. Does he realize that all-out war would mean the end of civilization and would mean the loss of perhaps 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., 1819 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 Feit, 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.


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, our intervention is as dead as the old colonialism, but also because the war is against an entire 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 national-wide 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 unjustifiable.

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 there, 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 the devil. If we all die we are almost sure to miss our target—and we might cause disaster unintentionally.

If Goldwater wants a war with Panama, Cuba, Zanzibar, and other old and new 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 WANZER.

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., a warranted 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 of China, looking toward a plebiscite to reconcile or unify North and South Vietnam. It is, furthermore, in violation of good faith 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 WANZER.


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 same 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.

WASHINGTON, 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 and I have known Americans as I send it to you for whatever use it may be to you.

Most sincerely, L. VANH ANDERSON, Jr., President 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, I would request our Government to place this dispute before the United Nations. This procedure would help implement the White House statement that the United States would not be involved 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 faithful 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.


Dear Senator Morse: I am enclosing a letter in The Times which was designed and I hope issued 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 Aims at Soldiers 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 one which to unarmed civilians, 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. The countries 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.—

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. Nevertheless, I was compelled to prop up both sides, our Khanh would not last a day.

Senator Morse (Mar. 26, 1964) said, "If we are not an agent provocateur in Vietnam, we are not far from it. * * * there are no Chinese in South Vietnam. There are no Russian soldiers in South Vietnam. The only American soldiers in South Vietnam are U.S. soldiers. What are they doing there?"

Senators Barnett, waterfront, and Mansfield have all been critical of American policy in South Vietnam. Prof. Roland Bainton, Yale Divinity School; Roger W. Burnham, Businessman, Milford, Conn.; Dr. Jerome Davis, New Haven; Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, Yale University; Rabbi Robert E. Goldfried, New Haven; Prof. Sidney Lovett, Director, Yale in China Association; Prof. John Oliver Nelson, Yale University; Parents MORSE and GRUENING which could lead to Washingtons.—never. •

Our newspapers have admitted is opposite. I most sincerely hope our leadership recognize abroad by our allies and at home of at most a quarter or 30 percent of its people. I'm still alive and not a victim of an atom bomb. There has not been and there does not exist in our local paper this 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. We should never have gone in there, we..."
"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 Eastland, and Senator Bayh. 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, Whittier Monthly Meeting of Friends, Whittier Friends Unprogrammed 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, unconcerned travel in all continents except Australia. I remember the political campaign of 1966. I voted Democratic first in 1932. In 1960 I could vote for neither. In 1966? The belief that civil and anti-poverty legislation is contradicted by our foreign policy.

Respectfully,

Florence R. Scholl

Palo Alto, Calif.


President Lyndon B. Johnson,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President:

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? My question speaks for us who are 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, Griffin, 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. Kennell.

Rowayton, Conn.


Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: 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 brandode and arrogant plans—at best, another Korea; at worst, a nuclear holocaust, and our country thenceforth would be an easy target for German, or Soviet countsmelling by comparison.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. Levine, M.D.

Batiste, N.Y.


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 terminally set because of the illegality, but the more so since the fighting would be for the purpose of crushing what appears to be a growing 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 caught the President. 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.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing on behalf of 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

Gardiner, Mass.


Hon. Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: 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 this appointment.

Respectfully yours,

Wallace Dalley


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. Liberati


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


Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I promise you that 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—a lone state in this world 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 but the red 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 and be getting along, even though we have Russia, Cuba, and other countries in that category.

My husband and I support 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 Sen: On the radio on Saturday, I heard a commentator state, "We will risk a war with China in order to preserve the peace. How causal 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 powerful support of peaceful alternatives in southeast Asia.

Sincerely,

Blanche H. Foster

New York, N.Y.


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. Turbeve.

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 Payonk

San Francisco, Calif.

June 24, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: People of this country are 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 quoted to have said could easily accelerate into a East-West thermonuclear war.

B. H. Livingston

San José, 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.

Senator Wayne Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

We do not support war in southeast Asia. Urges use of United Nations.

Dr. and Mrs. Ted J. Goldstein.


Senator Wayne Morse, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Thank you for your courage in opposing the war in South Vietnam.

