

guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 1105. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.J. Res. 1106. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 318. Concurrent resolution commending the President for his recent statement with respect to aggression in the Middle East and expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to such aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Con. Res. 319. Concurrent resolution commending the President for his recent statement with respect to aggression in the Middle East and expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to such aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 320. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress on disposal from the national stockpile of certain materials; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H. Res. 798. Resolution to name the national wildlife refuge located at Walter F. George Dam and Reservoir project, Alabama; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America to restore to the citizens of the several States their sovereign right to determine the form and the manner of their legislative representation in State government; to the committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to H.R. 1794, relating to providing social and educational conditions for certain American Indian tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 11892. A bill for the relief of Le-Shiu Du and Chen Chin-Lan Tu (also known as Mr. and Mrs. R. S. Tu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 11893. A bill for the relief of Halguhi Sarkis Seringul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 11894. A bill for the relief of Angela Neme; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 11895. A bill for the relief of Mr. Lothar A. Koeberer, his wife Mrs. Agnes

Koeberer, and his minor child Agnes Koeberer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 11896. A bill for the relief of Dr. Amparo Gonzales Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11897. A bill for the relief of Sehimi Aktschura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 11898. A bill for the relief of Lauren F. Teutsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 11899. A bill for the relief of the JELL Brick Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11890. A bill for the relief of Antonios Jabbour Mikhail, his wife, Ivette Jabbour Mikhail, and Jabbour Antonios Mikhail and Mikhail Antonios Mikhail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 11891. A bill for the relief of Adolfo Lopez Mendez, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 11892. A bill for the relief of Guido Aquilini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

950. Mr. SNYDER presented a petition of Clarence L. Frazier of Lexington, Ky., relative to prayer and Bible reading in our schools, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 1, 1964

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Richard T. Bray, Jr., pastor, Claybrook Baptist Church, Weems, Va., offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, who hast been our help in ages past, and art our hope for years to come, we bless Thee for Thy faithfulness, of which there is no end. We praise Thee for the gift of life, which only Thou canst bestow, and for Thine unflinching goodness that overarches all our days.

Grant us grace, we beseech Thee, amid the confusion of the world and the disappointments of human hope to be still long enough to hear Thy voice speak unto our souls. May we open our hearts; may we surrender our wills; may we dedicate our thoughts to Thee. Correct us where we are wrong; confirm us whenever we may be right; grant us wisdom to discern Thy will, and courage to do it.

At this season, O God, we are mindful of Thy dealing with us as a nation. By Thy hand Thou didst prepare this land for human habitation; by Thy spirit, our forefathers were moved to seek its shores; by their trust in Thee, our Founding Fathers made declaration of the rights of men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Forgive us our national and personal sins. May we be humble in the ac-

ceptance of our heritage. Keep us loyal to the high aims which have been set before us. Grant us great sympathy with all the people of the earth in their quest for life and liberty. Help us to share our blessings with others. Enable us to stand for righteousness and truth, and lead us in the pathways of peace.

We ask these things in the blessed name of our Redeemer and Thy Son, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 30, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 314)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report of the projects and progress of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period of January 1, 1963, through June 30, 1963.

This report covers 6 months of significant and encouraging activity in the national space program. The breadth of performance promises subsequent periods of even greater accomplishment in meeting the challenge of space.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 1, 1964.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL 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 enrolled bill (H.R. 2664) to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance and the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of the Judiciary Committee, were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MES- SAGES AND SIGN BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournments or recesses of the Senate for the remainder of this week, 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.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,
The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Wilson Cowen, of Maryland, to be chief justice of the U.S. Court of Claims.

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

AMBASSADORS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of ambassadors.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted with the Presidential appointment of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor to be our Ambassador to the Republic of Vietnam.

I believe that in this statesman-soldier we have a man of extraordinary ability and integrity who well understands the situation in that area, and who will represent us with great patriotism and great devotion. I believe this is a truly outstanding appointment of which this country can well be proud.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a newspaper article in re-

gard to the appointment of General Taylor.

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

CLOSEUP: OUR NEW MAN IN SAIGON,
GEN. MAXWELL TAYLOR
(By William H. Rudy)

A distinguished Army career stretching over more than four decades has produced eight rows of decorations on the uniform of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor. One of them could well be "for imagination beyond the call of duty."

Max Taylor has often been the man called on when the situation needed something more than the routine response. Now, at 62, when his retirement had been expected in the not too distant future, he has been named Ambassador to South Vietnam.

As commander of the 101st Airborne Division in World War II, Taylor dropped into Normandy on the eve of D-day. If assignment in Saigon in 1964 lacks the same degree of personal danger, it is nevertheless the hottest of current trouble spots.

Taylor is a military brain without the "military mind." Back in 1922 when not yet 21, he graduated from West Point, fourth in his class, he was saluted by the class yearbook, the Howitzer, as "the most learned" of the class.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who was commandant of the academy at the time, years later was quoted as calling Taylor "promising * * * but a man who will never do anything to jeopardize his career."

But there came a day in 1959 when Taylor, as Army Chief of Staff, disturbed by the administration's policy of massive retaliation and outvoted by the other chiefs on 20 of 23 major issues, submitted his resignation to President Eisenhower. It was accepted. Taylor had been an Army man 41 years. He was 3 years shy of the normal retirement age for officers of his rank.

As articulate as he is courageous, he sat right down to write "The Uncertain Trumpet," a condemnation of existing U.S. military policy.

It was a book sharply critical of the Eisenhower-Dulles policy of massive atomic retaliation and forceful in its arguments against the plan advocated by Admiral Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs, to cut military costs by placing increased reliance on atomic weapons.

Taylor, correctly foreseeing that wars of the immediate future, at least, would be "brush fires" falling short of world conflagrations, advocated "flexible response."

"I have undertaken to write this book because of my conviction that the defense of the United States is presently controlled largely by nonmilitary factors which have become outmoded," he said. "While there are strong arguments for a cooling period after leaving the post of Chief of Staff before committing my views to writing, I have the deep feeling that there is no time to wait."

"We are faced with declining military strength at a time of increasing political tension. To arrest this trend before it goes too far requires certain immediate actions to be taken. * * * The permanent remedy calls for a complete reappraisal of our strategy by the responsible agencies of our Government."

Having sounded with "The Uncertain Trumpet" a clear signal that values existed for him above that of not jeopardizing his Army career, Taylor showed his own flexible response by becoming later in 1960 the president of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, succeeding John D. Rockefeller III, who became chairman of the board.

But one of those whose attention was attracted to "The Uncertain Trumpet" was another thinker who rejected easy answers—and when John F. Kennedy was elected

President, Maxwell Taylor was called back to duty.

He served first as the young President's White House military adviser and eventually, in July 1962, became Chairman of the Joint Chiefs by Presidential appointment. It was the post he held when President Johnson chose him for Saigon.

As the most influential of military advisers in the Kennedy administration, Taylor is able to go off to Saigon with the argument of massive retaliation versus flexible response resolved for the present in his favor.

In Vietnam he finds the prime example of the type of localized war to be contained and then resolved by more subtle and complex means than all-out military operations and atomic attack.

Max Taylor, who was to have such an impact on world military strategy and who was to head Lincoln Center, was born in little Keytesville, Mo., the son of a lawyer for the Katy Railroad. He graduated from high school in Kansas City and attended Kansas City Junior College for a year before going to West Point.

Taylor was sufficiently skilled in science and particularly in languages to have made a name for himself in academic life. He taught Spanish and French at the Academy for 5 years.

In 1926 he had married Lydia Happer, of El Paso, Tex., and in 1935 they arrived in Tokyo with two young sons. Captain Taylor was attached to the U.S. Embassy with the primary task of learning Japanese by going to school 8 hours a day. He stayed 4 years.

Anti-American feeling was running high in those pre-Pearl Harbor days, and Mrs. Taylor has recalled it's a wonder her husband wasn't arrested as he traveled by streetcar across the city to classes, studying Japanese calligraphy on little cards he kept in his pocket.

Taylor was able to read, write, and converse in Japanese when he returned to the Army War College in 1939. Even the most difficult languages were relatively easy for him, his wife has explained, partly because language study relaxes him and becomes a form of recreation. For most of his life he has concentrated on a language for at least an hour a day.

This language facility took him off on a special Army mission to South America just before World War II, but with Pearl Harbor the officer sought the active life.

Taylor was in on the birth of the Nation's airborne strength when he helped after the outbreak of war to convert the 82d Infantry into the 82d Airborne. He went overseas in 1943 as the division's artillery commander and took part in the African, Sicilian, and Italian campaigns, getting his first opportunity for wartime heroics, though the incident was a top secret at the time.

Just before the Allied landings in Italy, secret efforts were started to arrange with Italian authorities for the surrender of their forces. Major General Taylor and Col. William T. Gardiner, a former Governor of Maine, left Sicily in a British PT boat, rendezvoused with an Italian corvette and were landed south of Rome disguised as U.S. airmen picked up from a wrecked plane.

As ostensible prisoners they were taken into Rome under the noses of the German forces and conferred for 24 hours with Italian leaders. Discovery would have meant certain execution. They left just before the Allied landings at Salerno, but the arrangements they made later were abandoned because of changing circumstances.

In "Crusade in Europe," Eisenhower said "the risks he ran were greater than I asked any other agent or emissary to undertake during the war."

His second outstanding exploit was dropping into France on the eve of D-day to help prepare the way for the invasion. He was the first general officer to land in Normandy, and later received the Distinguished Service

Cross "for extraordinary heroism in action against the enemy."

Some weeks later he dropped with his 101st, "the Screaming Eagles," into Holland. When the division was trapped late that year at Bastogne in the Battle of the Bulge, Taylor was on a mission into the beleaguered town with the first armored relief forces.

There were few Allied decorations he did not hold at the end of the war.

Taylor's first peacetime assignment was as Superintendent at West Point, where he broadened the curriculum to provide more liberal arts courses.

"Cadets should not live in mental cloisters," he said. "Their interests must be catholic, avoiding the small horizons sometimes attributed to the military mind."

Taylor's horizons were broad enough and the posts he subsequently was chosen for were those requiring such a man. He commanded both the American Military Government and Army forces in West Berlin at a time of great turmoil, and in 1953 was assigned to the most troublesome post of all—commander of U.S. forces in Korea.

Service at such distant points under such difficult circumstances reinforced his view that the United States must be equipped with sufficient conventional forces to cope with limited and varying situations.

There followed his first tour as Army Chief of Staff, which ended with his differences with the Eisenhower administration and his first retirement, during which he was for a time chairman of the Mexican Light & Power Co. and lived in Mexico City.

On his return to Washington with President Kennedy, Taylor was frequently assigned to troubleshooting jobs—a report on the Bay of Pigs fiasco, missions to Pakistan and India, negotiations in Indonesia.

As Chairman of the Joint Chiefs he argued for ratification of the limited nuclear test ban treaty and for the Kennedy foreign aid programs, and with Defense Secretary McNamara visited the Far East to study the frustrating Vietnam conflict.

The Taylors' two sons have careers of their own now. John Maxwell Taylor, 34, a Government civilian employee, is married and lives with his wife and children in Falls Church, Va. Thomas Happer Taylor, 29, an Army captain, is stationed at Ft. Lewis, Wash., where his father once was.

The general, nearing 63, is a handsome, erect 6-footer, trim and fit from years of tennis, his consuming athletic interest. He was captain of the team at West Point and is now a director of the National Lawn Tennis Hall of Fame at Newport, R.I.

But he has had some annoying bronchial attacks recently, and considering the demands of a 14-hour day in the Pentagon, had indicated he might ask to be freed soon for a second retirement, probably after the November elections.

Now the call has come from President Johnson to go to Saigon. It is a problem that needs a man of broad horizons—and he has accepted.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the appointment of Gen. Maxwell Taylor as Ambassador to the Republic of Vietnam has come at a difficult and perilous time for southeast Asia. It is a moment of challenge for the protection of the free world.

I know I speak for all of us when I say that Maxwell Taylor will take to Vietnam our deepest hope that through strength, perseverance, and patience peace will be established for the embattled people of South Vietnam.

No one who has watched the long career of Maxwell Taylor can doubt that President Johnson has selected a leader

who will serve with wisdom and caution, discipline and hard work.

Maxwell Davenport Taylor was born in Keytesville, Mo., August 26, 1901, the son of a railroad lawyer. When he graduated from Kansas City High School at age 15, he was known as both an athlete and a scholar.

He had the best education the Army could offer, beginning at West Point. By the time he was appointed Assistant U.S. Military Attaché in Peiping, in 1939, he had become fluent in French, Spanish, and Japanese.

After a distinguished World War II service record—which included parachuting into Normandy on D-day with his troops—and a period as Superintendent at West Point, General Taylor became Chief of Staff for the Armed Forces in Europe, and Commander of the American Military Government and Army Forces in Berlin, 1949–51. He spent 18 months face to face with Soviet pressure on Germany, before he returned to be an Army Deputy Chief of Staff, in the Pentagon.

In 1953 he was sent to Korea, where he commanded the 8th Army. Then as Commander of the U.S. Army Forces in the Far East, and United States-United Nations Commander in the Far East, General Taylor rounded out his knowledge of Communist strategy and tactics in Asia.

In 1961, President Kennedy acknowledged General Taylor's abilities, and invited him to join his administration. As military representative to the President, and then as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Taylor has had a broad and intimate acquaintance with the foreign policies of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

There is no doubt that the man we are sending to Vietnam is unusually endowed with an understanding of American policy and an ability to meet the problems of implementing that policy. For 3 years he has been in the day-to-day handling of our effort in South Vietnam. He has gained the confidence of military and political leaders, both at home and abroad. Ambassador Taylor is firmly committed to keeping South Vietnam and southeast Asia from falling to Communist insurgency.

It is a long way from Keytesville to Saigon, but it is a path which Maxwell Taylor has traveled with distinction. On behalf of his native State of Missouri, I congratulate our new Ambassador, and wish him Godspeed.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Walter Ely, of California, to be a U.S. circuit judge, for the ninth circuit.

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

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. district judges.

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

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

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for membership on the Subversive Activities Control Board.

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

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

BROADENING OF VESSEL EXCHANGE PROVISIONS OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to broaden the vessel exchange provisions of section 510(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to extend such provisions for an additional 5 years, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF LEGAL AID AGENCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Director, Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the period June 1, 1963, to May 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROVISION FOR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO SHARE IN THE REVENUE FROM THE LEASE, USE, OR DISPOSITION OF AIRSPACE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEMS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that the Federal Government shall share in the revenue from the lease, use, or disposition of airspace on the Federal-aid highway systems (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH GRANTS

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on scientific research grants, for the calendar year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY COSTS INCURRED IN CONSTRUCTION OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred

in the construction of the Smithsonian Institution Museum of History and Technology, General Services Administration, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON COSTS INCURRED IN EXCESS OF THOSE INTENDED AND NECESSARY IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on costs incurred in excess of those intended and necessary in the administration of public information activities, Department of Labor, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR TURKEY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of economic and technical assistance program for Turkey, Agency for International Development, Department of State, fiscal years 1958-62 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON OVERCHARGES TO THE GOVERNMENT FOR CHANGE ORDERS ISSUED UNDER CERTAIN NAVY CONTRACTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on overcharges to the Government for change orders issued under Navy contracts awarded to the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., a division of Litton Industries, Inc., Pascagoula, Miss., Department of the Navy, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL, RESERVATION, OR RESTRICTION OF PUBLIC LANDS

A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of February 28, 1958, relating to the withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of public lands, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas the mushroom growing and canning industry is one of the foundation stones of Pennsylvania's agricultural economy, gainfully employing thousands of workers who produce a useful and unique product consumed throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas the continued existence of this great Pennsylvania industry as a viable force in our economy is now in dire jeopardy due to a torrential flood of low-priced imports from a single cheap labor country which have mounted to nearly 50 percent of domestic production in less than 3 years; resulting in wholesale bankruptcies and hardships to Pennsylvania farmers and canners; and

"Whereas every factor indicates even greater future onslaughts which will surely sound the death knell of a great American industry located primarily in the State of Pennsylvania: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania requests his excellency, William W. Scranton, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to intercede on behalf of the people of this Commonwealth and the mushroom industry with the President of the United States and the U.S. Tariff Commission to impose tariffs on the import of mushrooms of a sufficient amount to make them competitive with the domestic mushroom industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize Congress to take whatever steps may be necessary to protect the weakening and declining domestic mushroom industry, and restore the same to a competitive market; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Governor William W. Scranton; President Lyndon B. Johnson; U.S. Tariff Commission; the presiding officer of each House of the Congress of the United States; and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States."

Two petitions of C. R. Mead, Westport, Conn., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Sundry communications of Henry Stoner, of Avon Park, Fla., relating to matters within the jurisdiction of the Senate; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTION OF CONFERENCE OF UPPER NEW YORK STATE REGION OF HADASSAH

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a letter addressed to me embodying a resolution adopted at the conference of the Upper New York State Region of Hadassah, relating to human rights. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UPPER NEW YORK STATE REGION,
WOMEN'S ZIONIST ORGANIZATION
OF AMERICA,

June 3, 1964.

HON. JACOB JAVITS,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: The following resolution was adopted at the conference of the Upper New York State Region of Hadassah:

"Whereas the three human rights conventions approved by the U.S. representatives to the United Nations and by the President of the United States, are now before the Foreign Relations Committee—these conventions calling for: (1) The abolition of enforced labor; (2) the abolition of slavery; (3) political rights of women; and

"Whereas the Government and citizens of the United States have consistently thought to enhance the dignity of the individual and safeguard the civil rights of human beings

everywhere, which objectives the human rights conventions are designed to further: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That Hadassah supports the request of many American organizations and citizens to the chairman and members of the Foreign Relations Committee that this matter be brought to the Senate for ratification at the earliest possible date, thus adding the prestige and support of the United States to the sponsorship of the human rights conventions."

We know you are giving this measure positive support.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. KARL GOLDMAN,
Regional President.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 9094. An act to authorize the President to declare July 9, 1964, as Monocacy Battle Centennial in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy (Rept. No. 1153);

H.R. 9234. An act to incorporate the Little League Baseball, Inc. (Rept. No. 1154);

H.R. 10437. An act to incorporate the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements (Rept. No. 1155); and

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor (Rept. No. 1152).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.R. 4732. An act to change the name of the United States Olympic Association to the United States Olympic Committee (Rept. No. 1151).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 8590. An act to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame (Rept. No. 1150); and

H.J. Res. 658. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim 1964 as "See America Year" and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1149).

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution to designate the second Monday in April as National Teachers' Day (Rept. No. 1148).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H.R. 5478. An act authorizing a survey of the Frio River in the vicinity of Three Rivers, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes (Rept. No. 1157); and

H.R. 6923. An act authorizing a survey of Cedar Bayou, Tex., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes (Rept. No. 1158).

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 1847. An act to provide a residence for congressional and Supreme Court pages (Rept. No. 1156).

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 1282. A bill to permit a State to increase the mileage of its Federal-aid primary system when provision is made for the completion and maintenance of 75 percent thereof (Rept. No. 1159);

S. 1593. A bill to amend section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 concerning the interstate planning and coordination of the Great River Road (Rept. No. 1160); and

H.R. 10392. An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to locate a portion of a vehicular tunnel under parts of the U.S. Capitol Grounds and the U.S. Botanic Garden Grounds, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1161).

Mr. RANDOLPH subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today, from the Committee on Public Works, I reported favorably, without amendment, House bill 10392, relating to the location of a portion of a vehicular tunnel under parts of the U.S. Capitol grounds. I ask unanimous consent that the individual views of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] be printed as a part of that report.

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

H.R. 10503. An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1162).

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV, RELATING TO JURISDICTION OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1147)

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 338) amending rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate relative to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and submitted a report thereon; which report was ordered to be printed, and the resolution placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end of paragraph 1(p) of rule XXV (relating to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration) the following new subparagraph:

"(3) Such committee shall have jurisdiction to investigate every alleged violation of the rules of the Senate, and to make appropriate findings of fact and conclusions with respect thereto after according to any individual concerned due notice and opportunity for hearing. In any case in which the committee determines that any such violation has occurred, it shall be the duty of the committee to recommend to the Senate appropriate disciplinary action, including reprimand, censure, suspension from office or employment, or expulsion from office or employment."

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2967. A bill to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 in order to require that imported woven labels must have woven into them the name of the country where woven; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 2968. A bill to amend subsection 120(f) of title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. GORE:

S. 2969. A bill establishing a Department of Consumer Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. CHURCH (by request):

S. 2970. A bill to restore to the heirs of the Indian grantor certain tribal land of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 2971. A bill for the relief of Fay Lun Mar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE RELATIVE TO JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 338) amending rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate relative to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, which was placed on the calendar.

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

AMENDMENT OF SUBSECTION 120 (F) OF TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and myself, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference. I ask unanimous consent that a statement in explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2968) to amend subsection 120(f) of title 23, United States Code, introduced by Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. METCALF is as follows:

STATEMENT OF JUSTIFICATION FOR BILL TO INCREASE THE FEDERAL SHARE PAYABLE FOR EMERGENCY RELIEF IN CERTAIN CASES

Under the existing provisions of section 120 of title 23, United States Code, the Federal share of emergency relief for highways seriously damaged by a disaster is limited to 50 percent. In those States containing little or nothing in the way of public lands, no hardship results from this limitation. However, those States which contain large areas of Federal lands have come to rely heavily, for ordinary Federal-aid highway construction, upon the so-called sliding scale of Federal participation under Section 120. The sliding scale takes into account the non-taxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, and public domain lands—both reserved and unreserved—exclusive of national forests and national parks and monuments, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands in any State in arriving at the Federal share payable. Consequently, computations under this section may raise the Federal share payable for primary, secondary and urban highway construction from the regular 50

percent to nearly 95 percent in certain public lands States.

Under these circumstances, the same type of disaster could affect two States, one with public lands and the other without, in an entirely different manner. The former would receive as emergency relief a payment for reconstruction which might amount to little over half of the Federal share paid for original construction, while the latter would receive a Federal payment for its damaged highways representing the same Federal share used in their original building. For this reason, it appears most desirable to apply the same Federal share to emergency relief as is payable for original construction in order to avoid inequities among the States in case of widespread disaster.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Department of Consumer Affairs. The function and purpose of the Department shall be to protect our public interest, with particular emphasis on consumer interest. In connection therewith, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article from the current issue of the Nation, written by Mr. Desmond Smith, entitled "Chain Squeeze: The Power of Big Food."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2969) establishing a Department of Consumer Affairs, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The article presented by Mr. GORE is as follows:

CHAIN SQUEEZE: THE POWER OF BIG FOOD (By Desmond Smith)

Big food, the \$70 billion a year supermarket industry which has wiped out 140,000 family-owned grocery stores since the end of World War II, is now drawing a bead on its suppliers. Tomato growers in Texas, food canners in California, poultry farms in Alabama are among a dozen or so producing groups that have succumbed to the python-like embrace of the food chains in recent years. But the latest group marked for extinction, the western livestock producers, have proved more difficult to swallow. The battle for control of the stockyards, to the chagrin of big food, has suddenly shifted from the boardrooms of the giant supermarket chains to the White House. President Johnson, a cattleman himself, has asked Congress to move quickly on a bill that will provide funds and authority for a national commission "to study and appraise the changes taking place in the American food industry." Chainstore officials have yelled "election year politics," but will find it hard to sustain the charge. The President has deliberately emphasized the bipartisan makeup of his proposed commission.

The importance President Johnson attaches to this inquiry reflects, to some extent, a concern for the administration's farm program—where the matter of surpluses still awaits the logic of a Keynesian solution. But at least as urgent a motive is President Johnson's knowledge that (as he mentioned earlier this year in his message on agriculture) "while there are 200,000 retail grocery stores in the United States, \$1 out of every \$2 spent for groceries goes to fewer than 100 corporate voluntary or cooperative chains."

The market power of Big Food has been growing for some time; the plight of the livestock producers gave it the status of a national problem. The \$8 billion a year beef cattle business is today in the middle of a slump that is being compared to the worst days of the depression. Cattlemen put the blame on the chainstores which, they claim, have moved in on the feedlot and the cattle range with a big stick. They point out that retail beef sales through the chains now represent about 85 percent of the total retail sales of beef. The big stick carried by the food chains is their "take it or leave it" buying power. As Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, noted in Congress recently, "Something is wrong when livestock values drop by something like 25 percent over a period of about 15 months, without any appreciable drop in the prices paid for meat by housewives."

Ever since the supermarket came to maturity in 1948, the great fight for the consumer's food dollar—the biggest item in the family budget—has found the chains engaged in an economic war. Ironically, food chains such as the A. & P. were late in changing over to the supermarket concept. It was, in fact, the independent grocer, looking for a way to beat the chains in the 1920's, who pioneered the idea of the self-service store. By the early 1950's the change from neighborhood shopping to automobile shopping created the shopping center, and the chains switched to supermarkets. How successful that policy has been is spectacularly demonstrated by America's biggest food chain, the A. & P. In 1946, the company operated 15,000 colonial-trimmed grocery stores. Today, the number has been cut back to 4,500 brick-faced, no-nonsense supermarkets. Despite the reduction of outlets, profits bounded. In 1962, the A. & P. earned \$60 million after taxes.