Dr. and Mrs. William A. Muchave.

Los Angeles, Calif., June 22, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse, Washington, D.C.

Sending this to you because I fear screening from President Johnson's notice. Am in full accord with your views on South Vietnam. The administration is showing very blind expedient in relation to the loud-nothings who are trying to change U.S. 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 10, 1964—"Maimed, Scarred Child Victims of Vietnam War Horrify Doctor."

Dr. Ellmore, well known in southern California, tells us that there are 600 trained doctors in South Vietnam; 600 of these are in the army, leaving 200 doctors to serve 15 million people. (By contrast, a proportionate number of trained doctors in Los Angeles, near Los Angeles, will have 500 doctors for the residents of 18,000 homes.)

Dr. Ellmore says there is not one plastic surgeon in the country though many are needed. We provide white phosphorus, trichlortetraene, and other kinds of bombs. If a civil loss 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 country. 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 counsel that the Vietnamese army may do not fight with spirit and sometimes refuses to fight at all. I shouldn't wonder.

The policy of Madame Nhu and her husband led us to this. 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.

Ada N. Leffingwell, Homemaker; George Landfield, College Professor.

Hon. Wayne Morse, Senator, Oregon, Washington, D.C.

Dea! 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.

Honorable Senator Morse: I reread your statement on the war in South Vietnam, and I am at a loss to see where the "assent of Congress is being given any thought by those who seek to destroy our constitutional Constitution. The loss of so many Americans in our "assistance program"—tended nonmilitarily by some—, as you have said, unconstitutional.

The support that you deserve in your efforts to bring an end to this situation is too little.

Sincerely yours,

David Levine.

Palo Alto, Calif.

Senator Morse: Lately I have been reading very short remarks in the local press urging you to question the administration's southeast Asian policy. I too strongly oppose our country's position which is a stupid continuation of the same mistakes which cost us such terrible defeats in China, Cuba, and in countless other areas. The United States has a revolutionary history and yet we have become the opponent of modern revolution. It is for our country to recognize that the revolutionary aspirations of the world's underdeveloped peoples are not necessarily Communist, that they are inspired or controlled—these movements do become Communist controlled after all other democracy is destroyed 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 24, 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 am at a loss to see where the "assent of Congress is being given any thought by those who seek to destroy our constitutional Constitution. The loss of so many Americans in our "assistance program"—tended nonmilitarily by some—, as you have said, unconstitutional.

The support that you deserve in your efforts to bring an end to this situation is too little.

Sincerely yours,

David Levine.

Palo Alto, Calif.

Senator Morse: Lately I have been reading very short remarks in the local press urging you to question the administration's southeast Asian policy. I too strongly oppose our country's position which is a stupid continuation of the same mistakes which cost us such terrible defeats in China, Cuba, and in countless other areas. The United States has a revolutionary history and yet we have become the opponent of modern revolution. It is for our country to recognize that the revolutionary aspirations of the world's underdeveloped peoples are not necessarily Communist, that they are inspired or controlled—these movements do become Communist controlled after all other democracy is destroyed 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 24, 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 am at a loss to see where the "assent of Congress is being given any thought by those who seek to destroy our constitutional Constitution. The loss of so many Americans in our "assistance program"—tended nonmilitarily by some—, as you have said, unconstitutional.

The support that you deserve in your efforts to bring an end to this situation is too little.

Sincerely yours,

David Levine.

Palo Alto, Calif.
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 wonder what we, or plain citizens, can do to prevent a further spread of this war?

Respectfully yours,

HÉRTA 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 caniille—who like the war dogs, trained to war, are not satisfied until they give the world its last blood bath.

Respectfully yours,

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 let the President do the talking.

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.

Respectfully yours,

GLENDALE, CALIF., June 16, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We applaud your speeches on foreign policy. We also support your every effort, to find a peaceful solution to the brutal 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,

MARY KOVAC.


Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Some weeks ago, your office sent me 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 understandable 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 which is singularly depressant reading, 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: 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 strategically placed so that America can 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.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

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 Chinks are ready to pour thousands of troops into the country, just as they did in Korea, and yet we continue to give aid in increasing amounts.