In 1920, anyone with a couple of thousand dollars could start a small (1,000-square-foot) supermarket. In the postwar decade the average supermarket covered 9,000 square feet and required an investment of at least \$300,000. And even when the local food store operator had the necessary cash he often found himself shut out of the shopping center. The answer was always the same. The center's developer needed long-term financing; the finance agency—usually an insurance company—considered a national chain a more desirable tenant than a local merchant.

By the mid-1950's, phase one of the war—the removal of the corner grocer—was over except for minor pockets of resistance. Phase two was to prove a much more deadly battle. The chainstores began to cut into one another's markets. When all else failed, that old standby of big business, the merger, was used. The Federal Trade Commission noted in a complaint against the Kroger Co.: "Twenty percent of the grocery stores in the United States account for over 72 percent of the total grocery store sales in the country. From 1954 to 1957 some 36 corporations absorbed 88 grocery chains and thereby acquired * * * over \$1½ billion in total sales."

It would be wrong to conclude that the supermarket revolution is without its supporters. Whatever sociologists may feel about the disappearance of the cracker barrel, the housewife has few regrets. She appreciates such features as refrigerated counters, prepacked "convenience" foods, frozen orange juice, and the enormous improvement in sanitary food-handling methods that are part of the big change in food retailing. But even though the food chains deserve much of the credit for these gains, one still asks whether it has been prudent to leave the shaping of this marketing change entirely in the hands of the big food chains. More specifically, one wonders how long this country can muddle along without a Department of Consumer Affairs.

Congressional inquiries have turned up damaging testimony against the food chains. Deceptive food packaging, misleading labeling, misrepresentation, fictitious sales and the widening practice of substituting food-chain grading for Federal grading in meat (most people understand what "Prime" signifies on a slab of beef, but what on earth is "superrite quality"?) make a pattern of sharp merchandising. But the great weakness of congressional publications is that the public rarely gets to read them. Consumer Reports is one of the few magazines that regularly uncover consumer fraud, for few national magazines or big city newspapers (dependent as they are upon food advertising) are eager to expose so sensitive a topic.

We live in an economy of abundance; production is no longer the problem. Increasingly our concern is going to be with the problem of marketing that abundance. What is required is a permanent branch of the Government that will speak for the unorganized majority in America, conduct inquiries in cases where there is widespread public dissatisfaction, and do so with the minimum of political prejudice. Mrs. Esther Peterson, assistant to the President for consumer affairs, is doing a job that is a good deal more than a political sinecure. Now we need to recognize that the job deserves an office.

And this is required the more obviously because of the strange economic conditions under which the food chains have prospered. Since it was the cattlemen's cry of pain that alerted the President and Congress, it is worth examining the chainstore's defense in this situation. Chain officials admit that the drop in cattle prices may have cost the livestock producers more than \$1 billion. But they insist that, according to their own marketing studies, the chains have been losing a penny a pound on the retail sale of beef. Following this line, they note that last year beef consumption was more than 95 pounds per person in the United States, and suggest that a saturation point may have been reached. But the livestock producers argue that U.S. Department of Agriculture figures on retail beef prices are far more significant than partisan studies. And these show that beef prices have remained stable in the food chains and have not reflected the catastrophic drop in stockyard prices. Beef consumption, they insist, could go a good deal higher. Plenty of Americans, cattlemen point out, are eating "tube" steaks—frankfurters—instead of cube steaks. If the food chains would reduce beef prices, a large untapped market would soon reveal itself.

Whatever the merits of these conflicting statements, it would be naive to suppose that they provide the real answer to the current debate. The prime cause of the present economic disruption can be found in the supermarket wars over the last decade. Before 1955, the main objective of the food chains was to wrest the neighborhood market from the local grocer. When a chain had gained a virtual corner on the customers, the savings made by mass-volume merchandising were often shared with the housewife. But as the local grocer quit—or merged into a cooperative—rival chains moved in to fight for a share of the market. Once the market had been split, true low-cost selling was abandoned. In its place came a surge of trading-stamp promotions and other customer-financed incentive schemes. Simultaneously, the chains stepped up the pressure on their suppliers. A supplier who would not come into line was reminded of Sears, Roebuck, and Montgomery Ward. Most suppliers got the hint; the mall-order houses had met supplier opposition by creating their own sources.

With the local grocer disposed of, the next to go was the wholesaler. The chains took to buying direct wherever possible. This

move had great consequences for the food producers and the processors. For one thing, they learned that Big Food—once it had banded together as a loose buying combine—disliked competition as much as Big Steel. Contrary to chamber of commerce theology, most businessmen dislike competition in their own fields. The history of antitrust actions from Theodore Roosevelt's day to the present is melancholy testimony to this observation.

Having disposed of the wholesalers, the supermarket chains could put the arm directly on the food processors. This pressure has taken many forms. Price-off deals, "advertising" allowances (which not only paid for the chain stores' local advertising but also became a price reduction), free merchandise, and even cash allowances for preferential shelf space (eye level instead of knee level). All such devices have become woefully familiar to the food producer or packer who wants to do business with Big Food.

It is clear that, for all the infighting among the supermarket giants, and for all the squeezing of the foodgrowers and processors, the public has gained little or no benefit. According to Department of Agriculture comparisons, a market basket of food that cost the housewife \$10 in 1947 would cost her \$11.83—nearly a fifth more—in 1963. True, by comparison with other items in the family budget, food prices have remained relatively stable. But in the same years that the cost of retail food has been rising slowly, the price to the farmer has been dropping fast: Since 1947 (again USDA statistics), the price farmers receive for Choice lamb is down 16.5 percent; for pork, 37.9 percent; for choice beef, 13.8 percent; for eggs, 36.3 percent; for potatoes, 44.7 percent. During all these years, the food chains have been perfectly aware of our fertile acres and heavy granaries; they know that food is a buyer's market, but have been careful not to pass the word to their customers.

When the big food chains began to gang up on the livestock producers 18 months ago, the cattlemen hollered monopoly. When the meat buyers from the chains bypassed the stockyards and bought directly from the feed lot, the cattlemen went to Washington. The powerful National Association of Food Chains protested their charges, but the equally powerful National Farmers Union sided with the cattlemen. James Patton, president of the NFU sent a short note to the White House and a detailed letter to the Attorney General. The key section of his letter to Robert Kennedy urged the Department of Justice "to carry out an investigation of retail food chainstore buying practices, their degree of vertical integration into packing plants, feed lots, and ranches, their power to influence and subvert competitive free enterprise, and their power to increase the spread between producers and consumers without regard to supply and demand."

Meanwhile the Senate Commerce Committee got busy. By early April, spurred by the President's interest, the first important hearings on a joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Food Marketing to study the food industry from the farm to the consumer were being conducted by Senator GALE MCGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming.

The Senate recently approved the joint resolution; the House is expected to follow suit. Some time this fall the National Commission should begin its study. All this will take time, and whether Congress will eventually enact legislation that can provide the farmer, distributor, and consumer with some desperately needed countervailing power must await the recommendations of the National Commission. But Big Food is clearly scared. As Senator MCGEE noted last month, there has been a sudden rise in weekend "hotshot" beef sales at the supermarket.

RESOURCES AND THE FUTURE ENERGY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a release and report by the Republican Citizens' Committee Critical Issues Council, headed by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, reassessing the energy requirements of the United States for its future.

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

RESOURCES AND THE FUTURE: ENERGY

The Republican Citizens Committee's Critical Issues Council, headed by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, today called for a reassessment of the Nation's energy policies and suggested recommendations to meet the energy problems which the country will face in the coming decades.

The council report was drafted by a task force under Mr. Lewis L. Strauss, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The other members of the group were Dr. Willard F. Libby, of the University of California; Mr. Louis Roddis, president of the Pennsylvania Electric Co.; and Mr. Robert L. L. McCormick, former assistant to Mr. Herbert Hoover.

The report stated that "the wise production and use of electrical energy calls for sound working relationships between private enterprise and government. While public oversight is necessary, it must not paralyze private initiative.

"With respect to some of the key electrical energy matters today facing our people, we think the present and previous Democratic administrations have been deficient. . . . Democratic Congresses, from 1955 to the present, have been unwilling to accept a number of the constructive approaches which we propose," the report stated.

"We recommend a detailed study of the relative efficiency of methods of generating electrical power within the United States and the development of a new constructive Federal power policy which will give due consideration to the demonstrated achievements of private industry in this area of power cost reduction."

The report also recommended that the Congress, or the President by Executive order, establish a competent objective body to review the original purposes and present activities of the Rural Electrification Administration (REA), adding:

"Farmers are entitled to reasonably priced electrical power, but we do not believe that long-term money borrowed by the United States at about 4 percent and then reloaned the REA at 2 percent should be used to promote competition with private citizens.

"Efficient private producers have proven that they can provide electricity at low cost to the consumer even against competition taking advantage of the artificially low interest rates of REA loans."

The paper went on to say that the REA appears to have changed its emphasis from servicing farmers to the generation and transmission of much of its electricity for "suburbia" or "outer suburbia." It pointed out that the Norris-Rayburn Act which established the REA in 1936, was designed to help bring electricity to rural areas not served by private companies, and was not intended to promote competition with private enterprise.

The report also said that the General Accounting Office had found that major Federal power projects in general do not charge rates sufficient to cover the modest interest charges imposed on them, and recommended that rates charged to users of Federal power be adjusted so that they do not receive an unfair advantage over those receiving their power from private industry.

Other recommendations by the council included:

The Congress should express a national policy on a nationwide electrical transmission grid.

Congress should immediately set a policy on the renewal of licenses for private industry to operate hydroelectric plants.

The Federal Power Commission should be given full authority to deal with private transmission of power on public-land States. The Interior Department now has veto power in such matters.

The Federal Government should maintain a constant surveillance over primary sources of energy; and revise its import or other regulations whenever necessary to maintain exploration, adequate supplies, and equitable prices.

A new review of the peaceful use of atomic energy to determine the areas in which research can be effectively and increasingly supported and to restore the sense of urgency to the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes which has been forced to yield to the more glamorous and costly demands of space exploration.

Private industry has initiated a technological revolution in the generation of electrical power. Between 1926 and 1962, the average cost of electricity for residential use fell from 7 cents per kilowatt-hour to 2.41 cents. Also, new large generating plants developed by private industry can produce power at a little more than half the cost of small plants.

For all practical purposes, United States is virtually running out of hydroelectric projects that are feasible—that is, economically competitive when compared to power generation by the new processes mentioned above. Yet the Democratic administration continues to place heavy emphasis on what appear to be economically questionable hydroelectric projects.

The text of the report follows:

RESOURCES AND THE FUTURE: ENERGY

Our economy, which is based upon the employment of energy in its various forms, has in recent decades demonstrated a rapid growth in energy requirements.

At the present time, most of our energy is derived from fossil fuels in which the accumulated solar radiation has been stored by plant and animal life over countless millennia. These are the deposits of coal, petroleum and natural gas. While they are finite in amount, exhaustion is not an imminent peril and, in the case of coal, is very far off indeed. We are holding our own (use versus new finds) in petroleum, although it might be argued that in time we may have to reduce usage for stationary energy sources to provide reserves for automotive and aircraft purposes. Any shortage and accompanying price increase might, however, stimulate the production of liquid fuel in large quantities from coal. Therefore, no case for urgency can be made with respect to the short term supply of fossil fuels.

Energy derived from falling water and converted into the form of electricity has been developed in the United States to about the practical limit of its economic and geographic possibilities as will be discussed in more detail later.

The waves, tides, winds, and direct solar radiation all are possible sources of useful energy, but all are either undependable, diffuse, inefficient, low grade, or locality limited. They represent an insignificant part of the presently consumed energy (other than solar radiation in the production of crops), and hence they will not be discussed.

The fuel cell, an interesting development, is not a new source of energy, but a fuel use promising higher efficiency. Present high temperature steamplants approach 40 percent thermal efficiency, a very great improvement over the past 30 years. Fuel cells may be developed eventually to operate at greater

efficiencies than this, but, to be significant, the capital cost per installed kilowatt would have to be lower. At present the contrary appears more likely.

Finally, we have nuclear-powered generators of electricity. Only 22 years have elapsed since the first controlled fission chain reaction, and only 10 years since the first plant to produce electrical energy for civilian consumption from nuclear fission was initiated (shippingport). In view of the striking and continuous reduction in the installed cost per kilowatt of capacity and in the production costs per kilowatt hour—to the point where in several parts of the United States nuclear plants are today competitive with conventional coal-fired plants—it is not unreasonable to expect further reduction in the cost of electricity from atomic fission. Nuclear powerplants will be competing, of course, with more efficient steamplants burning coal. In 1920, it required 3 pounds of coal to produce 1 kilowatt hour; in 1940, 1.4 pounds; and in 1960, only 0.7 of a pound. Thus, in the last 40 years, the amount of electricity which could be generated by the same amount of coal has more than tripled. Continued improvement at this rate can hardly be expected, however, whereas nuclear technology is at its beginnings.

Atomic power from the fusion of the nuclei of light elements is a development with vast and revolutionary potentials for the future. Whether the necessary breakthrough in technology is imminent or far distant is unpredictable. Most authorities agree that the principle is theoretically feasible.

THE RECORD

1. Dams for energy and reclamation: In 1902, Republicans established the Bureau of Reclamation and vigorously carried out Federal reclamation of arid lands. Of major reclamation projects today, some two-thirds were created by Republican administrations. These include the gigantic multiple-purpose Hoover Dam, on the Colorado River. Republicans approved and were engaged in the final stages of engineering plans for the Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River and Central Valley of California developments, when the Democratic administration took over in 1933. The Grand Coulee, key to the whole Bonneville Power Authority, is the largest dam in that hydroelectric complex.

2. Water and power for the Southwest: The Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge Dams brought forward the Colorado River storage projects under the Eisenhower administration. This enormous project, one of the most extensive water programs for arid areas yet undertaken by man, will not be completed until after the year 2000.

3. Power on the Niagara: Pursuant to the treaty of 1950 and the subsequent statute, licensing arrangements were made with the New York State Power Authority for developing the electrical resources of the Niagara River and were consummated by the Eisenhower administration. This source supplies power for New York and much of New England.

4. Oil as an energy source is conserved: In 1924, Republicans established the Oil Conservation Board; and, in 1929, oil beneath the free public lands was withdrawn from private entry. The same year a Republican administration initiated the major interstate compact for conservation of oil, which has since come into being among 21 States.

5. Petroleum on the Continental Shelf: Our vast new development of petroleum on the continental oceanic shelf of the United States was initiated and methods for its supervision established under the Eisenhower administration.

6. Self-liquidation policy for public works: A Republican administration established the policy of Federal loans for self-liquidating public works, then financially not feasible by private capital or State funds. Diverting the Colorado River water supply to the Los

Angeles area is an instance. Those loans made by a Republican administration are repayable to the Federal Government.

7. Water and energy from the Mississippi into the Rockies: The so-called Frying Pan project on the Arkansas and Red Rivers, while finally authorized in 1962, was engineered by the Eisenhower administration and repeatedly proposed to Democratic Congresses without avail. This enormous project will assist all South-Central States from the Mississippi to the Colorado Rockies.

8. Atomic energy: The Eisenhower administration made historic contributions toward effective use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. In 1953, it proposed the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Republican Congress of 1954 amended the Atomic Energy Act liberating the development of this great new power source from the heavy hand of Government monopoly. The administration emphasized the uses of the atom in medicine, industry, agriculture, and especially the generation of electricity. The first reactors for commercial civilian power date from the Eisenhower administration.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The wise production and use of electrical energy calls for sound working relationships between private enterprise and Government. While public oversight is necessary it must not paralyze private initiative. It is this unique relationship of public to private endeavor which has helped make our country the stronghold of freedom. This relationship is delicate, and judgments on its precise applications can vary among men of good will. For example, the extent of Federal support for TVA financing is an open question among many citizens of each party. So too, in a free society, one man's yardstick can be another man's goad—depending upon who wields it. For these reasons, this paper will deal with clear-cut actions, facts and issues. It will not overstress the realm of judgmental hairsplitting.

Our objective is not an indictment of Democratic policy as a whole. We recognize that within both parties there is room for difference of opinion on the responsibilities of the public and private sectors in the generation, transmission, and distribution of energy—and the relationships of each to the other. We seek, therefore, only to make reasonable criticisms and to emphasize constructive recommendations for the solution of energy problems which the Nation faces.

With respect to some of the key electrical energy questions today facing our people, we think the present and previous Democratic administrations have been deficient, through action in some cases, inaction in others. Moreover, Democratic Congresses, from 1955 to the present, have been unwilling to accept a number of the constructive approaches which we propose.

Fourteen specific subject areas merit discussion:

1. Improvements in energy technology: Vast technological developments have recently occurred in the efficiency of electrical generation plants, but the Federal Government seems inadequately aware of the facts. New steam plants, especially those using coal, generate electricity by the most advanced methods. This is of vital importance in the coal-producing Appalachian area, where attention is now focused on the poverty problem. Private industry has initiated a technological revolution in the generation of electrical power; and new methods of transmission now permit electricity to be sent over long distances with negligible line losses.

By the strategic placement of generating plants (e.g., at the coal mine pit-heads), by improved methods of mining and distilling coal, and by enormously increased efficiency of generation, tremendous savings to consumers are possible. Yet the administration

continues to place heavy emphasis on what appear to be economically questionable hydroelectric projects and on providing subsidized REA loans to build small steam generators, many of which are unnecessary.

Small plants are relatively inefficient producers. Studies made 8 years ago clearly demonstrate that the cost of producing electricity by steam varies significantly with the size of the generating plant employed. For example, a 25,000-kilowatt plant will produce power for 13.6 mills per kilowatt-hour, a 100,000-kilowatt plant can produce it for 9.3 mills, a 200,000-kilowatt plant for 8.3 mills, a 400,000-kilowatt plant for 7.7 mills, and a 1-million-kilowatt plant for 7.4 mills. Thus, a 1-million-kilowatt plant can produce power at a little more than half the cost involved in a 25,000-kilowatt plant.

The amount of heat required to produce a kilowatt-hour has declined significantly. In 1926, it was 23,600 B.t.u.'s per kilowatt-hour; in 1962, it was only 10,493. The portion of power produced by steam rose from 62.6 percent in 1926 to 79.7 percent in 1962. During this same period, the average cost of electricity for residential use fell from 7.00 cents per kilowatt-hour to 2.41 cents.

This technological revolution is pertinent to the question of power hydroelectrically produced, especially on marginal Federal projects, for the kilowatt-hour costs on some of these planned projects are high to start with.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

We recommend a detailed study of the relative efficiency of methods for generating electrical power within the United States and the development of a new and constructive Federal power policy which will give due consideration to the demonstrated achievements of private industry in this area of power cost reduction.

2. The scarcity of economically feasible hydroelectric projects: For all practical purposes, the United States is virtually running out of feasible hydroelectric projects—that is, projects which are economically competitive when compared to power generation by the new processes mentioned above. One example is the Knowles Dam project in Montana; the electrical generation costs are expected to run from 10 to 20 mills per kilowatt-hour. Another example is the Devils Jumps Dam project on a tributary of the Cumberland River in Tennessee and Kentucky on which the cost would approximate 12 mills per kilowatt-hour, computed on a comparable basis with privately financed plants and normal amortization. (Compare these with the new steam generation cost of 7.4 mills per kilowatt-hour for large installations.)

While these projects doubtless have agricultural, recreational, or aesthetic benefits, their overall economic advantages in electrical generation are marginal, and they can be justified only by placing exaggerated emphasis on criteria other than cost. It would be possible to build dams in every river in the United States for hydroelectric purposes and justify them, if the standards are loose enough. This characteristic taints the economic justifications for proposed hydroelectric projects on which the taxpayers' dollars may be imprudently expended.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

We recommend that the study mentioned in No. 1 be completed and the criteria therein developed in judging the economic justification as well as the feasibility of hydroelectric projects before contracts are let on pending proposals.

3. Standards for determining the feasibility of justifying multiple-purpose projects: The present administration has rewritten the standards for justifying new multiple-purpose hydroelectric projects, thus permitting justification for marginal projects such as those described above.

The previous standards for justifying multiple-purpose hydroelectric projects had been in existence for a decade; and were far from stringent. Yet, in 1962, the administration felt it necessary—presumably in order to open the gate for more projects—to draw up a new set of standards. The old standards were loosened by extending the period of projecting costs and benefits (the cost-benefit ratio) from 50 years to 100 years.

Extending the standards to apply 100 years hence raises obvious questions. It is no more possible today to foresee conditions in 2064 than it would have been to project 100 years forward in 1764 or 1864. Technological and population changes are certain to render any 100-year projection completely obsolete. Furthermore, since Federal Power Commission licenses to private concerns are limited to a maximum of 50 years, a private company cannot even calculate on a 100-year amortization, and there is thus a built-in discrimination against private capital.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

We recommend that the present standards for justifying multiple-purpose projects be discarded in favor of a new and realistic set of criteria. We recognize that certain elements, such as recreation, navigation, or flood control, are not readily susceptible to so-called user charges; nor can such benefits be estimated with accuracy under present standards. But the present procedure which often compares the cost of apples with the benefits of bananas is so loose that almost any project can be justified.

4. A nationwide electrical transmission grid: Congress has never authorized an electrical transmission grid across the Nation. Yet, segment by segment, Federal agencies appear to be working to accomplish this. The proposed 900-mile high-voltage interconnection between the Bonneville area and the Hoover Dam is one example.

If the Congress wishes to authorize a nationwide transmission grid, or a series of regional grids, we believe it should say so. Certainly this objective should not be accomplished by bureaucratic subterfuge, or in unplanned bits and pieces.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

The Congress should express a national policy on high-voltage, cross-country transmission grids for electrical energy to be adhered to by all Federal agencies.

5. Executive differences with the views of the Federal Power Commission: The Democratic members of the Federal Power Commission are appointees of the Democratic administration, yet the executive branch often works at cross purposes with the recommendations of the Commission. This seems to us unfortunate. There should be unified Federal policy on the development of the Nation's electrical energy resources, worked out on an impartial basis. The Department of the Interior, as owner of land or as a special pleader, should not set the policies.

An example of harmful policy conflict is the effort of the Interior Department to prevent private industry from developing the high Mountain Sheep Dam in Idaho. The Federal Power Commission evidently held a contrary view. In substance, the Federal Power Commission found it necessary to disagree with the Interior Department for trying to spend public funds when private resources were available to achieve approximately the same purposes.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

The policies for Federal development, transmission and distribution of electrical energy and the rates charged to the consumer therefor should be decided primarily by a bipartisan Federal Power Commission. It is detrimental to the public interest that the viewpoints of the Federal Power Commission and the Interior Department should be

uncoordinated. This subject should have the prompt attention of the Congress.

6. Uncertainties facing private industry as the present Federal 50-year hydroelectric licenses come up for renewal: Many existing important hydroelectric plants operated by private industry are under 50-year licenses, some of which will come up for renewal by 1970. Private industry is in a dilemma concerning further investments in the generation, transmission, and distribution facilities, because of uncertainty over license renewal. This uncertainty is a deterrent to new industries which might locate in areas where they could contribute to employment and local prosperity.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

The Congress should promptly establish a Federal policy on such license renewals, and this policy should not discriminate against private industry over Government ownership.

7. Veto power on the dispatch of electrical transmission lines on public lands: Since the Eisenhower administration left office, the Interior Department has sought to establish control over the terms, conditions, and uses of electrical power transmitted by lines across land owned by the Federal Government. The Federal Power Commission has taken issue with this position of the executive branch. We believe the Federal Power Commission is right in its contentions.

In the 17 Western States the supervision of vast public lands by the Interior Department results in virtual control over all aspects of long-distance transmission of electrical energy. The extent of Federal ownership of Western land is frequently not realized. The chart below indicates the percentage of land owned by the Federal Government in five States:

	Percent
Nevada.....	85.5
Utah.....	68.4
Oregon.....	51.9
Idaho.....	64.6
Wyoming.....	48.2

Since the Interior Department administers the land, private companies, which may wish to transmit power over any large area in the West, are in a position (under the Interior Department's indicated policies) where they can operate only by submitting to conditions imposed not by the Federal Power Commission but by the Department of the Interior.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

We recommend that the Federal Power Commission, free of dictation by the Interior Department, deal with the private transmission of power in the public-land States. The Interior Department should not have veto power in such matters.

8. The lack of adequate hydrological studies: It has now been more than a decade since the first Hoover Commission strongly recommended that more Federal emphasis be placed on obtaining better hydrological data in the United States. The Eisenhower administration, through the President's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy (PACWRP), made strides in this direction. Since 1961, this effort has received inadequate encouragement.

The recent, outstanding study of the Task Force on Coordinated Water Resources Research of the Federal Council for Science and Technology has made a valuable contribution to the Nation in this respect, but the recommendations of the study have not been implemented. The task force, under its distinguished Chairman, Dr. Roger Revelle of the University of California, was concerned with water primarily for its use by human and industrial consumers. However, the recommendations for better hydrological information apply in a parallel way to the need

for more information in this area in connection with the generation of hydroelectric energy.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 8

We endorse the proposals of the Revelle Task Force, since obtaining more data about water will apply to its usefulness in generating electrical energy. We believe the Federal system for obtaining hydrological data should be materially expanded and the agencies involved better coordinated.

9. Coordination among Federal agencies: Under the Eisenhower administration, a significant step forward was taken in coordinating the numerous Federal agencies concerned with generating electrical power, through the creation of PACWRP (see above).

Under PACWRP, policy differences were greatly reduced, in marked contrast to the problem of the Missouri River during the late forties, when it became necessary to organize an ad hoc coordinating group for the Missouri River Basin alone. The so-called Pick-Sloan plan for the Missouri River Basin was then developed and hailed as evidence that Federal agencies could work together and reconcile the views of two organizations with different objectives. In this instance, one was concerned primarily with flood control and navigation, the other mainly with irrigation. There was not enough water in the Missouri basin to supply all needs, and bureaucratic compromise could not alter that fact. Yet, the Pick-Sloan plan demonstrated a need which was met in considerable degree in the Eisenhower administration, though nothing since has been done along this line.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 9

The President should insist upon coordination among executive agencies concerned with generating and transmitting electrical energy.

10. The new emphasis in REA on transmission and generation facilities: The Norris-Rayburn Act, establishing the Rural Electrification Administration (the REA), was approved by Congress in 1936, with the announced purpose to bring the advantages of electricity to rural areas. A "rural area" was defined as any portion of the Nation which was not included within the boundaries of a city, village, or borough with a population of more than 1,500 persons. This definition of area is now construed to cover much of suburbia or outer suburbia.

Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, author of the act, convinced the Congress that the law was needed to make electricity available to farms and at reasonable prices. The private power industry had naturally concentrated where the need per capita was greatest and where the demand would make the financing of facilities feasible.

It is amazing to realize that only four decades before the enactment of the Norris-Rayburn Act virtually all of the United States was lighted and fueled by coal, gas, kerosene, and the like. The private electrical generating industry rose during the first three decades of the 20th century from insignificant beginnings into the most important industry in the United States.

Like all of our dynamic fields, the electrical power industry had severe "growing pains." It did not have enough trained people to service the entire United States; and high population density areas were stressed. Private industry serviced major rural areas where the load was adequate, such as central New York State, with its power requirements for dairying, and California, with its irrigation pumping needs. But, the general farming area was not so served in 1936 when the REA was created. Senator Norris correctly pointed out that this was because adequate loads did not exist in most rural areas.

In 1936, 89 percent of all farms were without central service electricity. In 1964, the

situation has completely reversed itself; 98 percent of all American farms are electrified through central station service, and most of the remaining 2 percent could be so serviced readily. In this respect, we believe the REA has realized its purpose.

In recent years, however, the REA has placed major emphasis on the building of transmission and generation facilities and on supplying electrical energy to suburbia and outer suburbia. This was not the purpose of the Norris-Rayburn Act. Now that nearly all of the farm population has been supplied with electricity, the REA, as is the common experience with bureaucracies, has sought ways of perpetuating and expanding itself. In the few years since the Eisenhower administration left office, borrowings from the REA to set up facilities for generation and transmission of electrical energy have greatly increased and the trend is sharply upward.

If rural areas are lacking in generation and transmission facilities, they should by all means have them, but we believe it unwise to finance such facilities with Federal funds where adequate and existing private facilities already exist. Numerous examples bear out this point; for instance, the Patuxent area of Maryland and in southern Indiana. In both cases, taxpayers' money was unnecessary since private facilities were available. These recent policies of the REA are not the purposes of the law as expressed by its original congressional sponsors.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 10

We recommend that the Congress by resolution or the President by Executive order establish a competent objective body to review the original purposes and present activities of the REA. Farmers are entitled to reasonably priced electrical power, but we do not believe that long-term money borrowed by the United States at about 4 percent and then reloaned through the REA at 2 percent should be used to promote competition with private citizens. Efficient private producers have proven that they can provide electricity at low cost to the consumer even against competition taking advantage of the artificially low interest rates of REA loans.

11. New steam-generating plants of the REA bypassing Congress: As mentioned in item No. 10, the REA appears to have changed its emphasis from servicing farmers to the generation and transmission of electrical energy for consumers not engaged in agriculture. One aspect of this is certainly open to question. On repeated occasions, the Congress has refused to appropriate funds for steam-generating plants as supplements to Federal hydroelectric power projects because private facilities were available. The Congress was obviously unmindful of the fact that hydroelectric power is often sporadic, depending upon rainfall, and that therefore hydroelectric power usually needs to be supplemented with standby steam-generated power. The questionable point is that REA loans have been made apparently to build steamplants for which the Congress had refused to grant funds. Here are examples:

1. 1962—Colorado-Ute Cooperative: The REA provided \$21,602,000 toward financing a 150,000-kilowatt steamplant to firm up power from the Colorado River storage project.

2. 1962—Basin Electric Power Cooperative: A \$36,600,000 loan was made to build a 200,000-kilowatt steamplant, most of the power from which will be disposed of to firm up Missouri Basin power.

3. 1963—Upshur Rural Electric Cooperative: A REA loan of \$9,170,000 was made to build a 33,000-kilowatt steamplant and transmission lines. The Southwestern Power Authority will buy most of the power and lease the transmission lines.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 11

The Congress should, by suitable legislation, restrain the REA from financing the

construction of steamplant power-generating facilities as supplements to hydroelectric projects in cases where the Congress itself has refused to appropriate funds specifically for such facilities.

12. Comparable rates: Consumers located where they may buy power from Federal projects usually obtain it at a price well below its true cost of production. This is unfair to power consumers who are not so fortunately situated, yet who pay taxes to subsidize the power for others. This inequity to taxpayers and to privately owned utilities is a consequence of several factors.

First, Federal power projects are usually tax exempt. Consumers of electricity supplied by investor-owned electric companies must bear through their electric bills a significant tax burden. In most instances, this amounts to about 23 to 25 percent of the cost of electricity, yet those who obtain their power from Federal projects, in most instances, do not have to pay such taxes.

Second, rates charged to consumers for power from most Federal projects are intended by law to return interest on the unamortized power investment at only 3 percent or less per year. Since it costs the Federal Government about 4 percent to borrow money of a comparable maturity, the result is a subsidy given a few power consumers at the expense of many others.

The Comptroller General of the United States, an agency of Congress, found that the Missouri Basin power projects, from their inception to the end of fiscal 1960, had lost a total of \$51,778,000. The Southwestern Power Administration and its appended power projects, from its inception in 1944 through 1961, had lost \$50,105,000. The Columbia River Power System, on its power operations, had lost \$53,320,000 from 1958 through 1963. The Southeastern Power Administration, on its power operations from 1955 through 1960, had lost \$20,400,000. The sum of these losses was a gift to the users of this power, paid for by taxes collected from citizens in other areas.

Thus, the General Accounting Office has found that major Federal power projects in general do not charge rates sufficient to cover the modest interest charges imposed on them.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 12

The rates charged to users of Federal power should be adjusted so that the users of such power do not receive an unfair advantage as opposed to those who do not receive their power from federally subsidized projects.

13. The fossil energy source materials:

Coal: In terms of tonnage, the coal industry is unique in that it has remained relatively static for years. In 1962, the use was as follows: industry 24 percent; coke 20 percent; electricity 48 percent; retail 8 percent; remainder, ammonia and other special chemicals. Recent U.S. production of coal is 440 million tons per annum (1962), about one-seventh of the world production. Coal and natural gas are almost perfectly competitive for the cost of electricity production, about 25 cents per million B.t.u., averaged over the United States (local factors favor one over the other of course). Oil is about one-third higher in cost.

Coal reserves are calculated on the assumption that 50 percent of the known quantities in the ground are "recoverable," depending on technology and economic demand. On the basis of this 50 percent, the present reserves in the United States are 83×10^{10} tons. At 1962 rates, we are then mining 0.05 percent per annum. In other words, at 10 times the present rate of use and with no new finds, we have a 200-year supply—i.e., no case can be made for an imminent shortage of coal.

Natural gas: Probably one of the fastest growing areas of energy source is natural

gas, which is increasing at 5 percent per annum. In 1962, a total of 13.9×10^{12} cubic feet were sold. In 1960, the breakdown was 6.5×10^{12} industrial, 4.1×10^{12} residential and commercial, and 1.8×10^{12} field (i.e., losses, etc.).

In the year 1961, proven reserves (economically and technically recoverable) were 275×10^{12} cubic feet. Under present use rates, this is a 20-year supply but both use rates and new finds are increasing so rapidly that this figure does not have much meaning, as is also true in the coal industry.

Petroleum: In 1962 the petroleum-use picture was—gasoline, 1.6×10^9 barrels; distillate, 74×10^7 barrels; residual, 5.6×10^7 barrels; kerosene 16×10^7 barrels (mostly jet fuel); other, 74×10^7 barrels, including losses, export, etc.

The total demand was 3.8×10^9 barrels, and the world supply was 8.8×10^9 barrels, so that U.S. use runs around 40 percent. Net U.S. imports are around 70×10^7 barrels per year or less than 8 percent of use.

The present U.S. proven reserves (under present technology and price structure) are 31.4×10^9 barrels.

It is generally believed that large reserves of both oil and gas probably lie elsewhere awaiting discovery on this continent and on the coastal shelf.

If an equitable relationship of imports to domestic production is maintained, these energy resources should remain adequate for the foreseeable future. The Eisenhower administration worked out such a policy of balanced relationships in 1959.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 13

The Federal Government should maintain a constant surveillance over primary sources of energy and revise its import or other regulations whenever necessary to maintain exploration, adequate supplies, and equitable prices.

14. Atomic energy: As previously noted, the Eisenhower administration gave particular encouragement to the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and notable successes were achieved. The first nuclear reactor to produce electrical energy for commercial use was initiated during the Eisenhower administration and built at Shippingport, Pa., with large contributions from private industry.

The cost per kilowatt-hour of electrical energy derived from the fission of uranium, which was estimated at 3 to 10 times the cost of conventional power in 1954, had been reduced by the ingenuity of American scientists and engineers until at the end of the Eisenhower administration plants were under construction whose output was competitive with steam-generating plants in the same areas of the Nation.

Thus, while no early exhaustion of fossil fuels appears to threaten us, and while technology is continually reducing the cost of electrical energy derived from fossil fuels, the remarkable strides in the reduction of power costs from nuclear energy will stimulate a healthy competition to make electricity still cheaper for consumers.

An important research project in the area of nuclear power development is the theoretical feasibility of producing electrical energy from the fusion of light elements such as hydrogen and deuterium. This project, research upon which was meagerly supported until 1953, was given the encouragement of needed appropriations beginning in that year. Very great progress has been made since, but a breakthrough in technology is yet to be achieved. Both the British and Soviet Governments are now believed to have come abreast of our former position of leadership in this area of research. The British effort is said to exceed ours, whereas the Soviet effort is reported to be 200 percent greater than ours.

The significance of power from fusion, if it can be achieved, is (a) the fuel supply is unlimited since it exists in all bodies of water, and (b) the cost of power so produced would be a fraction of present power costs. We understand that this line of research in our own laboratories has been reduced both in priority and support. We believe this to be shortsighted.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 14

We recommend a new review of the peaceful uses of atomic energy to determine the areas in which research can be effectively and increasingly supported and to restore the sense of urgency which seems to have yielded to the more glamorous and costly demands of space exploration.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is pursuant to my considered practice of having introduced all of their reports into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a group of outstanding Republican leaders in the other House has recently seen fit to deliver themselves of a tirade on policy in Vietnam. I am not surprised that the partisan political knives should be drawn on this issue. What amazes me is that they have come out of the sheaths so early. I can only conclude that they are intended to be used in a preliminary rumble in San Francisco as a warmup for the political war later on.

Let me make clear, Mr. President, that I am not deploring discussion of the Vietnamese situation. It is a serious situation. Any light which can be shed upon it by serious discussion in the House, in the Senate, or anywhere else, for that matter, is to be welcomed.

But a statement which labels the effort being made by thousands of Americans in South Vietnam, and at a cost of many American lives, a "why win" policy is not serious discussion.

Any statement which classifies the complex problem of Vietnam, which has confronted us through the Eisenhower, the Kennedy, and the Johnson administrations, as one peculiarly associated with the latter alone, is not serious discussion.

Any statement which describes a policy that has seen 16,000 American troops, vast naval and air forces deployed in southeast Asian waters, and billions of dollars spent in a region of limited unilateral American interest, as a policy of "pervasive softness," is not serious discussion.

Any statement which assumes that this Government can take operational control of the forces of another nation without assuming, at vast cost in lives and resources, total responsibility for what happens in that nation—in short, any statement which assumes that the purposes of freedom can be achieved in an alien land with an army of foreigners and some bargain-basement techniques of command, is not serious discussion.

Any statement which, in the manner of Colonel Blimp, assumes, from a map, that the mountains, sea, jungles, and rivers—thousands of miles—of the external South Vietnamese borders and of the

borders of Vietcong-held areas within that nation can be sealed off, not with tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of U.S. forces, but with a wave of a statement, is not serious discussion.

Fortunately, Mr. President, there are Republicans who understand the situation in Vietnam from a firsthand experience with it. I refer particularly to our recent Ambassador in Saigon, Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge. He knows the meaning of what we are attempting in Vietnam and in southeast Asia. He knows the realities of the situation which confronts us. He knows the course of policy which offers the best hope of success. We shall not hear from him any comment about "why win" or "pervasive softness." Here is what we shall hear from him—and I quote from Associated Press dispatch No. 52, on June 30, 1964:

In Vietnam the aim of the struggle is to create a proper political atmosphere. That's how you beat the Communists there. The minute you've created a proper political atmosphere the war is over. That's why I was encouraged by the report I received just before I left Saigon that people are no longer feeding the Communists. I don't see the need for more troops in Vietnam. I think our policy there of relying on the Vietnamese to win with our help is the right policy.

Mr. President, the statement of the House Members to which reference has been made is not an invitation to serious discussion. It obscures the real questions with respect to Vietnam which confront the people of the United States. These questions do need, and should have, discussion. We do need public clarity on rational objectives of policy, not only for Vietnam, but also for all of southeast Asia. We do need public discussion of the means for achieving these objectives—of the military and the diplomatic channels which may be open or can be opened for dealing with the problems of that region which involve not only the United States, but, first and foremost, the people of the region itself, and, in a larger sense, the Chinese, the Russians, the Australians, the British, the French—indeed, in an ultimate sense, all of the people of the world.

That sort of discussion would be helpful to any President, Republican or Democrat, in this serious situation, as he strives, for all of us, to pursue a course which will safeguard our national interests, bring about peace, and preserve the opportunities for freedom in southeast Asia, at the lowest possible cost in American lives.

That is what President Johnson is attempting. Can any President attempt less? Can any President do more?

Mr. President, the Republican task force also made a statement about the weakness of the Nation's military position. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a news release by the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, dated June 29, 1964, in reply to that segment of the statement, and also a portion of the remarks made by the President of the United States at the Coast Guard Acad-

emy, at New London, Conn., on June 3, 1964.

There being no objection, the news release and the excerpt from the President's remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[News release, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), Washington, D.C., June 29, 1964]

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara today issued the following statement:

"I read with regret the partisan attack on our Nation's military program contained in the report of the Republican policy committee's task force on American strategy and strength.

"The national defense has always been a bipartisan activity of the U.S. Government. To date Republicans as well as Democrats have supported the national defense program of the Kennedy-Johnson administration. Such support was given to our very first actions in 1961, which were to submit supplemental budget requests that increased the defense budget of this country by \$6 billion for fiscal year 1962. From the beginning of this administration through our current request for fiscal 1965, there has been an increase of \$28 billion over the level of spending that prevailed during the last year of the previous administration. These much needed increases have received bipartisan support throughout the country as a whole as well as in the Congress.

"As a result of these increases, the national security of this country has been greatly enhanced. Since January of 1961, there has been—

"A 150-percent increase in the number of nuclear weapons available in the strategic alert forces.

"A 50-percent increase in our strategic bombers on alert.

"A 60-percent increase in the tactical nuclear force in Western Europe.

"A 45-percent increase in the number of combat-ready divisions.

"A 75-percent increase in airlift capability.

"A 100-percent increase in funds for general ship construction and conversion to modernize our fleet.

"A 175-percent increase in the procurement of airlift aircraft.

"A 100-percent increase in the procurement of tactical aircraft.

"A 44-percent increase in the number of tactical fighter squadrons.

"An 800-percent increase in the Department of Defense Special Forces trained to deal with counterinsurgency threats.

"A 15,000-man increase in the strength of the Marine Corps.

"Since 1960, the intercontinental ballistic missiles and Polaris missiles in our arsenal have been increased from less than 100 to over 1,000 and the number of Polaris submarines in commission from 2 to 21.

"Today the intercontinental ballistic missile force of the United States is more than four times that of the Soviet Union.

"As for the future, our research and development program has laid the foundation for a continuing increase in our military strength. Since 1961, there has been—

"A 50-percent increase per year in the total funds expended on research and development over that prevailing during the last 4 years of the previous administration.

"An addition of 208 major new projects. These include 77 weapons programs with costs exceeding \$10 million each, including such major ones as the medium range ballistic missile, the F-111 fighter-bomber and the new main battle tank.

"An increase in expenditures for the development of counterinsurgency weapons and equipment from less than \$10 million in

1960 to over \$103 million requested for fiscal year 1965.

"A 54-percent increase in our antisubmarine warfare research and development program in our fiscal 1965 budget request over 1961.

"This tremendous increase in strength could not have been accomplished without the closest cooperation between military and civilian leaders. As Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer said when he was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: 'I am in constant touch with the Secretary, and through me, or in direct consultation with the Chiefs themselves, he obtains the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff,' and 'I would like to reiterate it here, there is the closest possible working relationship between the civilian officials in the Defense Department and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.'

"Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, who succeeded General Lemnitzer as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, reaffirmed the existence of this intimate working relationship between the military and civilian leadership in the Pentagon in February of this year. And in June of 1963, General Taylor said, 'the voice of the American soldier is entitled to a serious hearing in our national councils—and I am happy to report that he today receives that hearing.'

"I am confident that there will continue to be the closest of working relationships between the military and civilian leaders of the Pentagon."

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY, NEW LONDON, CONN.

We, as well as our adversaries, must stand in awe before the power our craft has created and our wisdom must labor to control. In every area of national strength America today is stronger than it has ever been before. It is stronger than any adversary or combination of adversaries. It is stronger than the combined might of all the nations in the history of the world.

And I confidently predict that strength will continue to grow more rapidly than the might of all others.

The first area of this increasing strength is our ability to deter atomic destruction. In the past 3 years we have increased our nuclear power on alert 2½ times, and our nuclear superiority will continue to grow until we reach agreement on arms control.

We have more than 1,000 fully armed ICBM's and Polaris missiles ready for retaliation. The Soviet Union has far fewer, and none ready to be launched beneath the seas. We have more than 1,100 strategic bombers, many of which are equipped with air-to-surface and decoy missiles to help them reach almost any target. The Soviet Union, we estimate, could with difficulty send less than one-third of this number over targets in the United States.

Against such force the combined destructive power of every battle ever fought by man is like a firecracker thrown against the sun.

The second area of increasing strength is our ability to fight less than all-out war. In the past 3 years we have raised the number of combat ready divisions 45 percent. They can be moved swiftly around the world by an airlift capacity which has increased 75 percent. Supporting tactical aircraft have been increased over 30 percent, and the number of tactical nuclear warheads in Europe has been raised 60 percent. We, and our NATO allies, now have 5 million men under arms. In addition we are now ready to mobilize large reserves in the event of conflict. Six divisions, with all supporting units, can be moved into action in a few weeks.

And we are continuing to build our forces. In a few years our airlift capacity will be five times what it was in 1961. Advanced weapons and equipment are flowing to our

armies. Our fleet is being modernized through a decade-long shipbuilding program. And new tactical aircraft are being built.

A third area of increasing strength is the struggle against subversion. Our adversaries, convinced that direct attack would be aimless, today resort to terror, subversion and guerrilla warfare. To meet this threat we began a large effort to train special forces to fight internal subversion. Since January 1961 we have increased these specialized forces eight times. We have trained more than 100,000 officers in these techniques. We have given special emphasis to this form of warfare in the training of all military units.

Our Army now has six Special Action Forces on call around the world to assist our friendly nations. They are skilled in the languages and problems of the area in which they are stationed. The Navy and Air Force have several thousand men whose abilities, training, equipment and mission are designed to combat clandestine attack. And behind these groups are five brigade-size backup forces ready to move into instant action.

But just as subversion has many faces, our responses must take many forms. We have worked to increase and integrate all the resources, political and social as well as military and economic, needed to meet a threat which tears at the entire fabric of a society.

But success in fighting subversion ultimately rests on the skill of the soldiers of the threatened country. We now have 344 teams at work in 49 countries to train the local military in the most advanced techniques of internal defense.

Subversive warfare is often difficult, dirty, and deadly. Victory comes only to those with the desire to protect their own freedom. But such conflict requires weapons as well as will, ability as well as aspiration. And we will continue to increase this strength until our adversaries are convinced that this course too will not lead to conquest.

The fourth area of increasing strength is in the development of new weapons for deterrence and defense. In the past several years we have begun many important new weapons systems. Minuteman II will have twice the accuracy of the first Minuteman. The new Nike X, when its development is completed, will give us the option to deploy, if national security requires it, the best antiballistic missile available to any nation. We are developing a new aircraft, the F-III, with much greater range, payload, and ability at air combat than present tactical bombers or fighters.

The Lance missile, the EX-10 torpedo, the A-7A attack aircraft, a new main battle tank, new antitank missile systems, are the emerging products of development that we are carrying on. And that effort is without parallel in all the world. We will continue to carry forward new projects which offer hope of adding substantially to our strength. I can assure the American people that the United States is, and will remain, first in the use of science and technology for the protection of the people.

DEPLORABLE FINANCIAL STATUS OF CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I offer for the RECORD a brief statement describing the deplorable financial condition in which the Children's Hospital of Washington, D.C., finds itself as a result of inadequate funds being made available to it, both through charity and through public sources.

The story is relatively complicated, but I have prepared a chronology as of Friday, June 26, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MEMORANDUM RE FINANCIAL CONDITION OF CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL: CHRONOLOGY AS OF FRIDAY, JUNE 26

1. The Senate added \$110,000 to the deficiency appropriation for the District of Columbia for fiscal 1964 for reimbursement increases to Children's Hospital for care of indigents.

2. The House knocked this out in conference, and the conference reports were approved in both Houses. (See Washington Post story of June 4.) But the statement of the managers on the part of the House said: "Deletes the proposal of the Senate to increase the rates paid to Children's Hospital. The managers on the part of the House feel this matter should be the subject of consideration in connection with the regular District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1965."

3. In an excellent editorial, the Washington Post on June 15 called upon the Commissioners, the administration, and Congress to save the Children's Hospital.

4. Thereafter, on June 17, President Johnson sent a message to the Congress containing an amendment adding \$160,000 to the District of Columbia appropriation request for fiscal 1965 to increase reimbursement rates to Children's Hospital for care of indigents. (See text of message, and Washington Post story of June 18.)

5. This money is desperately needed, and it is crucial that the Appropriations Committee act promptly to meet the request.

But the \$160,000 is only part of the story and will not solve the problems of the Children's Hospital created by its service without charge to indigent children in the community.

What is needed is to redefine the term "indigency" so that the hospital can be reimbursed for caring for those who are in fact unable to pay, although they do not meet the present legal criteria of "indigency." (See the excellent Washington Post editorial of June 19.)

6. The true plight of Children's Hospital is hard to appreciate for anyone who is not closely familiar with the situation. A real insight is supplied by President Kauffmann's memorandum, which is attached.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have the following items printed at this point in the RECORD:

First. A news story from the Washington Post of June 14, 1964, entitled "Hill Conferees Reject Plea for Aid to Deficit-Hit Children's Hospital."

Second. An editorial, also from the Washington Post of June 15, entitled "Unpaid Bills."

Third. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the District of Columbia.

Fourth. A news story from the Washington Post of June 18, entitled "L.B.J. Seeks Funds for Children's."

Fifth. An editorial under date of June 19, published in the Washington Post, entitled "To the Rescue."

Sixth. A copy of a proposed draft of a special report to the board of directors on the state of the Children's Hospital.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 14, 1964]

HILL CONFEREES REJECT PLEA FOR AID TO DEFICIT-HIT CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

(By Dorothy Gilliam)

House-Senate conferees rejected a bid for help to financially ailing Children's Hospital yesterday despite pleas from House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

Their action dashed hopes for relief for the hospital during the current fiscal year. It was understood that House conferees argued during the closed meeting that additional money for the hospital would constitute payment of a subsidy to a private institution and might create a precedent for other District hospitals.

Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, reportedly made a strong plea for the \$110,000 request—part of the \$1.4 billion deficiency bill approved earlier by the Senate—which would have permitted the city to increase payments to the hospital for the care of needy children.

The House-Senate conference referred the matter to the District Appropriations subcommittees of both Houses for action in the city's budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1.