You are right in saying 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: 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 SENATOR: 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 Vittos.

ABERDEEN, WA., 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 our European neighbors to invade and annex the countries they wish 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, FOR 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 1964 Geneva Treaty which provided for free elections. Almost immediately, the Eisenhower administration supported hated Diem family dicta­torship who would not allow free elec­tions. Since then, this regime has been 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 dictatorship, as then we can get killed and the taxpayer gets “soaked” in carrying out his plan does not bother the big capitalists.

J. OSBORNE.


HON. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: The brevity of this communication does not represent the concen­tration I have about our policy in Vietnam. I am in full agreement with the suggestions made by you and Senator Gruening as to our position on nations 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.

PREQUO ISLE, ME., June 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I understand there is seri­ous question whether our military involvement is war¬like to North Vietnam, which would be a terrible thing to do.

You have consistently fought against unwise and unnecessary war through all the
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 stood out as forthright and wise. You may at some cause for your statements now but the future will show your wisdom, I am sure.

Sincerely,

CHARLES RISIKER
CHARLOTTE, W. VA.,
JUNE 19, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. DEAR SIR: Just a note to tell you how 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 the responsibilities given to it. 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 pay to their own money into Washington, no one knows. Most of us hope a revolt if it comes will be 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 to the Government.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH W. BURTON
DEMOCRATS OF NEW YORK.
JUNE 16, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

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 SENS. I 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 to at least 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 political 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 need for peace 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 underwrite mailing millions of reprints of your messages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, over the heads of the newspapers ‘cordone sanitare’ 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 convinced of your sincerity and the message and reach as many others as possible, either by word of mouth, by sharing the obtained text from you, or both.

Sincerely,

BERNARD DONN.

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 Vietnam.

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,

WILFRED COUSIN.

SECOND SPRINGS, ILL.,
JUNE 24, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You are not my Senator, but I sincerely wish you were. If I ever move to Oregon, you will be the reason.

Sincerely yours,

W. H. PACKARD
Skokie, I11.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Your brutally frank statement yesterday regarding our involvement in Vietnam is the type of action-and the trigger-happy returnUrl. Because you said the United States wants to police Asia. It can’t be done. So you are 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 and I hope 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 SENS: The views you expressed today on the NBC “Today” program were like a breath of fresh air on a muggy day. I agree with them 100 percent. I sense the 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,

MARCIA K. TAYLOR

WESLEYVILLE, PA.
JUNE 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senato Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree with you wholeheartedly on the South Vietnam situation. I am willing 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. TAYLOR

WESLEYVILLE, PA.
JUNE 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENS: 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 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 hope 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 SENS: The views you expressed today on the NBC “Today” program were like a breath of fresh air on a muggy day. I agree with them 100 percent. I sense the 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 COUSIN

SECOND SPRINGS, I11.,
JUNE 24, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENS: I heard you on TV program “Today” and just want you to know that I am one of the 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.

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 stand in the military.

We mothers dread 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. LANDSTED.

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. TARFF.

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. ELASSEN.

GLENDALE, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for making known your position on the war in South Vietnam and that the problem be handed over to the U.N., which I am sure in many cases never gets read, what can we do? Thank you again for always speaking out clearly and without party bias. If we had more people with your honesty and wisdom, we would perhaps not be standing at the brink of world war III.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. MARYLIN KELSEY.

BRONXVILLE, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Whenever I hear you speak I feel like the sun has risen and we have come out from behind a dark, thick cloud. I hope you will read my letter.

You are a great developer of the American young men being killed in Asia. Whenever I speak about how angry I shall be if he is sent to Asia, every one 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 delinquency. We are going to have great chaos and delinquency very soon if we do not do something about opportunities for body development and 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 TZNANDSEN.

EAST ORANGE, N.J.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

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. Anyone 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 presidency.

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.

If we had more people with your honesty and wisdom, we would perhaps not be standing at the brink of world war III.

Very truly yours,

MRS. M. D. CLAUDE.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

Brooklyn, N.Y.

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 SENATOR 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 Hitleresque venture.

Democracy, self-reliance, 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.

Sincerely,

MRS. CHARLOTTE PHIL.