The House earlier denied the Commissioners' \$110,000 request, but the Senate approved funds to help in the hospital's financial emergency. Rejection by the House-Senate conference came as a surprise because of House Speaker MCCORMACK's endorsement earlier this week.

The hospital has a current operating deficit of \$476,000. The hospital board has authorized an emergency fund raising campaign to keep the institution open. Dr. Robert Parrott, hospital director, yesterday expressed "surprise and disappointment" over the conference action and said the board would now have to "examine very closely" what the hospital can do for needy children over the summer.

"I would hope that the Appropriation Committees of Congress," he said, "will examine the entire situation and take action in the upcoming fiscal year to allow the District government to assume a fuller part of its responsibility for the care of District youngsters."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 15, 1964]

THE UNPAID BILLS

Under the lash of hard necessity, the District Commissioners are at last considering the simplest and most obvious solution to the impending disaster at Children's Hospital. The city must reform the crabbed and perverse rules that govern a child's eligibility for medical aid.

Children's Hospital loses about \$300,000 a year in the unpaid bills of children who are indigent by every definition but the Health Department's. Unlike the city's own clinics, the hospital cares for sick children regardless of their eligibility for medical aid. The hospital's deficit is currently running above half a million dollars a year, and within a few months the hospital will be as destitute as the least prosperous of its patients.

Out of over 100 children whom the hospital admits as indigents, the Health Department considers only about 50 to be eligible for public medical aid. The hospital cares for the others, certainly, but the whole cost of that care is borne by the hospital itself.

Thirty out of every hundred indigent patients are ineligible because the Department's family unit rule creates a void of

responsibility. Under the law, a child's parents are responsible for the hospital bill. Under the family unit rule, any relative living in the same house is responsible. In a typical instance, the hospital discovers that a child's mother, abandoned and penniless, lives with relatives. The city then refuses to pay the child's bill because the relatives have incomes. But the law gives the hospital no right to recover from the relatives. Since neither the city nor the relatives will pay, then, the hospital bears the whole cost of caring for the child.

Another 5 or 10 cases in every 100 are ineligible because of the man-in-the-house rule. The man is not the child's father and cannot be made to pay; the city refuses to pay in the name of what it calls morality.

In the remaining 10 or 15 cases, the child is ineligible because his family's income exceeds the permitted levels. A family of five is permitted to earn only \$260 a month to be eligible for public aid. Since slum families in Washington characteristically pay extortionate rents, it is quite possible for parents with three children to earn more than \$260 a month and yet remain totally incapable of paying large hospital bills.

All three of the District Commissioners are kindly men, and no doubt they would like to help Children's Hospital. Certainly the Health Department is most anxious to reform its regulations. But Congress has insisted upon the old eligibility rules, and the Commissioners have been notoriously

reluctant to press Congress on the point. It is a particular misfortune that Commissioner Duncan, who is charged with questions of health and welfare, should have shown so little interest in them over these past 3 years. In the present emergency, the initiative seems to be coming from the White House and the Budget Bureau. Perhaps the great distress of Children's Hospital will finally force the Commissioners, the administration and Congress all to realize the dangerous and mindless unreason of the city's medical aid regulations.

AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING AN AMENDMENT TO THE REQUEST FOR APPROPRIATIONS TRANSMITTED IN THE BUDGET FOR 1965 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$160,000 FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(June 17 (legislative day, March 30), 1964.— Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed)

THE WHITE HOUSE, Washington, June 17, 1964.

THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress an amendment to the appropriation request made in my 1965 budget for the District of Columbia in the amount of \$160,000.

This proposal is intended to provide assistance to Children's Hospital, which has for

many years been much more than a valued community resource. Talents and devotion have brought the hospital to a position of leadership in research and in the development of programs covering all aspects of child care. The hospital has borne a large burden in caring for children whose parents were unable to pay sufficient sums to meet the cost of services rendered. The District government must assume a proper share of the cost of caring for these District children. This budget amendment is an appropriate step in that direction, and I am instructing the District officials to continue their study of other appropriate measures.

The details of this amendment, the necessity therefor, and the reason for its submission at this time are set forth in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observation thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET, Washington, D.C., June 17, 1964.

THE PRESIDENT, The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration an amendment to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for 1965 in the amount of \$160,000 for the District of Columbia:

District of Columbia funds

Budget page (District of Columbia volume)	Heading	Request pending	Proposed amendment	Revised request
33	Health and welfare (Delete the paragraph under this heading and insert in lieu thereof the following.) Health and Welfare, including reimbursement to the United States for services rendered to the District of Columbia by Freedmen's Hospital; [and] for care and treatment of indigent patients in institutions, including those under sectarian control, under contracts to be made by the Director of Public Health; and purchase of three passenger motor vehicles, including two for replacement only. [\$70,526,048] \$75,656,000: Provided, That the inpatient rate and outpatient rate under such contracts, with the exception of Children's Hospital, and for services rendered by Freedmen's Hospital shall not exceed \$34 per diem and the outpatient rate shall not exceed \$5.75 per visit [.] the inpatient rate and outpatient rate for Children's Hospital shall not exceed \$40 per diem and \$6.75 per visit; [.] the inpatient rate (excluding the proportionate share for repairs and construction) for services rendered by Saint Elizabeths Hospital for patient care shall be [at a rate of \$9.49] \$9.74 per diem: Provided further, That this appropriation shall be available for the furnishing of medical assistance to individuals sixty-five years of age or older who are residing in the District of Columbia without regard to the requirement of one-year residence contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1946, under the heading "Operating Expenses, Gallinger Municipal Hospital," and this appropriation shall also be available to render assistance to such individuals who are temporarily absent from the District of Columbia: Provided further, That the authorization included under the heading "Department of Public Health," in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1961, for compensation of convalescent patients as an aid to their rehabilitation is hereby extended to the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation.	\$75,496,000	\$160,000	\$75,656,000

This proposed supplemental appropriation is to adjust the per diem and outpatient rates payable to Children's Hospital to more closely reflect audited costs. It will also enable the District of Columbia to relieve existing overcrowding in the pediatrics ward of District of Columbia General Hospital through the transfer of healthy babies, who are wards of the city, to Children's Hospital for care on a reimbursable basis.

I recommend that the foregoing amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1965 be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,
KERMIT GORDON,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 18, 1964]

L.B.J SEEKS FUNDS FOR CHILDREN'S—ASKS HILL TO VOTE \$160,000 TO MEET HOSPITAL NEEDS

President Johnson sent to Congress yesterday a proposal to award hard-pressed Children's Hospital \$160,000 in the 1965 budget.

The President, in his message, said in part: "The District government must assume a proper share of the cost of caring for these District children. * * * I am instructing the District officials to continue their study of other appropriate measures."

In doing this, the President thus endorsed a plan worked out by District Commissioners and Charles A. Horsky, White House adviser on District affairs, with the help of the Budget Bureau and hospital representatives.

Horsky said yesterday he was delighted with the President's action. Study will continue on ways to help all District hospitals give more and better care to families who need treatment but can't afford it.

OPERATING AT A LOSS

Deep in financial trouble Children's Hospital has been operating at a loss for 3 years. It is operating at a deficit of \$470,000 in the current fiscal year.

Hospital officials have warned they may have to close the doors to indigent children or even shut down altogether.

The budget amendment endorsed by the President would provide a total of \$160,000 in the 1965 budget. Of this, \$90,000 would go to cover the District's cost of reimbursing the hospital at a rate of \$40 a day for inpatients and \$6.75 a visit for outpatients.

The District is presently limited to paying \$34 a day for inpatients and \$5.75 for outpatient visits. The proposed increases will more closely reflect audited costs to the hospital, the Bureau of the Budget said.

AID TO PEDIATRICS WARD

The remaining \$70,000 of the \$160,000 will enable the District to relieve existing overcrowding in the pediatrics ward of District of Columbia General Hospital by transferring healthy babies who are wards of the city to Children's Hospital on a reimbursable basis.

At any given time there are about 20 babies under the age of 6 months who have become wards of the city either through abandonment or because they have no suitable homes.

Horsky said study will continue on the cost of easing the city's stringent standards governing hospital care for indigent children. This proposal would affect all hospitals here, including District of Columbia General and Children's.

This District is forbidden presently to reimburse hospitals—for treatment of persons from families above certain income levels. These levels have been criticized as too low.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 19, 1964]

TO THE RESCUE

President Johnson has accurately perceived the value of Children's Hospital to this community, and he has acted swiftly and effectively to rescue it from financial disaster. He has asked Congress to permit the District to spend an additional \$160,000 on the care

of indigent patients there. The hospital's desperate circumstances are wholly due to its tradition of treating all children who require it, regardless of their ability to pay.

The city has systematically paid the hospital less than it costs to care for these children; the President proposes to raise the public payment much closer to the actual price of treatment. He also proposes to have the hospital care for some of the healthy infants, abandoned or orphaned, who are now crowded into District of Columbia General Hospital.

But even if Congress appropriates the entire \$160,000 requested, that sum represents only one-third of the hospital's current annual deficit. The greatest part of its loss is incurred in caring for children who are indigent in fact but not in law. The city's definition of medical indigence is a catalog of irrelevances, and it must be completely rewritten if the hospital's deficit is to be ended. Very clearly, the city ought to pay for those children whose parents cannot. Perhaps the President can find the opportunity in a supplemental appropriation bill later this year to provide the city with a just and businesslike rule of responsibility for its sick children.

SPECIAL REPORT TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS ON THE STATE OF CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL
(By Rudolph Kauffmann II, president)

The time has come to state frankly and bluntly that the National Capital area community, including the Government, must find some means during the year of 1964 to relieve Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia of the mounting financial deficits which are incurred on behalf of indigent infants and children and which present revenues from all sources are incapable of meeting.

The alternative is that the community will lose its major child health resource at the time of its fullest potential as a complete child health center.

Unless: (1) The Government proves willing to provide substantially increased support for the care of indigent patients and to broaden its definition of indigency; or (2) private citizens come forward with more than twice the annual sustaining funds they are now providing, or both, the directors and corporate members of the hospital must:

1. Close its doors to all but patients able to pay for their care, or, if this does not suffice;
2. Offer its facilities to some larger institution such as a university or general hospital;
3. Hand over the institution to the Government; or
4. Seek dissolution of the institution employing whatever assets it possesses to satisfy its creditors.

CHILD HEALTH PROGRAM AT STAKE

These rather stark alternatives, paradoxically, are faced at a time when the hospital has developed and is offering a fully rounded child health program such as that demanded by the responsible citizens of most other major communities in the country. One of thirteen such institutions in the Nation and the third oldest such institution in the Nation, Children's has never in its history been in a position to provide as high caliber of hospital care to children as it is at the present time. For example:

Its director is a nationally recognized pediatrician.

Its active and courtesy staffs of practicing physicians in the Washington area include recognized leaders in their professions.

Its full-time research and teaching staff supplies a diagnostic team that supplements and complements the skills of the community's practicing physicians and that has few peers in the Nation.

Research grants, under which many of the hospital's physicians are developing new tools to prevent and cure the diseases and defects of children, now total in excess of \$1 million annually.

Its teaching program, under which resident physicians from many parts of the Nation and countries overseas, students at George Washington University and Georgetown University Medical Schools, and student nurses from more than 16 schools of nursing, injects a steady stream of qualified practitioners into the life of the community, of the Nation, and of the world. Thousands of sick children benefit as a result.

Special organizations affiliated with the hospital, such as the Child Welfare Society, which specializes in keeping the well child well; the Hearing and Speech Center, which treats and schools children with hearing and speech defects; and the Hillcrest Center for Emotionally Disturbed Children, under the medical direction of the hospital's Department of Psychiatry, add their special skills to round out the hospital's ability to minister medically to children.

LARGE INVESTMENT

To support the work of this many-sided and many-skilled professional team, without which the hospital would be little but bricks and mortar, the corporate members and directors of the hospital have in the last two decades invested \$5,800,741 of privately donated funds, matched by \$2,220,406 of public funds made available under congressional authority to create the facilities that modern medical knowledge must have to implement itself, and to provide the quality of hospital care that the public is entitled to and that it has a right to expect.

But, to state the positive side of the question, to boast of the professional progress of Children's Hospital, immediately raises a question: Why the problem?

Why, with so much in the way of facilities and medical know-how, does Children's Hospital present a paradox? Why is it that the better it gets the more nearly it approaches what in the case of a business institution would be bluntly called bankruptcy? Why must it be said bluntly and frankly that the institution stands with its back to the wall?

Stated simply the answer to this question is to be found in the fact that all costs of hospital care are increasing and that the reimbursement sources for the care of charity patients have not kept pace. Approximately half of the patient days of care in the hospital and 90 to 95 percent of the children admitted for treatment in its clinics are charity cases falling into one or another of several categories. A majority of these cases reside in the District of Columbia. In the case of just 40 percent of these District of Columbia charity cases the hospital is reimbursed, but in part only, by government. But the rest, or more than half of the District of Columbia charity cases are in effect treated free as the following will illustrate:

Proportion of medically indigent District of Columbia children found to be eligible for District of Columbia government reimbursement on admission to Children's Hospital

Ineligible: "Family unit rule"..... 25
Ineligible: Supplemental income from "man in house"..... 12
Ineligible: "Over income"..... 23
Eligible for Government reimbursement... 40

In these cases, the ones for whom no reimbursement from any agency or government source is received, the unfortunate fact is brought about by the application of welfare-type eligibility standards set by Congress for the District of Columbia. These require that if the earnings of a "family unit" or "man in the house" computed col-

lectively with the income of actual parents, are in excess of certain arbitrary maximums, no tax support for the medical care of children involved in such situations may be obtained. The maximum gross allowable income level itself in most instances is hardly sufficient to cover the cost of food, shelter, and clothing, much less medical or hospital care. For example, the maximum monthly income for a family of four to qualify for tax supported medical care is \$230 per month.

When such standards involve medical care and when they affect in concentrated form a large number of patients at a single institution such as Children's Hospital, their application has a devastating effect on the financial operation of the institution. It is hard to believe that those who support these standards and implement them intend either to destroy the city's major child health institution through their application or to abandon the health care of thousands of infants and children.

Even in the instance of patients who qualify for government reimbursement the funds allocated provide reimbursement only at a rate far below the actual cost. Thus, 40 percent of the District of Columbia charity cases admitted to the hospital are cared for at a substantial loss because the rates of reimbursement for such care do not meet the cost of care and the remainder of charity cases are cared for at what amounts to a total loss.

This remains true although every effort is made to obtain part payment for care given patients ineligible for support from a third party. However, even in cases where some family income might be available it is impossible to hold responsible for payment individuals who bear no legal responsibility for the existence of or for the support of a child. Certainly it is impossible to repossess the health of the child to whom care has been given and for whom payment on a budget plan has not or cannot be made.

The following statistics will illustrate in specific detail how losses occur, particularly on children eligible for public support:

TABLE I.—Operating income and expenses for the last 5 fiscal years

Year ending—	Operating income after allowance and free service	Operating expense	Operating loss
June 30, 1963.....	\$2,656,317	\$3,240,885	(\$584,568)
June 30, 1962.....	2,518,280	2,689,089	(170,809)
June 30, 1961.....	2,048,266	2,331,423	(283,157)
June 30, 1960.....	1,855,229	2,186,553	(331,324)
June 30, 1959.....	1,740,618	2,159,641	(419,023)

TABLE II.—Losses on Health Department eligible indigent patient services for fiscal year 1963

	Children's cost	MAD reimbursement rate	Units provided	Loss
Inpatient.....	\$40.15	\$32	10,556	\$86,031
Outpatient....	10.55	5	26,857	149,054

TABLE III.—Projected losses incurred on Health Department eligible patient services fiscal year 1964

	Children's cost	MAD reimbursement rate	Units provided	Loss
Inpatient....	\$46.07	\$34.00	7,548	\$91,104
Outpatient....	11.13	5.75	30,255	162,772

But to this loss is added an additional estimated loss on care of indigent patients not eligible for government or agency support—

an amount just under \$300,000 in fiscal year 1963, for example.

HOW LOSSES HAVE BEEN MET IN PAST

There is nothing new in Children's Hospital operating at a deficit. It has done so, with minor exceptions brought about by windfall donations, throughout its modern history, and presumably throughout its entire history. After all, it was founded as a charitable institution. And it has tried to conduct itself as one, its board of directors having been guided by the statement in its original charter below:

"Be it known to all whom it may concern, that we, * * * citizens of the United States, and of the District of Columbia, have associated ourselves together pursuant to the provisions of the 3d section of the act of Congress, approved May 5, 1870, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law," for the purpose of establishing a charitable institution in said District, to be used as a hospital and dispensary for the treatment of the medical and surgical diseases of children, where all such may be treated gratuitously: *Provided, however,* That the board of directors may provide for the admission of sick children whose parents or guardians may be willing and able to defray the expenses thereof."

To implement this policy, and to fulfill its obligation to the community as set forth in its charter, it has sought and obtained from generous friends and supporters substantial funds. Also it has received specific endowments and unrestricted bequests, made to it because it was a charitable institution.

In the period covered by the statistics above, for instance, it sought and obtained annual donations through its annual sustaining fund appeal and its annual Christmas card appeal as follows:

TABLE IV.—*Gifts and donations from sustaining fund and Christmas card appeal*

Year ending—	Card appeal	Sustaining fund	Total
June 30, 1963.....	\$31,163	\$116,446	\$147,609
June 30, 1962.....	27,698	103,599	131,297
June 30, 1961.....	75,806	102,206	178,012
June 30, 1960.....	33,556	91,018	144,574
June 30, 1959.....	61,828	-----	61,828

And it received in this same period unrestricted bequests totaling \$837,642, more than half of which was required for day-to-day operations.

To meet its deficits it has, of course, spent the revenues from these appeals. It also has spent to finance its day-in-day-out operations not only the income from an endowment fund of \$1,243,479, but also all of the income from and \$445,000 of the capital of funds that have come to it in the form of unrestricted bequests.

To sum up, it has been ready, willing, and able to spend nonoperating income and capital in the period under review as follows:

TABLE V.—*Expenditure of nonoperating income and capital for recent 5 years*

Year ending June 30, 1963.....	\$440,821
Year ending June 30, 1962.....	389,080
Year ending June 30, 1961.....	407,282
Year ending June 30, 1960.....	367,549
Year ending June 30, 1959.....	243,075

But the hard fact of the matter is that taking nonoperating income and capital from all available sources into account, it now finds itself with only \$143,000 to meet deficits that are averaging \$40,000 each month.

STOPGAP APPROPRIATION REQUIRED

To find some way to avoid the inevitable financial collapse of the hospital, the officers of the board of directors have taken their case to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia who have agreed to ask Congress

for a supplemental appropriation of \$110,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964. The amount of this request is based on reimbursement for units of service which the hospital provided solely for patients ruled eligible for tax support at a rate somewhat greater than that presently provided but less than the hospital's audited cost of care. If this is granted it will provide only temporary relief.

The hospital is informed that the Government of the District of Columbia is precluded from making exception to the prevailing strict rules of eligibility for health care. Presumably only Congress itself can order relief from losses in this category by specifically exempting the medical care of children from the eligibility rules. If the hospital is to survive, or at least survive in its present form, relief of both sorts is necessary.

INDIGENT CARE VITAL PART OF CENTER

This immediately suggests an important question which the community not only has every right to ask but should ask:

Why not send the patients who are causing these losses and who in many communities would be the responsibility of the taxpayer, to the city's public hospital, the District of Columbia General Hospital?

The answer to this question also falls in several parts:

1. District of Columbia General Hospital already is caring for a capacity patient load of children.

2. Except under emergency conditions, the thousands of indigent children who are not eligible for Government reimbursement at Children's Hospital are not eligible for care at District of Columbia General Hospital. In fact, without Children's Hospital, there is no place to provide their health care needs under present regulations.

3. Thus, Children's Hospital cares for as many, and in some cases more, sick children who cannot pay for their care than does District of Columbia General Hospital. It serves the northerly sections of the city for Government-eligible patients in the same way as District of Columbia General serves the southerly sections of the city. It is, therefore, the other half of facilities for such care and traditionally has been treated as the privately operated half of a public-private partnership devoted to caring for the city's sick poor children, having been expanded and modernized to do the job by the investment of over \$2 million of matching Government funds in recent years. There is no "third" place for them to go in any important numbers.

4. Children's Hospital has been planned and staffed and its plant has been financed to do this job. In fact it was doing it as the sole such institution in the District of Columbia before the creation of a children's unit at District of Columbia General Hospital. Perhaps it should be compared to an eight-cylinder automobile; its operation could hardly be cut in half by removing four of the cylinders, and it is doubtful it would run at all in such a condition. To put it another way, Children's Hospital's ability to perform the charity task is built into its total function as a children's medical center providing the finest of health care for all types of patients, including those who can pay. Thus, if the institution remains prepared to meet fully the child health needs of the community, it is doubtful that important savings could be realized from simply turning away sick children even if they arrived at the door properly tagged "eligible" or "ineligible" which, of course, they do not.

5. In order to carry out the care of the charity patients at less expense and to provide a stimulus to improved care for all patients and to fulfill a responsibility as a complete medical center, the hospital has, over the years, developed some of the country's best recognized training and research

programs in child health. While the presence of teaching programs allows the charity care to be carried out at lesser cost, it is also true that the presence of charity or "ward" patients allows a stronger teaching and research program. A significant cut-back in charity patients would in proportion diminish the strength of the teaching and research programs as well as narrow the spectrum of available health care services. And, at some point, it could no longer serve as well the purpose of educating young doctors and nurses. It might no longer attract and hold highly skilled specialists who gravitate to an institution because of teaching and research opportunities thus concentrating for the benefit of the entire community in one place a central pool of specialized medical skills. If Children's Hospital were bereft of this concentrated team of specialists there would be little real justification for its existence. That function could just as well be fulfilled by adding beds for children at each of the general hospitals of the community.

Thus a specialty hospital like Children's is a meld of complex and interdependent parts. Take one part away and the whole tends to fall apart and become, relatively speaking, a nonessential community asset.

PROGRAMS GEARED FOR PAYING PATIENTS AS WELL AS INDIGENT

At this point another question suggests itself: Why does not the hospital make more of an effort to attract more paying patients to meet the competition of the general hospitals, particularly suburban hospitals conveniently located in higher income areas?

The answer to this is that all of the programs are intended to meet the needs of infants and children in the best possible way and thus to "attract" paying patients whose parents wish the best of medical and surgical care for their infants and children despite certain inconveniences of travel.

Since World War II the facilities of the hospital, including a new main building, research center and a modern diagnostic and treatment center (together costing \$5,800,741, \$3,580,335 of it privately donated and \$2,220,406 of it in matching Government funds) have been improved and expanded because the hospital recognized that changing times made it imperative that it equip itself to care for difficult and highly specialized cases in addition to routine cases that would gravitate inevitably to neighborhood hospitals. Thus, it has laid the groundwork for maintaining a reasonable increase in private patient load. But such a program bears fruit slowly.

The medical board of the hospital is active in bringing to the attention of referring physicians the importance of having available an institution qualified to cope with the difficult and complex ailments of children; also the importance of supporting such an institution despite considerations of convenience.

BROADER PUBLIC GIVING WOULD MATCH GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

And, still another question is: Since Children's Hospital is a charitable institution, and, since private givers in the Washington area have proven themselves willing to support it through their donations and bequests, why doesn't the hospital increase its efforts to obtain more such support from the community?

Once again, the answer must be complex rather than simple:

The hospital has indeed increased its efforts over the past 3 years to solicit funds from individuals on the basis of a list of known friends and supporters of the institution. The list of contributors now includes the majority of those individuals who traditionally and in the light of the trend toward unified appeals to support community

charity can be expected to support such an institution in addition to their support of unified fund drives and their responsibility to the many other demands made upon their incomes by other worthwhile charitable, educational and cultural institutions and organizations. The next step in any effort to supplement present private support for Children's Hospital charitable work would have to be either a request for an increased level of giving by those who have traditionally supported the hospital or a much broader, public type, appeal. The board of directors of the hospital believes that such an additional appeal would receive much greater reception if the effort were to be matched closely by the Government's assuming its fair share of the financial burden for the medical care of the poor.

CAN NATIONAL CAPITAL AFFORD NOT TO HAVE MAJOR CHILD HEALTH CENTER?

In the final analysis there are the questions: Can the Nation's Capital continue to afford a specialized institution devoted to the all around medical care of children? Also, what will happen if Children's Hospital ceases to exist in its present form?

The answer to these questions lies at the heart of the matter.

Of all places in the world, the Nation's Capital should feel that it can afford to travel first class in this respect. Children deprived of the corrective health measures that modern medicine is capable of providing may grow up to cause the community vast expense in terms of institutional care for adolescents and adults, in terms of delinquency and crime, in terms of unemployment brought about by physical and mental handicaps. Such ills can be prevented if the skills represented by the core of dedicated men and women brought together on a team basis such as those at Children's Hospital are brought to bear on a solution to these problems at an incipient stage.

This kind of child health care is available and needed and used at Children's Hospital now, not only by the indigent family but by families at all income levels, including those on the Government payroll. It is used, for example, by the families of Members of Congress and of the diplomatic corps.

The hospital and its various programs have been selected for visits by royalty, visiting statesmen and professional persons from all over the world.

Infants and children in families who may not even have heard of the hospital have benefited indirectly from its presence by and through the fact that it is training doctors and nurses in the finest of child health practice, is carrying out research to understand and combat children's problems.

But the Nation's Capital is beset by many problems. It may be that the specific problems of the future existence of Children's Hospital in its present form—a children's medical center, evolved through nearly a century of devotion to child health into the force for good in the community that it now is—cannot be salvaged in the context of life as it exists in the Nation's Capital today.

This statement of the situation represents what amounts to a last resort. If it fails of response, the corporate members of and directors of Children's Hospital will be forced to make such adjustments and to adopt such solutions as the hard realities of the situation dictate.

RUDOLPH KAUFFMAN II,
President, Children's Hospital of the
District of Columbia.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the desirability of the Congress rallying to the rescue of this splendid institution

which may be forced to close its doors unless finances are provided for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule of germaneness be waived for a very minor remark.

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

Is there further morning business?

REPUBLICAN STATEMENT OF AMERICAN POLICY ON VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] commented upon the statement made by some 55 Republicans in the House on Vietnam.

I have read the statement. I do not agree with one portion of it, at least. That portion is, as I remember, that it recommended that American commanders should take command of the Vietnamese troops. I rise nevertheless to say—as I happen to be one of the few Republicans on the floor at this time—that I believe this statement, whether the Senator agrees with it or not, or I do, brings into play the very debate that he, himself has recommended, that Vietnam should be discussed, and discussed openly and objectively.

I might also say, without any attempt to compare this particular statement with other statements that have been made in the Senate, that policy in Vietnam has been discussed on the floor of the Senate for months. Some Members of the majority have been, almost daily, very critical of the administration's position on Vietnam. The majority leader, himself, has an alternative to the program of the administration in Vietnam.

I would not want to stop by making these comments. I believe that it is necessary to maintain the strength of our troops in Vietnam, a strength capable of maintaining our position.

I believe also that every possible alternative should be considered which would be helpful. I would advocate a convocation of the Geneva Conference, not with the purpose of agreeing to neutralization, but with the purpose of seeing if there is any possibility of any agreement that would recognize two separate, sovereign countries, and support for the position, and support against the continued aggression and subversion of North Vietnam. Thus could lead, I hope, to the establishment of multilateral patrols along the borders.

I think such a convocation might involve the possibility, however doubtful it may be, of staying increased military movements which could lead to escalation and final confrontation of the United States and Communist China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I do not agree with the entire statement made relating to American command of the Vietnam forces, but the House Members have the right to state their positions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the Senator may be extended.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am not at all averse to a reconvening of the Geneva Conference to consider the situation in Laos. I am not at all averse either, under certain circumstances, to a reconvening of the Geneva Conference of 1954 covering the situation in Vietnam and the other parts of what used to be known as French Indochina. But I certainly cannot imagine the Senator from Kentucky, with his wide experience as a diplomat, as a member of the State Department, and as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, agreeing to a proposal which would make that a war under direct American military command and control in a foreign country.

Mr. COOPER. I just said that I did not agree with such a suggestion. I said that the majority leader took occasion to criticize the proposal, which I do not agree with; but I must say that almost every day Senators, on his side, are disagreeing with the administration position.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. The majority leader himself has offered alternatives, constructive proposals, I believe that alternatives should be constructive.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I said in my remarks, I welcome discussion. All I hope is that the discussion will be constructive. I do not care for opposition on the part of either Republicans or Democrats for the sake of opposition. If a Senator is going to oppose, he should come forth with a constructive alternative, if he finds fault with a policy which the Nation has in effect at the time he makes his remarks or offers his solution.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to address myself to the subject under discussion. I am grateful to the majority leader for remaining while I do so. It is interesting that the report of the task force on the part of the Republican Party in the House is side by side with the report of Ambassador Lodge to the people of the United States and to the President. I wish to identify myself with that group which believes, regardless of party, that we must stick it out in Vietnam. I do not believe that we ought to pull out. I believe there is too much at stake for us to pull out. Also I do not believe that we should overtly extend the war into North Vietnam, which has been recommended by some. I feel that while Senators, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has said, have every right to speak and should be encouraged to speak and have been encouraged to speak their views, I cannot accept the proposition that any American President would not wish to win a struggle in which American lives and the destiny of freedom are concerned. I do not believe that there should be any implication in their statement, much as they may differ with the policy which is involved.

The majority leader has called for constructive suggestions.

First, there is no question about the fact that a U.N. role in the problem is essential. In my judgment, we should press for a U.N. role—at least some role along the borders which are allegedly being infiltrated, as Vietnam is an independent and sovereign country.

Second, there is a complete inadequacy of cooperation with us by allies who ought to be as deeply interested as we. I do not make that statement in any sense of remonstrance, but it is a direction for activity by the United States. The war is Australia's war as much as our own. It intimately threatens Australia's future freedom and security. The war is Malaysia's war. It is a war of the Philippines. It is also a war of Taiwan, or the Republic of China on Taiwan. It also deeply involves Japan. Those are at least some of the nations. It is next door to Taiwan, one of our strongest and firmest allies in that area of the world. An American overture of the most urgent kind is required to obtain cooperation from other nations in Asia.

Third, the success of freedom is involved. Therefore, the job of economic reconstruction in the country of India, the Government of India, and its security against the Chinese Communist incursions—all of these are critically important, just as is the defeat of the effort to subvert the new Government of Malasia. It is critically important that we make a success in those struggles because they reflect on the whole position in southeast Asia.

Finally, I have great pride in the bipartisan foreign policy forecast practiced by Arthur Vandenberg, and followed by Eisenhower, Nixon, and the other leaders of our party up until today. I am deeply pledged to it. I intend to stand with it in the policy I have outlined which, I believe, with respect to Vietnam, I am following in the finest traditions, offered for us and our allies, and which has also been joined in on our other side by the late Secretary Cordell Hull and other leaders, along with the late President Kennedy and President Johnson.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD communications I have received from people across the country who thoroughly disagree with U.S. policy in Asia.

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

NEW YORK, N.Y., June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Capitol Hill,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up fight against Vietnam fiasco. Your words make sense.

MIKE SPECTOR.

TACOMA, WASH., June 29, 1964.

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

You have done a world of good already by your masterful responses to interrogators Scalley and Rawlson on "Issues and Answers" yesterday. No acknowledgment necessary.

REX S. ROUDEBUSH.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., June 29, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud and support your courageous and well reasoned stand on American policy in southeast Asia.

Dr. and Mrs. RAYMOND.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 28, 1964.

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

Congratulations on your appeal for legality, commonsense, and peace on "Issues and Answers."

SIDNEY MEYER.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., June 17, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The country and the world owe you and Senator Gruening a debt which it will never be able to fully repay. Attacking official U.S. policy is many times not only irresponsible but impossible. Irresponsible because those people making policy have access to information not generally known which may greatly influence the solution picked for the problem in question. Impossible because the President, Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of State are always on the front pages of newspapers and magazines and always on the radio and television news broadcasts. Their opinions and ideas are generally known. The other side often goes unnoticed. We do not always think about the unthinkable. Thus, the administration can much more easily build up their support than can the opposition.

This is the case presently with Vietnam. Here, opposition has been impossible but not irresponsible. As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee you have had access to all the administration's information—or at least whatever they have been willing to let you see. Even so, until recently only the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and a very few newspapers presented the opposition point of view. The first time that the TV mentioned that you were making speeches on Vietnam was when a channel two reporter, speaking on the progress of the civil rights bill, said that you again interrupted the "debate" to speak on McNamara's war. No mention was made of your reasons for this opposition. Indeed, the way he made mention of your speech was in a contemptuous way—as if you were wasting the time of the Senate.

Recently, however, several newspapers have, at least, mentioned your name. This is a beginning. More people are now talking about Vietnam and when the Senate takes up the foreign aid bill the Vietnam debate will really get going.

I do not support present U.S. policy in Vietnam. I do support taking the issue to the United Nations where it belongs. The war is probably a civil one since not many Communist Chinese or North Vietnamese are directly involved but this may be debatable. How important the war really is to our security and in terms of such intangible things as American lives and material things such as money and arms may also be debatable. But what is not debatable is that our policy toward this war in Vietnam is a part of the larger issue of whether we want for ourselves and our children a world of law, or "liberty and justice for all" or as President Kennedy said in his inaugural address: "A new endeavor, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved." Or whether we want a world based on the jungle law of military might with "the intoxication of power, constantly increasing and constantly growing subtler. Al-

ways at every moment * * * the thrill of victory, the sensation of trampling on an enemy who is helpless. If you want a picture of [this] future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face—forever." (George Orwell in "1984.")

The one depends on nations forever taking arms to settle disagreements, the other on an expanded use of international organizations such as the United Nations—to talk, to settle disputes by reason and facts, not force and arms.

At a time when we are extending the boundary of law at home must we leave it in Vietnam? Daniel Webster once said that "whatever government is not a government of laws is a despotism, let it be called what it may." Today, I say that whatever world is not a world of laws is a despotism, let it be called what it may.

To you, Senator MORSE, and to Senator GRUENING I say please continue to speak out against our unnecessary, illegal, and immoral actions in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

NEIL M. HORWITZ.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

I would also like to take this time to commend you, Senator MORSE, for your stand on civil rights. Few people have ever been as consistently right on so many important issues as you have been. When history records these days it will be seen that you were one of the Senators most responsible for so strong yet just a bill being passed by Congress.

I would like to pose several questions:

1. Under cloture, I thought that only the civil rights bill would be discussed and that, for example, there would be no morning hour or no nongermane speech, even on the Senator's time, would be allowed. Which of these was the intent of the Senate?

2. On Thursday, June 11, 1964 a modified Ervin amendment was passed 80 to 16. It added a new section 1102 to the bill. Under this amendment, if a man commits a crime and has his day in court and then later commits the same crime can he be tried again? If originally he was tried for say, contempt arising under his first crime, can he, for the second crime, be tried for the crime itself?

3. Briefly, if possible, what was the Motorola case?

4. On "The Making of the President, 1960" last week it mentioned your running for President against the then Senator Kennedy. I presume that this was in the Oregon primary. Is this correct and what was the results?

Thank you, Senator MORSE, for letting me take some of your so valuable time. Once again, please continue speaking out against our policy toward the war in Vietnam. Again, thank you very much.

NEIL M. HORWITZ

(Again).

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 14, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to congratulate you on your remarks concerning the southeast Asia area and situation.

I hope we listen to your advice and bring neutrality and peace to that area instead of destruction.

Keep up your remarks in the interest of peace.

Yours truly,

GARY ALEXANDER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

June 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read some of your remarks on our foreign policy in southeast Asia. I believe you are doing a great job. Someone in the Senate has to try to bring some sanity to our policy in that part of the world. If we continue as we are

going, South Vietnam will turn, at best, into another Korea.

We are getting in a position of no return. Please keep up your vigorous attacks on our policy in Asia. I, like you, feel we should take our problem to the U.N. If the U.N. isn't good enough for us, it won't be good enough for anyone else. It takes much more than money to keep the U.N. as an effective force. It takes the U.N.'s faith in its machinery, or the U.N. will become just a sight-seeing attraction in New York and follow the footsteps of the League of Nations. George Bernard Shaw either said or quoted someone else who said, "The only thing we learn from history is that we don't learn from history." The time in southeast Asia is growing short.

Please keep up your magnificent efforts. Many Americans are behind you.

Very truly yours,

GILBERT B. FRIEDMAN.

VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I live in Vancouver, Canada, and heard your interview with Station CJOR, Monday, June 4. If I was a praying man I would flop down on my knees and thank God that there is a little spark of sanity yet in the United States. Everything you said was exactly according to facts and your estimation as to the solution right now also squares with the development and stage that the world is in, re the newly emerging nations and those waiting to be born, South America, etc.

Your interviewer is still befuddled by cold-war semantics and brainwash. Communism won't overrun or move into any country, no matter how small, until the present way of life has broken down and the people themselves want a change. I'm afraid time is running out on us and we need many more voices like yours with courage and understanding to let their fellow Americans realize that they do not have this holy mission bestowed upon them to force their way of life on the rest of the world. It wasn't humanly possible to make more blunders and mistakes than U.S. internal and foreign policy has and if they pursue this line, we surely face annihilation.

Once more the thanks of many, many thousands of Canadians and surely men of good will all over the world for your brave stand against such great odds.

Very sincerely yours,

Mr. E. ENGLE.

ALGONAC, MICH., June 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I compliment you on your true and courageous statements re our activities in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, etc., today.

It is many a day believe me since we have heard a Senator in U.S. Congress stand up and tell the truth as you did.

It is a terrible thing when any people can no longer trust their government to tell the truth. We are being lied to all along the line.

Scully's argument was really something to behold—i.e., that we should not take the time to take on disgraceful adventure in Vietnam, etc., to the United Nations as that would give "the Communists time to take over."

If the people of Vietnam think communism more suitable to their needs than our famous "free enterprise" which is a polite name for monopoly today, then all our vicious war against those poor people will never change their minds but will only strengthen their hatred of United States as indeed it should.

Scully's assertion that we have not violated our international agreements was

sickening and idiotic—he can lie so brazenly because he knows how brainwashed the average American is by monopolistic control of all means of communications.

As for that pathetic creature, Stevenson, how can you adequately express the contempt any citizen can feel for him?

But thoughtful people are profoundly thankful for men like you and Senator GRUENING and a few others (how pitifully few) and I'll bet your words today will be heard around the world.

More power to you my dear sir, if we survive as a nation with any self-respect at all it will be because of men like you, not little bootlickers like Adlai Stevenson. What a figure he cuts before the U.N.

In sincere appreciation of your honest efforts on behalf of country.

D. FLORENCE FAGG.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I enjoyed your viewpoint on Vietnam on "Face the Nation."

Would like to see you appear on other networks.

Mrs. KATHERINE BERMAN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
June 16, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I should like to thank you for the fine stand you have taken on the Vietnam situation that we are now unfortunately involved in. To begin with, our Government (or CIA) has no right infringing on other people's rights of self-determination. Then, to claim that there are foreign invaders, that the people ask for defense, and to go ahead and perpetuate a war fraught with dictatorships, torture, lies, and misinformation to the American people is a terrible disgrace. Please continue your fine work.

Sincerely,

DREW LANGSNER.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,
June 15, 1964.

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

HON. SENATOR MORSE: We fully support your views as expressed on "Face the Nation" with regard to the war we are conducting against South Vietnam. We believe that in view of the pressures exerted for our Government greater participation in South Vietnam (as witness program of June 14, Marguerite Higgins, etc.), it is imperative that you repeat your talk on TV in the very near future before we as a nation become embroiled beyond recall in a nuclear all-out war.

In profound appreciation for your humanity and sanity.

Respectfully,

Mrs. G. BLOOM.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
June 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I admire the moral patriotic stand you have taken on the dirty little war in Indochina. Long may you teach the people.

JAMES DUGAN.

MOORESTOWN, N.J.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I heard your broadcast on ABC radio June 28 and am in agreement with your thoughts on the Vietnam situation. I support your efforts to advance your foreign policy philosophy and as a private citizen will be glad to aid you in any way I can.

Sincerely,

EMALIE M. SMITH.

DEAR SENATOR: I listened to you on the TV program today. You were great. Now

if you could be seen by more people on TV or be quoted in the managed press.

With best wishes,

ZACK KORN.

ANDOVER, MASS.,
June 29, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Do keep plugging for meeting at United Nations to help keep the peace.

Very truly,

EDITH KITCHIN.

P.S.—Saw you on TV last night.

JUNE 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a former resident of the Pacific Northwest I am proud to congratulate you on your civilized stand on the Vietnam war.

Regards,

D. S. HERSKOWITZ.

NEWTON PUEBLO, COLO.

SIR: Admiring your talk on today's program, please keep up the good work. It was with the keenest appreciation that I listened to you. Somebody has to speak out and trust you will continue to do so. I'm no pacifist nor the other way either although I have 10 years' service under my belt. I see no earthly use of sending more troops to Saigon or any other place over there.

J. E. WICKERYOU.

JUNE 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

I listened to your interview with Nancy Dickerson of NBC's "Today" program this morning—subject of "The War in Vietnam," and I want to say my husband and I agree with every word you spoke.

More power to you and may you have some influence to stop our country from trying to police the entire Asian Continent.

We can't dictate to our neighbors and I think as a country (of which we are proud) we should quit trying to dictate the policies of other nations.

Mrs. WM. SCHUCHART.

DEARBORN, MICH., June 26, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May we congratulate you on your stand on South Vietnam. We listened to you on the "Today" show and also FRANK CHURCH with the opposite view. We need more people like you to point the way back to our country's basic principles and our Constitution, especially to younger people in public office—FRANK CHURCH. Our Constitution perhaps should be read in its entirety to each Senator every 6 months or so.

We are with you all the way too on the failure of the United States to utilize the United Nations. Most smaller nations and most Americans probably wonder why it hasn't been used.

Congratulations again and best wishes for great success in your stand.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. RAY E. GOEBORO.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
June 27, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been wanting to congratulate you for quite some time concerning your enlightened opinions on foreign policy. I certainly hope you continue to work as effectively as you know how towards a more realistic Vietnam policy, and other policies.

It is a pleasure to read your speeches in various magazines. It is indeed a shame that the newspapers don't hardly give you any coverage.

You have my deepest gratitude for your courageous work.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN FREEMAN.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,
June 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We hope you keep pounding away at the idea of bringing the Vietnam situation before the United Nations.

I am occasionally asked to speak before groups on behalf of the U.N. The question that is often put to me—even by U.N. skeptics—is:

Here is a threat to world peace. Can't the U.N. at least discuss the issue?

My best wishes.

D. L. MARTIN.

JUNE 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am very much in agreement with the stand you took with regard to the war in Vietnam.

I doubt very much if we are making any true friends there in Vietnam and around the world by our presence there. Many people are shocked by our indiscriminate bombing with napalm and threats of atomic warfare. We have defended the tyranny of Diem and bought our way in at that. The people are tired of war and by our presence there it will prolong the strife and agony for years to come.

We should remember what France paid in lives and money for years without any gain. I doubt if we will get any other countries to go along with us in this war.

Let's take a long-range look at the situation. As you have said, the best thing we can do now is to go to the U.N. This makes sense to me and the only wise move we can make at this time.

We need more men of stature to stand up to the hotheads and the uninformed. We need to make some long-range plans and "think the unthinkable."

Sincerely,

DON LINDERMAN.

P.S.—I am an ex-constituent of yours, 28 years in Oregon.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to tell you that we heard you on the "Today Show" and we appreciate your stand on the Vietnam problem. If we had 99 more men like you in the Senate and 435 in the House with your convictions the rest of us humble citizens could rid ourselves of our national guilt and shame.

We should understand that communism is an ideology and cannot be detained with bullets. The Romans tried to suppress the Christians and failed. The Christians tried to suppress the Moslems and they flourished faster than ever. Now the Christians are trying to suppress communism and for every Communist they detain abroad, four Communists in sympathy are generated at home.

For many long years these poor people in southeast Asia have tried to rid themselves of foreign impostors and now we, the most destructive of them all, are in there to ruin their land and homes. If we don't get out our Democratic Party is going down to defeat this fall election.

Please Senator, more of the same, you have millions of right-thinking people back of you.

Yours sincerely,

E. P. LEVINE.

GLENDALE, CALIF., June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have listened to your courageous talks against war several times with great admiration, but have not been courageous enough myself to write to

you. Your views on this unbelievable action in Southeast Asia and mine seem to be alike.

Not only do I object to sending young American men there to die, but I object to their (or our) killing and burning those poor miserable people of Vietnam and Laos. Like you, I am very critical of my Government, and certainly do not support President Johnson's actions. I believe that President Kennedy grew with his position as President and would never have gone this far—even under pressure.

I am not only critical of this vicious behavior—not only in Southeast Asia, but Cuba and South America—I am downright ashamed of it. But, thank God, in you we have a man who is not afraid to speak out. I hope everyone heard you speak on NBC today. Bless you, sir, and good heart to you.

Very sincerely,

MARGARET DORNHAUSER.

STONEWALL, OKLA.,
June 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I do not know how many people, I have heard say amen to every word that you said on NBC's "Today." I suggested we write and tell you how proud we had a man in the Senate that would stand on his two feet and tell the American people the truth about this (Vietnam) situation. Get our boys out of there, but they all said that it would be paper for your wastebasket.

This is one thing that could defeat President Johnson.

Sincerely yours,

FRED McKEEL.

GENEVA, N.Y., June 25, 1964.

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

HON. AND DEAR SIR: Thank you for your forthright and courageous statement about the situation in southeast Asia. We are certainly going headlong into something which will lead to disaster and a war which can be unending, and become a worldwide conflagration. What has become of President Kennedy's assertion, "that we do not fear to negotiate but we will not negotiate out of fear." The conference table is the place of wisdom. I am convinced now before it is too late. Some way must be found to organize minority opinion on this grave matter. Can you get someone to take the lead? Keep up your efforts.

Faithfully yours,

MELVIN ABSON,
Retired.

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

DEAR MR. SENATOR: A foolish woman once insulted you by saying you had been kicked in the head by a horse. If I could offer one suggestion for the future of American foreign policy, it would be: Find that horse and set him loose in the Department of State.

I listened to your presentation on the ABC television program "Issues and Answers" earlier this afternoon and then tuned in the NBC "Open Mind" program entitled "The Crisis in Vietnam." In your half hour you made more sense on Vietnam and southeast Asia generally than the whole gang on "Open Mind"—including a Princeton professor, a pair of journalists (one foreign, one domestic), a foreign policy scholar, and the Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Vietnamese Affairs—were able to achieve in 60 dreary minutes. Particularly valuable was your suggestion for combining a SEATO peacekeeping force with an emergency United Nations meeting, to be followed by a special UN force in that troubled land. Here is a way for us to oppose a Communist takeover without resorting to a dime-store Machavel-

lianism that flouts our charter commitments to the United Nations, defies moral principle, offends Africa and Asia and Latin America, alarms our allies, tantalizes our enemies, and threatens a nuclear holocaust.

Who can tell whether your suggestions will be followed? I for one am grateful that they have been given.

Whether this Nation hears or whether it forbears, keep speaking up. Robert M. La Follette, who came into the Senate 60 years ago next January, had to entitle one chapter of his autobiography "Alone in the Senate." A giant can stand alone when necessary.

Persist.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE KOSKI.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am sending you this page from the Cleveland Plain Dealer to let you know that there are a good many people throughout this country who think as you do about the Vietnam question, and who back you 100 percent in your effort to prevent a war over there.

Keep on expressing yourself in this matter. More power to you.

Sincerely,

ADA N. LEFFINGWELL.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer]

OPEN LETTER AD ASKS VIET NEGOTIATIONS

An open letter to the State Department, signed by 69 Clevelanders from all walks of life and urging negotiations instead of stepped-up war in Vietnam, is published in the Plain Dealer today as a paid advertisement.

The letter's publication has been timed to coincide with a foreign policy conference here today in which the State and Defense Departments are participating.

"The signatures are of those persons we could readily reach within the last 10 days," said Sheldon D. Clark, Cleveland lawyer and initiator of the open letter.

"In my talks with fellow Clevelanders it was felt that a statement to the officials of the two Departments at this time afforded the best means of expressing ourselves as forcibly as we know how," Clark said.

Scheduled to attend the all-day conference in Hotel Sheraton-Cleveland are George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, and John T. McNaughton of the Defense Department, Acting Assistant Secretary for International Affairs.

Among the signers of the open letter are Dr. Benjamin Spock of Western Reserve University, an authority on child development; the Reverend Alan J. Davis, pastor of Aldersgate Methodist Church; the Reverend Dennis G. Kuby, pastor of Unitarian Society of Cleveland; Paul Olynky of Fenn College, an advocate of a sane nuclear policy; Harold J. Quigley, leader of the Cleveland Ethical Society; Jack G. Day, lawyer, active in civil rights cases; Sam Sponseller, retired labor leader, and Oscar H. Steiner, businessman.

Money for the ad was raised by those who signed the open letter, Clark said.

[From the Plain Dealer, June 18, 1964]

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE—NEEDED: AN APPROACH TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The United States is a foreign party to a civil war in Vietnam. Fifteen thousand U.S. uniformed personnel have been committed to the battle. Casualties include American soldiers.

Acceleration of the American war effort in South Vietnam invites increased aid by China to the Communist Vietnamese. Stepping up the war effort risks the use by either side of

nuclear arms. Nuclear war offers no victory. What is the alternative?

Negotiation is urged by Senator Wayne Morse, Senator Ernest Gruening, Columnist Walter Lippmann and others. Recognizing it takes both sides to make peace, we urge our Government to initiate a conference of nations to guarantee a neutral Vietnam. We support U.S. efforts to insure enforcement of agreements. The United Nations can assist direct negotiation. Inspection teams must be free to operate wherever needed. They can be backed by frontier patrols. The best guarantee of enforcement is the mutual advantage of the agreement. The goal is a Vietnam whose independence is guaranteed and respected.