GLENDALE, CALIF.,

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 yours,

JACK and SYLVIA R. PRIMACK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

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 Hitleresque venture.

Democracy, self-reliance, 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.

Sincerely,

DORIS J. SIGEL.

HATHOMS, MASS.,

Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon:

Today 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 HEAL TH 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 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 and SYLVIA R. PRIMACK.

GLENDORA, CALIF.,

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 Hitleresque venture.

Democracy, self-reliance, 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.

Sincerely,
I tremble for my country and for the safety of all mankind when the backlash of redistribution sweeps over us.

Sincerely yours,

STELLA FALK.


HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My dear Senator Morse: My wife and I were way much moved and impressed by your presentation of your views on the war in southeast Asia during your appearance on the "Today" show 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 in delaying 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.


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. MILLENTCE SAPOLSKY.


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 the Governor, to my Congressman, etc., regarding 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 mean in a nation with the great tradition ours has.

What can be done?

Sincerely yours,

PHYLLIS J. THOMAS.


Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable 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 no 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.


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 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.


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.


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 American people 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. CYLVE CLAYT0N.
(Republican).

P.S.—We are calling our friends, reading your statements and asking them to write.


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. FEINSBERG,
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.


Dear Sir: I support your stand on our pulling out of South Vietnam. You can save the world from a holocaust.

Yours truly,

ELS A WEXLER.


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.
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 26


Dear Sir: Please continue to urge a peacekeeping 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. ARNASCO.


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.

W. L. MILLER.

UNADILLA, N.Y., June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You are right; it looks as if State Department have lost their heads, starting little wars all over the world. Why should we support your position. Am horrified and terrified current activities southeast Asia. I am quite willing to ship our boys over there. Why send our boys over there? Why have we 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.

P.S.—I'm also writing to the President about this.

May Beckman.

WHITE PLAINS, N.Y., June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE 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. JACOBS.

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 Lauches for support.

P. D. TOLLIS.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., June 26, 1964.


MRS. ELSA CLAY.

READING, PA.

Mr. MORSE: I heard you on the "Today" show and I'm glad somebody speaks up. But they have notes to read 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. God-waves, he will tell the people's what's going on, and they won't tell you. Keep up the good fight, way this was in the making a couple of years.

Respectfully,

MRS. KLECKNER.


Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: 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 rejoining while thousands await the death knell.

The pity of it all that we must rely on men whose trust hesitiate 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 behind barbed wire enclosures without shelter or food. Others die by the wayside of malnutrition and disease, old and young alike. It has been shown by cause 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,

MRS. E. C. FREYER.

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 ZOLA HEARDON.

FEARS TO MEET TAYLOR IN ASIA—SOME AMERICANS IN VIETNAMESE UNSURE OF MILITARY WEIGHT—NOW YORK TIMES—OTHERS BELIEVE THE DIPLOMATIC ASPECT WILL NOT BE IGNORED

(By Malcolm W. Browne)

(see New York Times June 26)

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 several former Ambassadors to Vietnam (including Cordell Hull) held 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 their sense—they are both. We have nothing to match these multithered men. Such a 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 actual 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.

Many of them do not think any 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 Army, Air 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.


Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: 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 HEMHELCH.

DARIEN, CONN., June 24, 1964.

President LYNCHON 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 peace, I have for some time been of that opinion.

On the same program, Senator Arlen, 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 Arlen, 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, new a Communist. I have only one son, 21 years old. He has just finished a 3-year hitch in the Army (101st Airborne), but he has no plans to go overseas. All the arms they have need to defend their freedom, a quite dubious term in several countries I can think of. Their government is the only one strong 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.


Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: 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 HEMHELCH.

DARIEN, CONN., June 24, 1964.
We have enough to do right here at home to protect our freedom. How about the 80,000 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 southeast Asia? Are we going to get bogged down in that war 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 the situation than I do. But I do not feel that we may 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, not 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 picture of southeast Asia and other distant lands. It ever came to a choice, which God forbid, between patriotism and morality, I would not hesitate to side with morality.

In your letter, which I am sure you personally will never read, but I had to get these things off my mind. Respectfully yours,

Conger F. Smith

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 us 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 how long (I am told) of your non-subservient ones?