Robert R. Archer, Professor; Raymond S. Beard, Business Counselor; Marguerite S. Bellamy, Housewife; Keith C. Billman, Social Worker; Evelyn A. Blackburn, Insurance Agent; Isabel N. Bliss, Homemaker; William M. Bliss, Engineer; Edith O. Brashares, College Instructor; Edwin A. Brown, Minister; Rilmia Buckman, Sociologist; Bronson P. Clark, Businessman; Sheldon D. Clark, Lawyer; Lila Cornell, Homemaker; Marie F. Cotton, Homemaker; Wendell P. Cotton, Salesman; Natalie C. Crouter, Housewife; Elfrieda S. Dalber, Secretary; Alan J. Davis, Minister; Hortense M. Davis, Teacher; Jack G. Day, Lawyer; Steven Deutsch, University Faculty; Mort Epstein, Designer; Gail R. Gann, Homemaker; Donald S. Gann, Surgeon; Joel M. Garver, Lawyer; Paul Gitlin, Social Worker; Henry Gluck, Psychologist; William F. Hellmuth, Jr., professor; Arnold A. Herzog, Lawyer; Fred Husa, Office Worker; Sidney D. Josephs, Businessman; Mrs. Harry Kirtz, Homemaker; Waldo H. Kliever, Consultant; Dennis G. Kuby, Minister; Jerome Landfield, College Professor; Ada N. Leffingwell, Homemaker; George Levinger, Educator; John P. Marhevka, Male Hair Stylist; Mrs. Edward A. Marshall, Homemaker; Charles R. Miller, Lawyer; Paul I. Miller, Professor; Hans F. Mueller, Retired; Laura Mueller, Homemaker; Sarah B. Nenner, Housewife; James M. Newman, Advertising; Paul Olynik, Professor; Clyde Onyett, Public Relations; William W. Outland, Order Analyst; Samuel Prellwitz, Industrial Research; Harold J. Quigley, Minister; Willard C. Richan, Educator; Eldon P. Roe, Merchant; Marian Rosenberg, Social Worker; Ralph Rudd, Lawyer; Audrey Sabadosh, Librarian; Nicholas Sabadosh, Teacher; Wilmer L. Satterthwait, Painter; Vera A. Schwartz, Legal Secretary; A. L. Sherwin, Lawyer; Frank Spigel, Lawyer; Benjamin Spock, Physician; Sam Sponseller, Retired; Vera Smisek, Teacher; Oscar H. Steiner, Businessman; Helen Stewart, High School Counselor; Edward A. Taubert, Photographer; Warren E. Thompson, Educator; Hugh Tyson, Graduate Student; Harry O. Way, Bacteriologist.
(This statement paid for by the signers.)

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,
June 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I express my deep appreciation for the position you have consistently taken on the Vietnam situation? It seems you are one of very few in the Senate who have taken this position, yet I believe most of the American people stand with you.

It seems, sometimes, that the administration has been goaded into its position by the Birchites, etc. It can't be good politics and it certainly is not good foreign policy. The U.N. may have some business there but

not the United States. If these people are to be saved from communism what are they to be saved for? Another Madame Nhu?

In our country's foreign policy does every other country have to be either capitalist or Communist? What's wrong with letting them decide. If they decide to try some socialistic form of government then that is their business. I simply cannot subscribe to the thinking that our system is synonymous with right and that their system is synonymous with wrong. Why do we want to keep on being ugly Americans in the eyes of most of the citizens of the world? We have been unsuccessful in making law-abiding citizens out of Mississippians (and others). Who do we think we are in telling southeast Asia how to live? A war there may never be lost but it is certain it would never be won.

Please continue to do all in your power to let the President and others in positions of responsibility know what you think is right for America during these times.

In appreciation,

TED H. CRABTREE.

P.S.—My typing is at least as good as my spelling.

ALLEGAN, MICH., June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Have seen you many times on TV but the issue of the Vietnam war June 25 was right to the point; we are all with you here. Why do they use this issue as a political football during this election campaign? We are certainly losing ground that all America was founded on. Don't we have enough red-blooded American Senators that would take a stand with you? Have you ever thought of running for the Presidency? I believe you would do a good job for us—would like to see more of you on TV.

Sincerely,

MARIE C. SMITH.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are right in everything you said about the war in Vietnam. This is a United Nations and SEATO problem—not ours. We have no business policing Asia. My son is over there and I want him home. I hope you win your point and I am not alone. I can produce dozens of families that feel as I do. We are sticking our nose into other people's troubles and have enough of our own. God bless you.

PATRICIA M. FRAZER.

P.S.—I saw you on "Today Show" this a.m. You were wonderful but makes my heart bleed to think of another war.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: So many of my friends and I want to commend you on your stand on "our" war in Vietnam and Laos. There is enough to work for here at home besides interfering in civil wars on the other side of the world.

Keep up the good work.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Mrs. FRANCES G. BERLIN.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your appearance on the "Today" show, Thursday, June 24 was sensational. I wish every man and woman in America could have heard you. In the past I have seldom agreed with you, but today I stood up at my breakfast table and cheered. Thank you, sir.

Mrs. E. J. KESSLER.

JUNE 26, 1964.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: After hearing you talk on the "Today" show, June 25, I just want to tell you

what you said makes sense in my opinion. I hope and pray that more Congressmen take the same position.

On the "Today" show they announced after your interview that Senator CHURCH would be on the next day to give a different view of the situation but after hearing Senator CHURCH this morning it seems to me that he has just about the same opinion of the situation in southeast Asia that you have. With all the problems in this country that we don't seem to be able to cope with I don't think we should be over on the other side of the world trying to solve problems.

Jack Lescouille on the "Today" show said it was surprising to him that people didn't seem to know or care about this problem we have taken on as ours in southeast Asia, of course those are not his exact words but that was the general idea he was talking about. It is a shame that more of our people cannot be awakened to the need to be actively interested in what their lawmakers are doing. I am very thankful to the "Today" show for trying to help in this matter.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GLADYS BRANDHUBER.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree with your position opposing the present involvement of the United States in Southeast Asia and further extension of such involvement.

I urge you to carry your opposition and viewpoint aggressively to the people via every means of communication possible. It is only such voices as yours that can prevent the United States from further violation of international law and treaties.

Respectfully yours,

D. W. MILLER.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., June 24, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my sincere gratitude for your courageous efforts in opposing our Government's policy in South Vietnam.

Your vocal expressions are the only optimistic note in this unbelievable mess.

Mrs. ALLAN F. SELADER.

GRAND HAVEN, MICH.,
June 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I surely agree with your talk over the "Today" program on the talk you gave over the air. You are a 100-percent American and you are certainly right on your Red China stand.

Stop and think what it will mean to have any war of any kind.

Keep up the good work.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT L. DICK.

PLAINFIELD, N.J.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I heard you this morning on "Today" and I think you are absolutely right. It is an outrage to send our boys to be killed in Asia. We stick our noses in too many countries and the money we pour into Communist countries is outrageous. If I had a son, I think I would rather he died a natural death than to send him to Vietnam. Do keep up your work and try and curb the ridiculous spending of life and money outside of the United States.

Sincerely,

HELEN STIRTSMAN.

P.S.—My husband was mayor of Plainfield in 1929 and judge of the district court; were he alive, he would agree with you.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
June 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I have just finished listening to you on the "Today" television show. We are so grateful to find we still have a statesman in our Government, and not just all individuals striving for their own political gain.

I have never been able to understand why the world seemed to condone the fact that we got up in arms when Cuba based another country's warmaking machinery on Cuba's soil, when the United States is parked on practically everyone's doorstep. This to me is just not fair reasoning.

We have two sons serving in the Armed Forces at the present time. One a young ensign on the U.S.S. *Dominant*, in the Mediterranean, and the other a private first class, in Germany. Our young next door neighbor is now in Valley Forge Hospital from injuries received in Vietnam, so these scattered "bonfires" are very real to us.

If there is anything that you know of that average citizens can do to help you get this problem into the United Nations and on into the right channels, we shall be very glad to help.

Thank you again for sharing your enlightened wisdom with us.

Very truly yours,

KATHRYN BROADMAN
Mrs. David Broadman.

EXCELSIOR, MINN., June 25, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just want to tell you how gratifying it was to hear your brave words on the "Today" program this morning. I agree with every word you said, and I only wish that your voice could reach the White House and the State Department.

Sending General Taylor as Ambassador to Vietnam is certainly not a step toward peace.

Sincerely,

Mrs. PAUL F. KIESEL.

WITHEE, WIS., June 25, 1964.

Senator W. MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just heard your wonderful talk on the "Today" program over NBC. I heartily agree that our boys should not be in Vietnam. A little 4-year-old said to me "if you vote for a Democrat it means war." How can we change that picture and idea? I have voted Democratic since F.D.R. and I would like to be proud of my party, but how when we do the things that you outlined in your talk. May you have the courage, money, and stamina to keep airing these views.

My heart is in this. I have a son leaving for Korea in July.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARTIN KESKIMAKI.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH,
Pittsburgh, Pa., June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have a feeling that yours must be a bitter and lonely lot—now in the first aftermath of the Asian crisis and your sublime response to it. I put these few words on paper because I hope to dilute by an infinitesimal amount the abuse probably inflicted on you. I hope that you understand that at least in the academic communities that you are a prophet with honor. Also that yours is not the ephemeral kind that comes and goes with political campaigns. It is of the type that will be deeply engraven in the records of the history of our times. I do not and cannot speak for the existing guild of historians, but I have sufficient experience to know that if there

is a future—better than radioactive debris, you will be recorded as one of its major achievers. You may be pleased to know that at least among my colleagues, each new crisis evoked by our insane stance leads us to say, almost instinctively that "Senator MORSE will take a stand."

I with that there was some simple, direct way to convey to you the admiration that I feel for your discharge of your high office. Were I a deeply religious person, it could be put as: "Thank God for WAYNE MORSE." As it is, there is only the statement, the historians will write your name in the lot of those who deserved the most of the countrymen.

Respectfully,

ROBERT G. COLODNY,
Associate Professor, History.

FORT WAYNE, IND.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Heard part of your discussion of South Vietnam and southeast Asia and TV this morning in answer to questions by newscasters.

Most erudite, most reasonable, most logical, and factual discussion I have heard and the most authoritative devoid of emotionalism and politics.

It was also a brave explanation. You will be accused of everything and a lesser light might even be accused of aiding the Communists if he had said the things you did.

Also, your solutions are based on the Christian spirit of which our country boasts. I want to say that I wish we had more men and women fearless enough and intelligent enough and moral enough to fight for the things in southeast Asia and our role there as you have done.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONLEY, M.D.

HINSDALE, ILL., June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your position and public statement relative to the Vietnam situation.

It is indeed disturbing in time of peace, in a country in which "only Congress shall declare war," to have our Communist riddled State Department "arrange the war," as I firmly believe they also did with Japan prior to Pearl Harbor.

Is China such a threat to Russia that our pink darlings feel that it is our duty to take them "off the hook," or are they afraid that if Russia became entangled with China, that the Red satellites may get an opportunity to free themselves?

For God's sake, do all possible to put the management of our country back in the hands of our representatives, and out of the hands of our damnable State Department.

Again, my thanks for men of your courage.

Sincerely,

GEORGE H. REDIEHS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was very good hearing you today on "Issues and Answers."

Thank you for representing the American people's side on the war in Vietnam.

With all good and kind wishes.

LUCILLE OSTON.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SIR: I would like to thank you for your courageous stand on South Vietnam.

Most people that I know think it is a messy situation, but say they don't know enough to write or sign petitions. There is a news blackout here, and your views are not heard. Continue the good work.

MISS CHARLOTTE GRANT.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
June 28, 1964.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

SIR AND GENTLEMAN: According to Pittsburgh Press, "Washington Calling," column, June 28, 1964, printed the following statement: "Senator WAYNE MORSE, Oregon Democrat, who disagrees with administration's Vietnam policy, is getting close attention from Communist news agencies. When he said he was convinced 'the greatest threat to the peace of the world is the United States,' the Communists broadcast his remark."

Mr. WAYNE MORSE, when I enter the voting booth I vote independently of party labels or tags. But I do say, and have said ever since World War I, that the United States, as today's reading of events and actions since World War I, to the present day and time proves such a charge as most correct in all details. And, Mr. MORSE, you don't have to be a Communist to see that.

Instead of maintaining and expanding not only our respectability and leadership among the nations of the world's people, we as a nation have, and are, becoming a nation that is despised and hated by the world's exploited, robbed, and murdered peoples, that was and is being accelerated by the hour, by and through the "cloak and dagger" organization—the CIA.

Our Constitution which may not be the acme and omega of perfection, nevertheless, is being torn asunder and our personal liberties being obliterated one by one, every day. We do not legislate by law today. We legislate by committees, witch hunters, and inquisition, and thereby traveling the very same highway that Rome trod, and will meet the same destruction.

In other words, we are fiddling while the United States burns.

In closing, be prepared to be maligned, ridiculed, slandered, and reviled, even impeached, if not murdered, if you stand by your guns, which is a fact.

America as a country, is great, grand, and beautiful. But surely is badly managed. And the present management better soon be changed to a better one. Or there won't be anything worth, or to manage.

I have been watching—and remonstrating—at the hypocritical, wasteful destruction of this country's resources and produced wealth since the year 1884 and the only difference from then to now is we are traveling down the slope to chaos faster than logs down a mountainside.

These are times that try men's souls. Are you and some others just summer soldiers, or are you made up of the materials that stand the heat of battle? I hope so, but time will tell.

Most respectfully yours,

CHAS. A. FRANCIS.

PASSAIC, N.J.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard you on TV Sunday and I want you to know how wholeheartedly I agree with you on foreign policy and especially on the trouble in Vietnam.

I was alarmed when I read in the New York Times this morning that President Johnson said in Minneapolis that the United States, "when necessary," would not hesitate to "risk war" to preserve the peace.

In my opinion that would be no peace.

Thank you for the wonderful work you are doing in the Senate. I only wish there were many more like you, Senator HUMPHREY and Senator FULBRIGHT, and others.

Very sincerely yours,
MISS HERTHA LINGG.

ELIZABETH, N.J.,
June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just heard WABC's "Issues and Answers" and several weeks ago, I watched WCBS's "Face the Nation." I am certainly pleased that somebody in your position has the "guts" to expound your philosophy of foreign policy even though many of your colleagues will not publicly approve of your comments and evaluations. I certainly agree with practically everything you mentioned on both programs. I am not too sure that the United Nations is the complete solution; however, I feel it would be superior to the current U.S. unilateral military action in Vietnam and elsewhere, including the U.S. planes in Laos.

It is comforting to know that we share the same opinions on the use of volunteers in McNamara's war, using SEATO allies in a peacekeeping role in Vietnam and the realization that the Vietnam puppets "we" set up are not as effective as the Nhu family. It was certainly a shame to see Madame Nhu's predictions about coups, etc., during her visit to the United States last year, become tragic realities several months later.

I am quite concerned about the outcome of the Far Eastern situation since I have very dear friends in the Philippines who occasionally travel in Thailand, Japan, etc. on U.N., Philippine Government and Philippine atomic energy matters. However, I repeat that I feel the U.S. actions are wrong and illegal.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES S. MCKARNS.

NEW ROCHELLE, N.Y.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE: With General Taylor going to South Vietnam it can mean one thing only.

I would like to know why Americans are the only ones sent to Vietnam?

Why are not other countries trying to help out over there?

Generals want war to add to their glory, but the mothers, wives and sweethearts of the American men do not want war.

Can you do something to stop the war-mongers from exploiting our men over there. We have lost too many men already.

Thank you for your consideration,
J. MIMNAUGH.

JUNE 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senior Senator of Oregon,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It was with great interest that I listened to your statements on today's "Issues and Answers." I share your opinion concerning our actions in southeast Asia 100 percent and I hope that enough people will have listened to you so that they snap out of their blind indifference and complacency to tolerate the brinkmanship of the Pentagon.

I understand that the Senate has the right to vote for or against the appointment of an ambassador. Why then don't you show through your vote that you disapprove strongly this newest move of appointing the Chief of Staff of our military forces to an ambassadorship, a move which throughout the world can have only one meaning? I suppose that Senator FULBRIGHT has similar views.

If you two and some other reasonable men who like you, watch with deep concern our slithering into a new war, would take an energetic stand maybe it could stop Mr.

Johnson to put his trust so completely in Mr. McNamara.

Very sincerely yours,
LOUIS F. LUCAS.

GLENVIEW, ILL.,
June 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your remarks on the television program, "Issues and Answers," today. While we believe in the ideals of the Democratic Party and have long voted for its candidates, my family and I have been greatly disappointed in the policy being used in the Far East. We have had a part in and have seen what happens in war, especially since the Second World War, and we believe in and support as we can the United Nations with all its operations as our best hope for the world. We have never been able to understand why the United States has not tried the United Nations for the Far Eastern troubles. We hope that there is still a chance for President Johnson to change his course and try. Surely, at this point, he is carrying us more slowly than the Republicans would, but nevertheless, into war without trying the United Nations' machinery for keeping the peace.

Thank you again for your remarks today. I am writing our great Senator, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, to this effect.

Respectfully yours,
RUTH M. FELTON
Mrs. Ruth M. Felton.

JUNE 27, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Among many other concerned Americans I am deeply grateful to you for your forthright questioning of our self-defeating un-American policies in southeast Asia. It is hard for me to understand how our Government can be so shortsighted as to believe that our prestige and influence in Asia can be increased by policies of a sort that were discredited even before World War II, and which—as you note—have been declared illegal under a variety of international agreements.

Has it ever occurred to you that by designating our regional alliances as specifically against "Communist" aggression and expansion that we have unconsciously reproduced the pre-World War II Axis "anti-Comintern Pact"? The U.S. Government condemned this Axis Pact as designed to hide their own aggressive and expansionist aims. I very much fear that our own anti-Communist pacts seem similarly aggressive and expansionist to many governments which reject communism for their own societies. During the formation of the SEATO, for example, the Asian governments deplored the U.S. emphasis on military force to "contain communism" and urged policies for economic development.

I am venturing to enclose some letters to the Times I've written on this issue. Some have been published, some not. Our Government's distortions of the record are truly shocking. Please keep pressing the issue. We, the American people, seem increasingly to be pushed into the role of robot—rather than the informed electorate on which our democracy rests.

With appreciation,
Sincerely,
HELEN MEARS.

APRIL 17, 1964.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:
A Times' editorial (April 16), headed "Blood Sport" began: "A deranged youth steps out on an Albany hotel ledge. Twelve stories below, crowds urge him to jump. Not to a net's safety. To death. What kind of people

can become such a mob? How can adults yell 'chicken' and 'yellow' to another human dangling on the lip of danger?"

Yes. But a more urgent question is how can some of our leading citizens cry chicken to our Government and urge it to carry out bombing attacks against North Vietnam? How can our Government, in effect, say yellow to the Vietnamese who want a U.S.-maintained fratricidal slaughter stopped? Not long ago the Times published a wirephoto from South Vietnam showing a small child hideously burned by napalm supplied by the United States, and dropped from a U.S.-supplied plane, piloted by a young American. Many of our most respected citizens tell us we must continue such activities or lose prestige. Others calmly debate whether a bombing attack against North Vietnam would be good or bad as an election gimmick.

The Times editorial concluded: "Disregard for another's life—by inertia or, worse, by goading—takes civilized people back to the cave. Does the attitude of that Albany mob bespeak a way of life for many Americans? If so, the bell tolls for all of us."

The Times says it better than I can, but it addresses its feeling of shock at the gnat. The lesser evil. It is the camel, national policy, that is truly frightening. If disregard for human life is ugly for the man-in-the-street, it is infinitely uglier at the level of national policy. Whether consciously or unconsciously our attitudes are influenced by those of our Nation's leaders. Our leaders have chosen the caveman's club, rather than the civilized men's tools of negotiation, arbitration, conciliation. In Vietnam our whole nation is the mob. And the bell is tolling.

HELEN MEARS.

JUNE 15, 1964.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:
In his column of June 3, C. L. Sulzberger declared that the SEATO alliance was no help in carrying out U.S. policy in Vietnam, and concluded that: "We must therefore face the problem of salvaging our Indochina crisis on the basis of what we consider right * * * In southeast Asia we must honor our commitments and respect our interest."

Most Americans would surely agree with Mr. Sulzberger that the U.S. Government should "honor our commitments." The difficulty is that by now the U.S. Government has made so many directly conflicting commitments that it literally cannot be faithful to all of them.

The United States is committed, under the U.N. Charter, not to use force save in the common interest. No U.N. resolution has ever requested, or authorized, U.S. military aid in South Vietnam.

The U.S. Government was further committed by the Geneva Accord of 1954 not to send modern military equipment, not to send additional military advisers, and certainly not to send 16,000 "miscellaneous military, many of them to actual combat, disguised as "advisers." Mr. Sulzberger actually quotes the late Secretary of State Dulles as telling him, in February 1955 that: "The Geneva * * * accord bars the importation into Indochina of new military aid. The United States of America can't increase the number of its military advisers."

The United States was, at least morally, committed to accept the result of a nationwide election to be held throughout Vietnam in 1956. The United States backed the decision of Ngo Dinh Diem not to hold the election.

The United States was committed to support Diem as the "legally elected President of the Republic of Vietnam." When Diem was overthrown by a military coup—with at least indirect encouragement from the United States, the United States at once committed itself to the new regime. When that regime was overthrown by another military

coup the United States at once committed itself to it.

Increasingly since late 1960, the U.S. Government has committed itself to the war effort in South Vietnam. Of all the commitments this appears to be the one the U.S. Government chooses to honor.

Is a commitment to a war effort in Vietnam the sort of commitment Americans in general would choose to honor above prior commitments to seek solutions by negotiation, arbitration, mediation, and by techniques spelled out in the U.N. Charter?

In a presidential election year, in a democracy, isn't this the sort of question that should be debated?

HELEN MEARS.

RUSK DISPUTED ON VIETNAM—GENEVA ACCORDS FORBID INDEPENDENT ENTITY IN SOUTH. WRITER STATES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In his press conference (the Times, Nov. 9) Secretary of State Rusk, responding to a question about Vietnam, said: "The other side was fully committed—fully committed—in the original Geneva settlement of 1954 to the arrangements, which provided for South Vietnam as an independent entity."

This is a puzzling statement. The record seems to prove that not only did the Geneva agreements of 1954 not provide for South Vietnam as an independent entity, but expressly forbade such a development. Article 6 of the final declaration says of Vietnam that "the military demarcation line should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary * * *." The 17th parallel was chosen merely as a cease-fire line to separate the opposing military forces.

The agreements specifically provided that Vietnam should be unified by nationwide elections in 1956. These facts are acknowledged in a State Department pamphlet "A Threat to the Peace," published in December 1961, which gives the U.S. official position about the Vietnam problem at that time. The pamphlet explains why the Diem government refused to carry out the agreement to hold the scheduled election, and why the U.S. Government backed Diem's position. The State Department wrote: "It was the Communists' calculation that nationwide elections scheduled in the accords for 1956 would turn all of Vietnam over to them."

It is profoundly disturbing to find our own Government rewriting history. It is not easy to see how our Government can encourage adherence to international agreements by ignoring them.

HELEN MEARS.

NEW YORK, November 11, 1963.

VIETNAM WITHDRAWAL URGED—EVENTS BELIEVED TO INDICATE NEITHER LEADERS NOR PEOPLE WANT OUR HELP

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES: Reporting to the House Armed Services Committee on January 27, Secretary of Defense McNamara said:

"In the case of South Vietnam our help is clearly wanted, and we are deeply engaged in supporting the Vietnamese Government and people in their war against the Communist Vietcong."

Surely Secretary McNamara meant to say "our help is clearly not wanted," for almost as he was speaking the Government which presumably wanted "our help" to keep fighting was overthrown by another military coup, and the Times reported this event in headlines which read: "Vietnam Junta Ousted by Military Dissidents Who Fear 'Neutrality.'"

In other words, the generals whom our Government supported in their coup to replace the Diem government which was beginning to "flirt with neutrality" began in turn to incline toward the same policy. If anything seems "clear" in this grim situation

it is that our Government is finding it increasingly difficult to find even military leaders who "clearly want our help" to continue their fratricidal strife.

As for the Vietnamese people, it has never been their war. If reports in the Times (and our newsweeklies) have made anything clear, it is that the Vietnamese people have supported the war so little that a ruthless policy of forcing them into fortified villages was introduced to prevent them from helping the guerrilla fighters. And the so-called Vietcong may or may not be Communists, or pro-Communist, but they are unquestionably Vietnamese.

LACK OF OUTCRY

The situation in Vietnam is so unworthy of us that the apparent lack of popular outcry against it suggests a condition of indifference and moral callousness few of us would have believed possible only a few years ago. It is this growing apathy and callousness that is the true enemy of the "values we hold dear."

The U.S. Government should at once present the problem of Vietnam to the U.N. Security Council, and should withdraw our military advisers and stop providing millions of dollars a day to keep a war going.

If our leadership means only destruction and death for the people who live in distant areas our commentators call "strategic real estate," our Nation will go down in history as just another rampaging great power, self-convinced that our might makes right. And it will not be the Communists who will have betrayed us. It will have been ourselves.

HELEN MEARS.

NEW YORK, January 31, 1964.

AFRICAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE ASSOCIATION, Chicago, Ill., June 24, 1964.

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

HONORABLE SIR: Our association has directed that we commend you on your firm and critical stand against the policies of our Government in Vietnam and southeast Asia. Our organization associates itself with you in the proposition (1) that the role of our Government played in the South Vietnamese situation endangers world peace and the whole of mankind itself; (2) should be immediately referred to the United Nations.

Moreover, sir, we think it strange that the Government of the United States can involve itself in police action for "freedom in South Vietnam" and cannot involve itself in Mississippi and the Southern States with police action to preserve freedom, the Bill of Rights, and the right of every citizen to vote. We are certain that Afro-Americans, people of African descent, colonial peoples everywhere look with grave misgivings on this strange contradiction. We are certain that more and more democratic-minded people everywhere will question the role of our Government and the American people as representing a nation devoted to preserving freedom and democracy in the world.

A copy of this letter in support of your views is being forwarded to the President of the United States and to the representatives in Congress. We urge you to hold fast and endure to the end that our Nation and its people not become the perpetrators of a world thermonuclear war.

Yours truly,

ISHMAEL FLORY,
Director of Organization.

(Cc: Lyndon Johnson, President of the United States, Washington, D.C.; Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D.C.; Senators Paul Douglas and Everett Dirksen; Congressmen William L. Dawson, Charles Diggs, Augustus Hawkins, Robert Nix, Adam Powell.)

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SIR: Heard you on the "Today" show this morning. You voice the stand that I have thought we should take. What can we do to stop the present program? Are we big enough to say we made a mistake? E.J.D.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

DEAR SIR: How wonderful your stand on Vietnam—saw you on TV program "Today." I thoroughly concur with you and hope for more Americans to know the truth about this.

MISS SAKI DIKRAN.

NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.

Thank God for Senators like you and the work you are doing toward stopping the horrible war in Vietnam.

Mrs. ESTHER METLIZ.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: At a meeting of 100 women held at Mapleton Park Synagogue, Brooklyn, on June 25, 1964, it was firmly stated that we agree wholeheartedly with your stand on Vietnam. We should never have gone there. We urge your further demonstration of good will to bring our boys home and negotiate a peace through the U.N.

Mrs. R. GOLDHEIME.

GLENDALE, CALIF., June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: You were great on Today NBC program subject of the President's private war in southeast Asia. But many think the king can do wrong, another F.D.R. image and look where its got us?

You should have been a Republican—yes—we shoot at Communists over there and coddle them here at home. Speak at colleges, etc.

Yours truly,

H. BANKY.

JUNE 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I agree with everything you said about our policy in Asia, on the "Today" show.

Glad to hear you express your opinion. We need more like you in the Government. Hope others who agree with you, will write you. As I am sure you will hear from the GOLDWATER followers, and Pentagon friends.

Keep talking.

Very truly,

Mrs. MILTON H. ROGERS.

OAK PARK, MICH.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: We agree with you that President Johnson has no power to make or declare war in Vietnam but only Congress has.

We heard you on the "Today" program, June 25, 1964, and thank you for telling us the best way to settle the Vietnam situation is in the United Nations as I and most American people I am sure agree. We want peace and not men killed—that is what the United Nations is for.

MARY and SOL HAMMERSTEIN.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Thank you for expressing the truth on the "Today" program on TV channel 4, on June 25, 1964. It is indeed unconstitutional to have a President of United States make war or declare war instead of Congress. We do not want war and have American boys killed in Vietnam. We want things settled peacefully in the United Nations.

Thank you,

Mr. and Mrs. ABE GOLDBERG.

JUNE 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: We listened to your brilliant speech on South Vietnam on "Today" TV. It is refreshing to have a Democrat pick flaws in the present administration's policy with concrete knowledge of our Constitution.

We don't want another Korea, or Bay of Pigs mistake.

If we are at war let Congress declare it. Am proud that our 18-year-old son enlisted in World War II—as did his father in World War I—both after Congress declared war.

We try to help other countries, yet are blind to our own small civil war.

Respectfully,

H. BRICE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was good to hear your strong voice in opposition to the Vietnam war. I have been disturbed over it from the beginning and feel powerless to do anything about it. I agree thoroughly with you.

Sincerely,

SARA LOWREY.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up your vehement protest against stepped-up, undeclared dirty war in Vietnam where American casualty list enlarges daily.

Show up the wickedness of a statement from some underling in authority in Washington that no protection assured to those brave young people helping to register in Mississippi, followed that day or next by total disappearance of three heroic young people. Place Army where needed.

Admiringly yours,

A. C. DART.

JUNE 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Confucius said the first step toward peace and order is "to rectify the names"—to call things for what they are—a spade a spade, a thief a thief, etc.

We are greatly encouraged by your boldness in calling a spade a spade and warmongering, warmongering. For the future of your country and the future of mankind, we hope you will continue to do it just as you are doing.

Our sincerest support for your effort.

Dr. and Mrs. HAROLD BASS.

FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 1964.

We are backing your stand to get out of Vietnam. Keep the good work up. Good luck and best wishes.

The DORSBY FAMILY.

TUCSON, ARIZ.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My congratulations to you for the courage you have shown in speaking out on the situation in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

LORETTA SMITH.

JUNE 25.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I deeply appreciated your thought-provoking statements on TV this morning and am thoroughly in accord with them. Many women in Maryland will agree with you.

LAURA C. A. LA FOE.

TACOMA, WASH., June 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Cheers for your statement re U.S. position as the world's No. 1 warmonger.

The recent statements made by the administration regarding increasing the war is quite frightening. I urge you to do all you can to influence more Senators to your position.

YVONNE BRAUNE.

TACOMA, WASH.

Senator WAYNE MORSE: I congratulate you on the courage and good sense you have shown on the Vietnam situation.

I fear though that there will not be enough to take the stand you have taken.

You have never done, in my opinion, what was expedient but dared to do what you thought was right.

MARK H. ANDERSON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

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

DEAR SIR: I want to express my appreciation for your stand regarding the involvement of the United States in South Vietnam.

Respectfully,

I. MARTIN.

LUBBOCK, TEX.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We heard you on the "Today" program this morning and we think you are 100 percent right and under God, why we the people are sitting idly by, I do not understand.

Please make a speech on TV and rally the people behind you. Another mistake Johnson made is appointing Earl Warren to head the committee on the President's death and now sending Dulles to Mississippi.

Mr. and Mrs. HENDRIX.

DEAR SENATOR: We fully agree with you in stating that the United States should stay out of Vietnam and to try and prevent war and leave the problem up to the United Nations. Our community are all for your statements.

THE 85 CLUB.

GLOVERSVILLE, N.Y., June 25, 1964.

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

This morning I heard you on channel 6 about 8 a.m. Your voice was expressed truthfully against our policy in Asia. I think I should rush to tell you I support you 100 percent. I am going to send a card to the President and tell him I support you and hope he changes the policy to give the U.N. the case.

Sincerely,

S. R. NESTLE.

CLAREMONT, CALIF., June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I lived in Peiping 1916-40. I heard you on "Today." We sure agree with you 100 percent. Keep talking and good luck.

FLORA WILSON.

PALO ALTO, CALIF., June 23, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support your efforts to have United States find new approaches to southeast Asia problems—and I support you in your opposition to unilateral military power that short-circuits the United Nations or other international means for peaceful, creative solution to these problems.

Sincerely,

OLIVER HENDERSON, M.D.

STOCKTON, CALIF., June 25, 1964.

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

Sir: Congratulations on your Vietnam speech.

What can we do to help you?

WILDA HUFFMAN,

California State Democratic Central
Committee, President, Democratic
Women's Club.

JUNE 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We support and commend your position regarding our involvement in Vietnam. It is time more of us expressed our opinions on this vital issue. We feel sure that many other Americans think as you do.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. PAUL KERBER.

ALVIN, TEX.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Thank you for speaking for peace. I have wondered for a long time

what my boys and others could do about peace and dying in Vietnam. It seems that we all want to know more good reasons for dying in Vietnam. The climate would kill a lot. Let's settle the problems without killing our boys.

Thanks,

Mrs. J. E. BURGE.

LAMONI, IOWA.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your "Today" appearance was good. You presented our case well. I agree with all you said, sir. And I urge you to continue saying it with the same clarity and reason and restraint and hard-hitting truth and patriotism that you showed in your "Today" appearance.

Perhaps the policies in Asia are devices to last through election; but the danger is that they will get out of hand, or into the wrong hands—and we may not be able to stem the tide. Even, without that, to play politics with the lives of men seems very wrong. But it is probably no bluff—and we need your voice—and that of other good liberals or we may well lose the respect of the world.

Truly, and with great thanks,

GLADYS MARTIN.

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Heard you this morning over the "Today" program. Very thankful we have a Senator like you. I am very much in agreement with your convictions. And the average U.S. citizen is also, I believe. The layman is discussing, and seriously, politics, these days and the present administration would be surprised at the amount of commonsense he has.

I am neither a Democrat or from Oregon, but heartily endorse your standpoint on this issue (Vietnam).

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. GRACE CLOER.

DEAR SIR: I'm glad to hear your views on Vietnam on TV. I agree with you. I've lived in Japan for 2 years, the news there presents only the views of the administration, yet I've only talked to one person who believed we ought to be in Vietnam. I would like to hear interviews of the common soldier, both for and against the war in Vietnam. I've heard them, but never see them in print.

Mrs. D. R. NICHOLS.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard that you will oppose confirmation of General Taylor as Ambassador to Vietnam. Thank God for a few like you.

I asked Senator HART to send me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD just so I can follow what you and your friends are saying about Laos and Vietnam. I told him why, too.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. MILDRED FRANKLIN.

DEAR SIR: You are the only one with any sense in Washington. I hope they put all the warmongers in the firing lines in Asia, as the rest of us people don't care who rules Asia. We have enough to take care of our own troubles, and so has all other people of the world no matter who rules them, and for God's sake we would like to know the truth from the State and Defense Departments for a change before we lose all the faith in our Government.

Appreciate your outspokenness on stopping the terrible war in Vietnam. No more American boys must be killed there.

Mrs. B. RAIND.

BURT, MICH.

DEAR SIR: Keep up the good work. I wish you luck in stopping Maxwell Taylor from becoming Ambassador to that terrible jungle

mudhole called South Vietnam. We Americans, including little Caroline and John John do not want a nuclear devastation war for our America over that Vietnam mudhole. It is insane.

E. J. SCHRAMM.

JUNE 2, 1964.

DEAR WAYNE MORSE: Hearty approval from us and many of our friends for your stand against U.S. war in Vietnam (we have just heard your brilliant presentation on "Today" show). Somebody has got to stand for sanity—keep it up.

BEN and DAISYLEE FUSON.

LOUDONVILLE, N.Y.

SIR: On "Today," June 25, you spoke the truth. It had never appeared to us in that light. We trust you will continue to press and stress your convictions.

MRS. ROBERT S. HART.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard your interview on the "Today" program and only wish, as a mother of two sons (volunteers, one Army, one Air Force) that we had more good men like you representing our Government and interests.

A MOTHER OF TWO SERVICEMEN.

HONORABLE MORSE: You are absolutely right about the Asian situation. I have been concerned about our policy there for a long time.

Please keep talking and attempt to get the people here to protest.

M. F. FRICHSER.

JUNE 24, 1964.

SENATOR MORSE: When you speak out for us, for our sons, you revive our hopes, bolster our faith, help us believe that somehow, somehow simple sanity will prevent our Government from forcing our finest young men into a hell that would be even worse than Korea. Do those who would vote for a horror of this kind have no sons, no grandsons? Have they become bloodless, heartless, conscienceless? I say, let them go and face the misery, degradation, abuse, torture—that has been the lot of our boys who were sent to fight battles for people who would not fight for themselves. Yours may seem a lone voice, Senator MORSE, but the people are listening. Would to God those in power were before it's too late. We honor and respect you because you speak out for us—and say what we believe.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your opposition to our asinine policy on Vietnam. Your voice is like a bit of fresh air coming out of Washington these days.

Yours truly,

NORMAN JENSEN.

JUNE 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I am one of many citizens grateful that you are making every effort to preserve the good image of our country. I have been in the Far East and southeast Asia and know how "we" are hated. Your stand on the Vietnam situation has my wholehearted support.

HELEN BLAIR.

LOS ANGELES,
June 26, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Your stand on the situation in Vietnam is courageous and expresses the feeling of most of my friends and myself. Keep up your good work.

RUBY ROSENTHAL,

JUNE 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: It seems that the South Vietnam government are unpopular with

its citizenry, and that our soldier advisers are getting themselves killed, apparently they are being killed in warfare instead of safely acting as advisors.

Respectfully,

ALLEN KENDEL.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: We heard your interview on the "Today" show this morning and thoroughly agree with everything you said. We have followed your career with a great deal of interest through the years and only regret that we are unable to vote for you.

We wish to thank you for representing our views in the Senate.

EDNA and ARNOLD KLEIN.

BELLEVUE, ILL.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I listened to your interview on the "Today" show. I congratulate you for your "unpopular position" of disagreement with this administration's position on Vietnam. I also feel this matter should be in the United Nations hands. Please pursue this standpoint—many Americans agree, I am sure. You were very forceful on the interview.

TACOMA, WASH.,
June 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: By some happy miracle the TV carried your toxin alarm. Please take this to the U.N. The Congress has plainly abdicated its power to declare war or peace.

PAUL BROWNE.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Many times I do not agree with your ideas. But I do want to give you a big pat on the back for your feelings and for your courageous statements as expressed when you appeared on "Today's" program this a.m. Too many acts have been by Executive action.

LOUIS B. ARMBRECHT,
A Legionnaire and a 40 et 8'er.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

I support your stand on our getting out of South Vietnam which would save the world from a dangerous war.

Mrs. F. ELKINS.

CALDWELL, N.J.,
June 26, 1964.

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

We wish to commend you for your speech on South Vietnam on "Today" show June 25. Keep fighting for public interest because it is the only way to bring attention to our representatives in Congress as to the dire needs of men dying in a disorganized war of the rice paddy in South Vietnam. You have the heart of the American Eagle.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS J. MOONEY, Jr.
JAMES PHILLIPS.

TOPANGA, CALIF.,
June 27, 1964.

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

We support your position regarding southeast Asia. Keep up good work.

IAN and JANE THIERMANN.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
June 28, 1964.

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

Congratulations to your brilliantly spoken words on "Issues and Answers."

MORRIS BERKOWITZ.

DETROIT, MICH.,
June 26, 1964.

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

Bravo your stand on Vietnam et al. Many are behind you—keep pressure on.

ROSE and MILTON SCHWARTZ.

EDINBURG, TEX.,
June 26, 1964.

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

Your statement on TV "Today" show Wednesday was most courageous and genuinely American. We need more national integrity and less gun-boat diplomacy in our foreign policy. Congratulations.

ANDREW OSTRUM.

LOMITA, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR: I heard you on "Meet the Press." And I was so happy when I heard you being opposed to our fighting in Vietnam.

All my life I've been a Democrat. But why must our party always get into a war? (Ike stopped Korea.) But here we're in another.

Yours sincerely,

E. O. ROGETAD.

PASADENA, CALIF., June 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am heartily in accord with your condemnation of the present policy of the U.S.A. in South Vietnam.

I have used your suggestions which appeared in our daily newspaper in a letter to our President.

I am hopeful that the State Department will change its policy before more blood is spilled for our own selfish purposes.

Very truly yours,

MISS GRACE M. LEALDAD.

MORRISON HOTEL, CHICAGO.

Mr. MORSE: Congratulations on your views as distributed into the public domain on "Issues and Answers."

You are right. The United States of America has too long violated the Geneva Charter. Red China can be "mellowed." But not if we continue to be an aggressor in southeast Asia.

TONY LAVELLI.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
June 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The enclosed letter, which appeared in the Ann Arbor News of June 26, should be of interest to you. We have reason to believe that a number of Ann Arbor women share our uneasiness about the course our country seems to be taking in southeast Asia.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH CONVERSE.

HEADED FOR WAR IN ASIA?

EDITOR, THE NEWS:

Last Tuesday President Johnson said, "War is obsolete because there can be no winner." On the same day, Senator MORSE warned, "The United States is headed for war in Asia and will be hated for the next 500 years by the majority of mankind."

Reading the news these past weeks has given us the uneasy feeling that we, along with the rest of the American public, were being carefully prepared for a new U.S. policy in southeast Asia. The "new look" has been unfolded in a steady flow of announcements: redeployment of service personnel to more strategic bases; new military shipments (oh, just routine replacements of worn-out equipment); then the sudden emergency—full-blown—of a jet air base just south of the 17th parallel in South Vietnam; and now the appointment of a military authority on

guerrilla fighting as our Ambassador in Saigon, when a civilian with U.N. experience withdrew. We gather that the administration expected us and many others to be hard to sell on the new policy unless we were gradually conditioned for it.

Well, this time we are going to stay hard to sell. We are told that we must honor our commitment in southeast Asia, even though as knowledgeable a person as Walter Lippmann has called the commitment a blunder. Now the United States is "honoring" this commitment (1) by increasing it and (2) by violating other commitments. Our country is publicly committed to leadership in the world's quest for peaceful solutions of complex problems. Our new southeast Asia policy violates this high commitment. Our new jet base in South Vietnam clearly violates the Geneva agreement of 1954.

It's easier to build a military base in a foreign country than to withdraw it once it's there. Khrushchev withdrew his missiles from Cuba but we still have Guantanamo and have sworn to hold on to it. Now it seems we've established a little bit of "American" territory in South Vietnam and will be asked to defend it to the death. Ah, whose death? Who and how many will die for that aircraft base in Vietnam, built with our tax dollars and without our knowledge?

We appear to be proceeding in disregard of the honest reservations of our allies and of Senator Morse's "majority of mankind" to come. In so doing, do we exhibit an unseemly arrogance which closes doors we can ill afford to close in a world where "war is obsolete?"

GAIL W. KELLUM,
ELIZABETH CONVERSE,

KENNEBUNK, MAINE,
June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your conviction, expressed on the NBC "Today" program this morning, that the whole question of Vietnam and the rest of southeast Asia should be taken to the United Nations for decision meets with my hearty approval.

I, as only one individual, and a woman at that, have long felt that we were conducting a war illegally without the voted approval of Congress.

We cannot talk of peace out of one side of our mouths, and conduct an illegal war with justification, out of the other side.

Like many others (I presume), I feel frustrated, listening and reading day after day about all these many problems that face humans all over the world, and not being able to do anything about them.

If there is any way that I can support you in your efforts to have the U.S. Government take this southeast Asia problem to the U.N. for action, instead of the United States of America drifting into a unilateral war with Communist China, I'd be glad to do my bit.

Sincerely,
MARION E. COLE.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: After hearing your views expressed on the program "Issues and Answers" today, I must agree with your proposal to let the U.N. solve the Vietnam crisis.

Sincerely,
PATRICIA M. CONDON.

LYNCHBURG, VA.,
June 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard you last night on "Issues and Answers." I had won-

dered why we were not working through United Nations in Vietnam. Why aren't we? I agree with you we should, and I hope we do.

Sincerely,
MISS ELSIE W. GILLIAM.

MANHATTAN BEACH, CALIF.

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

Today I wrote to President Johnson and Dean Rusk taking issue with them with the present U.S. policy in Vietnam and Laos. I have little understanding of our unilateral policy of force there for issues which seem political and not military ones. I too, counsel the President to use his policy of settling problems with words of reason rather than actions of force and destruction.

Frankly, I am filled with fear that this little dirty war will be escalated to a big dirty war. I hope you will continue to speak out loud and often as you see this issue.

If there is anything further you feel I can do, I shall be most happy to give it consideration.

Sincerely yours,
MANUEL SIEGEL.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: For several weeks I have been following your statements on Vietnam, and the President's handling of the war there, with great surprise.

I really didn't think any Member of the Senate had the political courage that you show. But in the long run I think you may find that the majority of the American people would support your view over the administration view on Vietnam if presented the issues and allowed to choose.

Certainly I agree with you completely and urge you to keep on. You set an example for other Members of the Senate and, I hope, may keep us from some hideous consequence.

Best wishes.
GEORGE SPENCER.

CHICAGO,
June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I watched the interview you gave this afternoon over ABC and I was gratified to see that there are still responsible people that are sane.

I am a foreign student from Greece. I am a bit at ease because I know that "your man from Washington" will have a landslide. I would be more than honored if I had the chance to shake your hand. I am certain that if you will happen to visit Chicago, I will not miss the opportunity to do so.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN PAVLIDIS.

LINDSBURG, KANS.,
June 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your splendid television interview yesterday. Your presentation was lucid and convincing. Keep plugging.

Mrs. CHARLES P. GREENOUGH.

TENAHA, TEX.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: We just saw and heard you on the "Today" program, and we just must write and tell you how very much we agree with you. I do hope you continue to tell the people what it will mean if we do get into a war. I wish everyone in the United States could hear you.

Congratulations again and please keep it up.

Respectfully,
Mr. and Mrs. MARION STONE.

BETHESDA, MD.,
June 29, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: In your address in Minneapolis you renewed the pledge to protect the freedom of South Vietnam and to use the force necessary to that end. However, the applause of listeners was reserved for your pledge to continue your quest for peace.

We do not believe that our foreign policy should be determined by a popularity poll but it is evident that there is no enthusiasm for escalating the civil war in South Vietnam into an international conflict. We agree with your remarks praising the United Nations and so we ask, "Why that organization has not been used in the present conflict?" Is the present government any more than the Diem regime one of the peoples' own choice?

We are not experts but it seems to make good sense to us to ask for a plebiscite of South and North Vietnam under U.N. auspices and with all foreign troops, including our own, withdrawn. If we cannot win, we might achieve neutrality at least.

This course should remove the implication that under the guise of "protection" we are helping to impose an unwelcome government on the people of South Vietnam and taking sides in a civil war. It should further your quest for peace, and still retain our honor.

Sincerely yours,
L. D. and ALICE MACINTYRE.

HYATTSVILLE, MD.,
June 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: After listening to "Issues and Answers" I had to write to you to say that I am completely in accord with your views on the war in Vietnam. I have been increasingly more disturbed about our policies in southeast Asia. I feel that we do have a responsibility to the world to advance democracy and freedom. However, I also feel we have no right to make war. When we adopt Communist tactics we have already lost because our goal is for people to choose freely. Freedom cannot and should not be advanced by U.S. force.

Cuba is a glaring example of our setting up a dictator in the name of democracy and how it has ended is not what our leaders foresaw.

Please keep up your plea to keep us fighting for peace and for a strong United Nations.

Sincerely,
BONNIE L. WALKER,
Democrat From Maryland.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senior Senator from Oregon,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Allow me to join those who heartily endorse your stand on our Government's attitude toward the situation in southeast Asia.

Sincerely yours,
HAMILTON S. CLOUD, D.D.S.

JUNE 9, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please send me your speeches and whatever else you can on Vietnam. I have been guardedly speaking to friends and writing my representatives urging a review of our policy there. You might say that I have lacked the courage to come right out and condemn the role our Government is playing. I appreciate all the more your forthrightness.

Now I am really ready to speak out, and keep speaking out. I don't care what my

neighbors may think. One stands the chance of being called a traitor, and all the rest, but it now seems abundantly clear to me that my country's best interests, and our national honor, depend upon us coming to our senses. To continue as we have is to morally disgrace ourselves.

But I do need all the facts I can get. It is difficult to piece the news together—the omissions are so gross, however, that the phrase "news management" seems wholly justified. Your speeches are weakly reported even in the New York Times. So please send me what you can even though I am not your constituent.

Most sincerely,

EDWARD CRAWFORD.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

MEMPHIS, TENN.,
June 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I just listened to you speak on Vietnam on the "Today" show, and you gave me heart. You said many things that badly need saying. Please continue your fight. What you are saying is vastly important, but just as important is that someone is saying it. We in this country, I maintain, are not inherently aggressive and impractical, but we are unbelievably ignorant, especially where our relationship to and standing in the world are concerned. Thank you for the forthright expression of views—and facts—which will perhaps reduce this ignorance.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GEORGE D. DAVIS.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 12, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I greatly admire the courage you have shown in your outspoken attitude toward the bloody mess in South Vietnam. I think that your position, more than that of any other prominent American, will be vindicated when all the facts are known.

As a young man of draft age it would provoke a crisis of conscience if I were conscripted to fight in a war so senselessly brutal and self-defeating.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. BATEMAN, JR.

P.S.—I would appreciate receiving a printed copy of each of your speeches on the Vietnam problem.

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S &
WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION, LOCAL 14,
Eureka, Calif., May 26, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: Our membership at their regular meeting of May 20, 1964, voted to commend you and Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, for your courageous injection of truth and reason into the foreign policy debate. We feel we are being sucked into a full-scale war in South Vietnam without all the facts being told the people. We would like to know what the State Department calls a "constitutional government" when in South Vietnam our soldiers are dying to protect what they call a constitutional government, while in Brazil an elected constitutional government was overthrown and these same people fell all over themselves to congratulate the "brass" there for their success in the overthrowing of the government there.