Does the President and Mr. Rusk really think that they can win, successfully or parially washed? That we have swallowed the old wornout line of the danger of communism? It is sickening to think what our country has sunk to. The decision 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 can call up a few thousands to support you. In Greece they had a peace march of 800,000 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, on the speeches we read one word.

Most sincerely, but downhearted;

Marianna Schultz

Best, Ore.
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. ADELMAN, 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. Cristino,

Vista, Calif.,
June 18, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse, U.S. Senate:

Dear Senator Morse: 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. F. 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.

Ellicott 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 successful in doing this is by repealing the Connelly reservation in order to make the U.N. more effective. If 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

Mary E. Phillips

Great Falls, Mont.,

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 it 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.

Bettendorf, Iowa,
June 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse, June 25, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Again I admired your insight and courage when 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.

Senator Wayne Morse, June 25, 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 on them? Why do they 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 you 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: We salute you with very full hearts on your uncompromising stand on the terrible situation in Vietnam, 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.

Bunker Hill, Calif.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to express my wholehearted approval and gratitude for your outspoken opposition to the administration's foreign policies in 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, it could not be President Johnson be impeached? Does he think that he is not going to get a devastating response to his bolded threat to use the combined foreign powers for not following our way of life? (In Mississippi?)

Granting that the President has favored many one-sided-looking policies, the Vietnam attitude can easily brazen 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 prevent?

Again, with appreciation,

Edith T. Coggins.

Washington, D.C.,
June 25, 1964.

The Honorable Senator Wayne Morse, 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 "nonsense" we have been fed.

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 our Administration and the 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.

Dearest Senator Morse: You are to be congratulated on your intelligent stand against expanding hostilities in southeast Asia. I hope 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, and as well as the products of Indo-china'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.O., U.S.A.
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.

NIC. 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 of this matter 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. MORSE.

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 policies both in and out of Vietnam. Why do we not hear the truth about this situation?

Sincerely yours,
MARGARET H. HANDY
(Mrs. Gardner W.).

MOYER MANAGEMENT CORP.,

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your address of June 23 on the situation in southeast Asia. As we are interested in assisting ourselves. We cannot afford to lose a war there or anywhere else.

Please continue your efforts to awaken our people to the national handling of affairs in Vietnam.

Yours truly,
FREDERICK W. COYKENDALL.
VISIT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD TO SENATOR KENNEDY AND SENATOR BAYH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before taking any adjournment, 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. Corrinden, 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 plane, Mr. Zimmy 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-rate 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.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 26, 1964:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Sam P. Glickman, 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. McNaughten, 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

To be lieutenant generals

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 8966, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be general

To be lieutenant generals

To be brigadier generals

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 3443 and 3447:

To be major generals

To be major general

To be general

To be lieutenant general

To be lieutenant general

To be major general

To be major general

To be lieutenant general

To be major general

To be general

To be brigadier generals
Col. Wendell John Coats, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

To be general

To be general
Col. Walter Martin Higgins, Jr., XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

To be general

To be general

To be general
Col. Richard Henry Free, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

To be general
Col. Wilbur Eugene Showalter, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

To be general
Col. Walter Perrell Winton, Jr., XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

To be general
Col. Lloyd Brinkley Ramsey, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

To be general
Col. Charles Morgan Prosser, XXXXXXXX U.S. Army.

To be general
Col. Osmund Alfred Leach, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

To be general
Col. Charles A. Buford Davidson, Jr., XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

To be general
Col. Charles Carmin Noble, XXXXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).
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 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 following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade indicated subject to qualification therefore as provided by law:

To be rear admirals
William C. Abbae
Donald A. Baer
Richard G. Colbert
Earl R. Crawford
Walter L. Curtis, Jr.
John E. Dacey
Woodrow W. McCorry
Nathan Sonnenstein
Philip A. Beshay
Robert W. McNitt
Raymond F. Dubois
Ralph Weymouth

Herbert H. Eligham
Robert Canada, Jr.
Joseph L. Yon
Horace D. Warden

To be rear admirals
William M. Heaman

To be rear admirals
Maurice E. Simpson

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA


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.