Would you kindly send us a copy of your speeches on South Vietnam and on foreign policy?

Sincerely yours,

O. L. DEARINGER,
N.C.D.C. Representative,
I.L.W.U. Local 14.

LA HABRA, CALIF.,
June 11, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: The brief news reports I hear of your speeches the past few months concerning Vietnam are very interesting and timely. You seem to be the only one talking any sense on this critical issue in public, although I think there is a lot of public sympathy for making a realistic settlement in southeast Asia.

I would very much appreciate receiving copies of previous or future speeches by you on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM T. HOLSER.

JUNE 9, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am sorry there are not more politicians to speak with your realism and courage. I would feel we had a much safer world and better future for our country and its people.

Is it possible to send me a copy of the speech you made in the Senate, Thursday, June 4, with reference to the southeast Asian situation? What can those of us who feel you speak for us, do?

Thank you.

Mrs. ROBERT SHERMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 16, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read some of your recent speeches in the Senate on our foreign policy and must express my hearty agreement. Your forthright stand is courageous beyond words and must eventually influence others to look at the world more objectively.

Sincerely yours,

EARL BUDIN, M.D.

UNIONTOWN, OHIO,
June 19, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to you to tell you that I am wholeheartedly in agreement with your views on our involvement in southeast Asia. Though I am a college instructor and a scientist, I have an active interest in politics and world affairs. I believe that the United States should get off the southeast Asia mainland altogether—including both Laos and South Vietnam. The State Department should realize that the United States cannot win a war on the mainland of Asia. Is this President Johnson's idea of prosperity—an artificially created prosperity based on building war materials for a war in Asia? If the President doesn't soon get us disentangled from that mess, he will not get my vote in November, even though I agree with his domestic policies otherwise.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

CONRAD GUTERMUTH.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Anyone who has had the experience of standing in the lonely trenches of fighting for what conscience dictates can only commend you and Senator GRUENING for the splendor of your courage.

Anyone who has read the whole spectrum of thought involved in this southeast Asia problem can only come out in one place—in your corner.

MARIE HITCHEN.
WILMINGTON, DEL., June 19, 1964.

JUNE 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to thank you for your heroic stand you have taken in the Senate, especially in regard to stopping the war in Vietnam. I do hope more and

more Congressmen will follow your humane and democratic ideas.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. BETSY DAVENPORT.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to give you my sincere congratulations for your stands in the Senate against the war in Vietnam. Please keep up the good work. Turns are certainly needed in most phases of our foreign policy. Senator FULBRIGHT and yourself have certainly been the mainstays for any attempt to overhaul this country's stands.

Sincerely,

MEYER FASMAN.

NORTH PLATTE, NEBR.,
June 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Please vote to cut the foreign aid bill deeply. Let the people vote on it and we would do away with it entirely. No reason in the world why we should support the rest of the world. Thank you.

W. W. KELLY.

P.S.—It has not made us any friends and note the "go home Yank" after taking our money.

JUNE 18, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Again, let me tell you how very much I appreciate your efforts to disengage our military in southeast Asia. I am enclosing our local and current effort to help you (and our "Nation under God").

With sincere encouragement.

LOIS D. WARREN.

This enclosure is going to each member of Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

Washington Post, March 29, 1964: "Two recent South Vietnamese napalm bombings, which fell into the brutal category, have grievously hurt the U.S. image throughout the world. One was widely dramatized by the publication of an Associated Press photograph on March 20 which showed a child in his father's arm, badly burned by air-launched, jellied, gasoline bombs which had fired a Vietnamese village * * * Publication of the AP photo resulted in the (U.S.) Defense Department's acknowledging for the first time that napalm has been furnished South Vietnam—under the military aid program, and that it has been dropped by Vietnamese planes provided by U.S. assistance plan."

DO YOU APPROVE?

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Oregon, March 25, 1964: "We should never have gone in there. We should not have stayed in. We should get out now."

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Alaska: "The time has come to reverse our policy of understanding to defend areas such as South Vietnam * * * A return of troops to our own shores should begin."

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana: "There has not been and there does not exist today a basis in our national interest which would justify the assumption of primary American responsibility in this situation which might well involve the sacrifice of a vast number of American lives * * *"

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Oregon, March 30, 1964: "By what right did the Secretary of Defense go over to South Vietnam and pledge U.S. support for a 'thousand years, if necessary' in behalf of the American people. He had no such right. The American people should answer him in no uncertain terms."

Whittier Peace Council recommends immediate withdrawal of all American forces from southeast Asia and urges settlement of the war by the 14-nation Geneva Conference

of 1962 under the auspices of the United Nations.

Write President Johnson, Senator KUCHEL, Senator ENGLE today.

This message is brought to you by the Whittier Peace Council and the following groups: Whittier Chapter American Association for the United Nations, Peace and Service Committee—First Friends Church, Whiteleaf Monthly Meeting of Friends, Whittier Friends Unprogramed Meeting, Whittier Area Women Strike for Peace, Whittier La Mirada Unitarian Fellowship.

For further information—or to help defray cost of this ad—please send requests and contributions to: Whittier Peace Council, 821 East Sunrise Drive, Whittier, Calif.

TAKOMA PARK, Md.,
June 20, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: We are gravely concerned with the situation in Vietnam. There is considerable feeling that we had no right to intervene in the first place, and our apparent plans to escalate the fighting there could develop into a war with China. Several Senators, such as Senator WAYNE MORSE, have made serious suggestions for negotiating a peace in Vietnam and withdrawing our troops. We urgently ask you to consider their proposals, stop the fighting, and begin negotiating immediately before it is too late.

Sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. REX V. NAYLOR.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I'm with you in your campaign to get U.S. troops recalled from Vietnam. This is a senseless war, in which we have no business.

Thanks for speaking out.

Sincerely yours,

(Miss) ELIZABETH YATES.

JUNE 20, 1964.

KENDALL, FLA.,
June 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I view as most distressing the "feelers" appearing throughout our news media citing the need for stepped-up military action in southeast Asia. If, as I believe, these are designed to test public response to such an eventuality, I feel I would be derelict in my duty as a citizen if I failed to express my strong opposition to it. It is my firm opinion that we have no moral or legal right to inflict our will on the people of southeast Asia, and that if action of any kind is indicated, we should not take it unilaterally upon ourselves, but should bring the matter before the United Nations for solution.

Respectfully submitted.

REYNOLDS MOODY,
Lieutenant Colonel U.S. Marine Corps,
Retired.

ROCHESTER, MICH.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am hoping for a negotiated settlement of the Vietnam "mess." The U.N., the Geneva Conference, any alternative to escalating the war or even continuing it.

Let us spend that million and a half a day on assuring every one the right to vote in this country or lessening poverty here.

Sincerely,

MARGARET DUFFIELD.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 26, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your very excellent speech on "Meet the Press," May 24, 1964.

What a pity that the public do not know the facts about such matters and must depend on the muddled reports that our newspapers print.

The Christian Science Monitor, New York Times, and the Wall Street Journal seem to do better reporting than most others.

Please appear on the TV as often as possible to give us, the public, the facts.

Senator MORSE, my thinking is that before peace of any kind can be attained it is necessary to bring China into the United Nations. My understanding of the United Nations is that it imposes an obligation on member governments to observe the provisions of the charter and the resolutions of the membership, and the important opportunity of behind-the-scenes discussions.

We need more speeches like yours and more men who are not afraid to speak the truth about facts as they exist.

Sincerely yours,

ERMA RAPP.

P.S.—I too felt very badly about the speech of Ambassador A. Stevenson. Twice I have heard him give speeches that I felt were from his lips and not his heart; they made me very sad.

CANOGA PARK, CALIF.,
June 15, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A few hours ago I sat down in a barbershop and casually thumbed through a recent issue of Life magazine which contained excellent photographs of the Vietnamese war. With my heart pounding I saw our side torturing young men in the Vietcong to extract confessions. The full horror of what we are doing suddenly dawned upon me.

Should the Asiatic multitudes achieve a dominant position in the world of tomorrow it will be a very difficult thing to be an American. All Americans will be held accountable for these crimes. We cannot plead ignorance when Life magazine so clearly has presented all of us with the facts as they are. Our Government has illegally committed American troops to a foreign war. Congress was not consulted nor was the U.N.

Please Senator MORSE, keep plugging for a cessation of our foul, filthy war in southeast Asia.

There are so few men who can do the honest, courageous thing that you have done. May you have the strength to continue.

Sincerely,

HAROLD SCHNEIER.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
Columbia, S.C., June 16, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I completely agree with your position on Vietnam. Our troop involvement there violates every precept of international law, just as it violates every precept of the existential morality of Christ.

As a Democrat, I am especially heartened by your willingness to criticize a Democratic administration. We need desperately in this country some opposition to the bipartisan warmongering which has kept the cold war going and stifled a realistic peace program. On the issue of Vietnam you are supplying it, with matchless eloquence and logic.

Sincerely,

EMMETT J. DURANT.

MESA, ARIZ.,
June 20, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: We hear with grave concern from Mr. Brinkley on the news that the State Department intends to do in Vietnam—send 200,000 of our boys in there to get killed and start a war with China that would never end. You could tell by the looks on Mr. Brinkley's face that he is worried, and I and all the people I've talked to are worried.

Just why does our State Department think they have the power to declare war? Is that not still the power of Congress? Of all the people I've talked to, I can't find one who knows of any reason why we are messing around down there in the first place.

Mr. Bundy, of our State Department, states we are going in there and extend the war to the north. MacArthur tried that in Korea thinking the Chinks would do nothing. We got run out of there by the hordes of Chinese and lost a lot of boys.

We are wondering how many sons Mr. Bundy has of military age. I think Mr. Bundy had better go up to the Bay of Fundy and get lost.

Mr. Brinkley gave us one ray of hope when he said you were going to demand the withdrawal of our troops, as they were in Vietnam illegally, and cut out all aid to that country. Those people in Vietnam are so busy fighting each other that they don't have time to worry about the Commies.

A. J. MCGINN.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
June 15, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: You seem to be one of the few humanitarians in Congress. That's the reason we are writing to you. If we lived in Oregon our family of six voters would support you in full. The only request that we have to make is read June 12 issue, 1964, and see the pictures under the caption "But this is my duty," in Life magazine.

Please tell Congress that at least in this area our people are sick and tired of this senseless war.

Are we a nation of barbarians?

Thank you, Senator and the best of luck.

Very sincerely,

LESTER W. DENEVAN.
WILDA A. DENEVAN.
LESTER M. DENEVAN.
TERRY L. DENEVAN.

LONGVIEW, WASH.,
June 19, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a line to you to encourage you in your attacks on foreign aid to corrupt, unreforming governments and on our policy in Vietnam.

I realize, as I'm sure you do, that such independent statements can be dangerous to you politically; it takes a strong and courageous personality to point out the harsh facts to the administration and the American public as you have been doing so effectively in recent months.

Best of luck to you, and I hope to keep hearing your strong, liberal voice on the major issues confronting the United States today and in the future.

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM J. GABOURY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Your work for peace is greatly appreciated.

War cannot bring victory, will not destroy communism, can only destroy people, prop-

erty to the American image. Would like to have your material on the questions of peace. Thank you in advance.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. VERA BACHMAN.

JUNE 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree wholeheartedly with your views regarding our "out-law" activities in southeast Asia and particularly in Vietnam. I began to rethink our participation in these countries this past week when you expressed yourself following one committee meeting with the Secretary of Defense and General Taylor.

I truly believe that a U.N. functioning "peace force" should be the position being expounded by our Government and not the unilateral military force as is presently being employed.

I support your views and will make known my acceptance of them to my own representatives.

Yours truly,

HOWARD RATCLIFFE.

MARTINSBURG, W. Va.

CARMEL, CALIF.,

June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I have just listened to your remarks on Vietnam on the NBC "Today" program. I have spent considerable time in that area in the U.S. Navy and feel closer to the situation than the average citizen.

Let me thank you for enlightening the public with your knowledgeable comments. I agree with you and hope you are successful in blocking our military entry into war in Asia.

Sincerely yours,

HUNTER W. STEWART.

JUNE 25, 1964.

Senator MORSE,

DEAR SIR: I saw and heard you on the "Today Show", and I believe you are 100 percent right. I have always admired you, you have more brains in your little toe than those generals who sit safely in Washington. While the kids go and get killed, to satisfy who? The generals of course.

The United Nations was born to settle wars, I am for President Johnson too, but he is letting the wrong people advise him.

I hope you convince these tinheads to change their minds.

Sincerely,

Mrs. R. DAVIS.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please, Senator MORSE, use whatever persuasion you can to stop the tide of aggressors in public office before we have another major war.

We in Florida cannot turn to our own Representatives; they are not fair to our own citizens, how can they be otherwise toward other nations.

Why is it so many people feel that they are entitled to tell other countries how to run their affairs when our own is about the most immoral in every way. Would any people be anxious to join our ways unless paid or coerced?

For a short time we had hopes in Governor Scranton till he came to Florida with the usual belligerent talk against Cuba.

I can look till I'm cross eyed but see only that they should settle their affairs inside Cuba by their own people. Will he spread communism to our neighboring countries? I think we are doing a better job of it by our example, by what is happening here in America and what we are doing to others.

Sincerely,

Mrs. J. STOWE.

MIAMI, FLA.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hope that I am correctly informed that you question present U.S. policies in Vietnam and favor our making an earnest effort to negotiate a settlement.

To me it seems urgent that negotiations begin promptly before the fighting is extended and that they include all the nations involved in southeast Asia. Enclosed is a copy of a letter similar to one I have just sent to President Johnson.

Will you please exert every effort to extricate us and the world from a struggle which has the effect of preventing completion of a revolution and which may readily get out of control?

Sincerely yours,

GELSTON McNEIL.

P.S.—This letter should have been modified for you. I do thank you, Senator MORSE, for your courageous and outspoken efforts in behalf of a more sane policy.

For months I've been intending to thank you for a fine presentation of constructive ideas with regard to Cuba which I heard in an interview-type program on station WGMS. Keep up the good work.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

June 24, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: "The people of the world, I think, prefer reasoned agreement to ready attack." Does not this statement of yours (March 23, 1964) call for a sharp change in our course in southeast Asia? For not only is it true that people prefer reason to violence: it is also true that negotiation on the basis of equality holds the only hope for life in a nuclear age.

Since 1945 war in South Vietnam has been killing and starving and maiming with terrible suffering thousands of women and children as well as guerrilla fighters (who are also human). None seems to know or care just how many. At a meeting last week I heard a Government spokesman, while rightly lamenting the over 1,000 American casualties, speak with gusto of "wiping out the guerrillas."

We should be demonstrating that we are friends of the world's poor by aiding their "revolution of rising expectations" in Vietnam and everywhere. There can be no stability until this revolution is accomplished.

Instead, by supporting military juntas and other corrupt, oppressive governments, by supplying napalm and helicopters and barbed wire and cropdestroyers and other accouterments of modern war, we are opposing the revolution. Whether or not we intend to do so makes little difference. We appear to the oppressed, underdeveloped, war-sick people to be just another white, colonial power replacing the French who, we ourselves admit, were denying the people their sacred right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I agree with Walter Lippmann (New York Tribune, May 28) and with Senator MORSE that American troops never should have gone into Vietnam. These men point out that we must correct our error by substituting negotiation for force. In this Senators CHURCH, GRUENING, BEALL, and others agree—as do I.

Stepping up the war in Vietnam would not only increase and prolong sufferings of the Vietnamese people and delay the revolution, it would drive Ho Chi Minh completely into the arms of China (even as our starvation policies toward Cuba have driven Castro into dependence upon the great Communist powers). Extending the war will also cause U.S.S.R. to support China and thus destroy

what improvement in relationships has been painstakingly and precariously worked out between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Mr. Johnson, instead of aggravating animosity between China and the United States of America, is it not time that we develop toward that great country a creative approach which offers some possibility of peaceful solution of problems and resumption of our traditional friendship? Would it not be wise to consider President de Gaulle's proposals? On the other hand, continuing our arrogant and self-righteous policies toward China tends to lose us friends, to solidify our enemies and thereby to lessen the possibility of rapprochement.

A year ago at American University President Kennedy pointed to the truth that conditions and attitudes in all kinds of societies change and that we must recognize and encourage changes in others and be open to change ourselves. It is also imperative, though extremely difficult for a nation—as for an individual—to admit its mistakes and change its course. Failure to do so will leave our country behind the march of history at best, and, at worst, can make our beloved country an instrument for the destruction of civilization.

Yours sincerely,

GELSTON McNEIL.

METROPOLIS, ILL.,

June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks to you, for the words spoken over TV, when you said that our boys should not be dying in South Vietnam. I think its so shameful for the United States to have our boys there, when there has been no war declared. Why don't our so-called allies go in there too. They know its wrong. Here we have Cuba, right at our door, and no attention is given to what goes on there. But they risk their necks million miles away.

We cannot police the entire world. What would we say, when other countries sent military force over here to change our method?

I am for a peaceful country. The same should be followed with integration. We can't do anything by force. But people will understand each other as time goes on. We have no trouble here with a racial problem. All get along together and that good will, will spread if they would keep agitators out.

Thanks again to you. Will you appear on TV more often?

We need a House full of Members like you in Washington.

Yours very sincerely,

Mrs. RAYMOND MITCHELL.

P.S.—The feed-grain program should be scrapped. It does more harm than good. The voluntary soil bank did so much more and cost less when people take their entire farm out of production. This feed grain the big farmers take out the less fertile ground and draw Government pay and use that money to buy fertilizer and livestock to produce more on remaining acres, and therefore the surplus gets greater.

HOUSTON, TEX.,

June 29, 1964.

YOUR HONOR SENATOR MORSE: Just listened to you on the "Today" show. I think you are so right. Did we not learn anything from Korea.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. EDNA J. DALY.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.,

June 25, 1964.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: At last we have someone on Capitol Hill who has given me and many

of my neighbors the inside on this Vietnam subject. This a.m. on program "Today," I stopped my breakfast to sit and listen to you; so clear was your explaining this dogfight we are in, and cannot do one thing except pour our men and dollars to destruction.

I am a widow but our country is, as you just about put it, carrying the load that is not ours alone. Do keep up your clear, precise speaking; you will get others to see also.

I do thank you for your brief talk.

I am,

Mrs. CLAIRE V. HEBERLE.

COFFEYVILLE, KANS., June 25, 1964.

Senator MORSE,
U.S. Senator of Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I heard your talk on "Today" TV today concerning the action of the United States, directed by President Johnson, in southeast Asia.

I agree in detail with all you said in your TV interview.

Too much of our actions are based on wishful thinking and self-deception—based mostly on an infantile messianic complex that we have that we are the chosen people to lead the rest of the world into the land of milk and honey—while we are disintegrating here at home. We cannot understand that the rest of the world and no part of it see us as we see ourselves looking through our Alice in Wonderland looking glass of wishful thinking, self-deception, and messianic complex.

Sincerely,

A. A. BAKER.

JUNE 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been watching this Asiatic situation and try and take a fair approach to our position there and what we should do about it. I have come to the definite conclusion that you have the right answer. We do not want to get mixed up in a hot war with China, and it looks right now as though we are headed in that direction. The French fought in that area for over 7 years with top-flight troops, coupled with material aid from us, and they were decisively beaten. Are we about to travel the same road? Such a stupid course would deplete our resources and manpower almost to a point of no return. It will be another Korea. It seems that the Democratic Party (I am independent) is as frequently labeled, "the war party."

Your position is, and will receive the support of the right-thinking citizen. Keep up the good work.

Respectfully yours,

CLAYTON E. DIGG.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF., June 24, 1964.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

DEAR MR. MORSE: You have been a hundred percent right since you have been in the U.S. Senate.

As you say that the United States is sticking its nose in too far in other countries business. That nose might be punched and bled for several years at the expense of all Americans.

Mr. MORSE, you will have my vote and I know many more will vote for you.

I remain a true Democrat.

Yours sincerely,

FRANK H. SPICER.

WEST HARTFORD, CONN.,

June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Please say what you said on "Today" about Asia—loud and long until it is heard. Thank you, sir.

Respectfully,

HELEN SHIVE

Mrs. John J. Shive.

FLUSHING, MICH.,

June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your hard-hitting remarks that we heard on the "Today" show this morning concerning the situation in southeast Asia certainly made a lot of commonsense. What a deep insight you have into this serious problem.

You have my husband's and my complete concurrence in the matter and there must be multitudes of people all over the country who feel the same.

It is to be fervently hoped that there is a possibility that you and others of your colleagues on Capitol Hill who share your views, might do something about all this before it is too late. Your straightforward talk on television this morning was certainly a step in the right direction.

Most respectfully yours,

Mrs. THEODORE BUELL.

LORAIN, OHIO,

June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to state that I agree with your position on the dangerous situation in Vietnam and in southeast Asia in general.

I respectfully ask you that you do all in your power to prevent any war in southeast Asia involving the United States.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES J. BROWNE.

OSKALOOSA, IOWA,

June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for being willing to speak out concerning Vietnam. It is sad that our country should be the one to bypass the U.N. and not give it a chance at the peacemaking efforts for which it was instituted.

Further, I feel that the news media has allowed false ideas to guide public opinion because it is not pleasant to criticize. Where are our courageous news reporters? Thank you again.

Most sincerely,

ZENA GRUBB

Mrs. Charles E. Grubb.

WARSAW, IND.,

June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to add my voice of approval to your stand on current Government issues.

Thank you for your courageous and truthful comments on the TV program of "Today," as well as those made previously.

I am among those who feel that our only hope for avoiding a national disaster is by following policies such as you have expressed, and I urge you to continue with increasing vigor.

Yours sincerely,

L. G. BAILEY.

SANDUSKY, OHIO,

June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator of the State of Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Heard you being interviewed on the "Today" show this morning, and was very interested in what you had to say, as I and my husband and sons have been thinking the same thoughts. Thank God for men like yourself who are not afraid to speak out, for your honesty, your forthrightness, and also your clarity. What in the name of heaven is happening to this country of ours, and who do you think President Johnson thinks he is, God? Do you under-

stand how small and helpless a person like myself feels in the face of what is going on in Washington. I don't want my two clean young boys fighting in that stinking hole for a ridiculous cause—besides, according to those brainy intellectuals in government now, it isn't the fashion to "win" a war anymore. If we had permitted General MacArthur to go on in Korea, this war may not have been necessary. I am one of those Americans who believe everything he wrote. And, according to many of my friends, they believe also, only most of them are too apathetic to write.

I compliment you on your honest criticism of President Johnson. All this makes me more of a fervent Goldwater admirer than ever. He is being criticized for his complaints about the United Nations. He is being honest, too.

Thank you again.

Mrs. GERALD LUTZ.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,

June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Bravo for you on the "Today" show this morning. I hope you get much backing for your stand on Vietnam. We need more men of your caliber who will speak out for the good of this country.

Faithfully yours,

MYRTLE G. OSTERGREN
(Mrs. Herbert L.).

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,

June 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that I am in full agreement with your views on the situation in southeast Asia.

If it will help to show President Johnson that we want your ideas of carrying this problem to the U.N., I hope this letter will be used in that behalf.

I only hope it is not too late to save us from getting into another holocaust.

May God bless you in your efforts.

Sincerely,

Mrs. THOR MEAGHER.

LIMA, OHIO, June 25, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Member of the U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am not one to write letters but after reading the attached editorial I got so mad about some of the thinking of the powers in Washington that you wonder. It looks to me that they are trying to do everything possible to get in a fight with China. Then we will have another Korea on our hands, only a great many times worse.

My reason for writing you is to let you know I like your stand on this matter and many more.

Thanks for your time in reading this note.

Respectfully,

RAY W. BARNETT,
Treasurer, Allen County.

ST. JOHN CHURCH,

Greensburg, Ind., June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard your viewpoint of the South Vietnam war.

I agree with you 100 percent.

What can we do to further your program?

Sincerely,

Rev. A. J. SCHNEIDER.

WISCASSETT, MAINE,

June 28, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: No one could deny the tremendous influence exerted on the foreign policy of the United States by the Pentagon. Just why a military department of our Government should be adjudged to be in pos-

session of infallible wisdom in the area of peaceful international relations is beyond my understanding. With specific reference to this Nation's unilateral action in southeast Asia—which bids fair to represent the worst bungling by this country in international relationships for all time—I consider it to be absolutely shameful, utterly appalling, and entirely inconsistent with the policies of a nation presumably working toward world peace. Apart from our participation in the matter as a part of a duly appointed United Nations force sent to restore peace, the United States has no military business in the area.

Speaking as a private citizen, I most heartily commend you in your stand on the issue. Let us put the problem before the United Nations for its judgment and action. This is where it belongs, and is the only place it belongs. Our saying one thing and doing another will yet be the death of us. If peace be the aim of this Nation, then in the name of God let us be about it.

Yours truly,

SCOTT D. KITTREDGE.

CINCINNATI, OHIO,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I congratulate you being a true American, being elected and holding a political office in our Government, upholding and not ignoring the Constitution of the United States, that reads, there shall be no foreign entanglements. As other politicians seem to ignore though sworn into office over a Bible.

Referring to your very true conversational talk over NBC-TV program, this is "Today."

It is a pleasure to hear you talk as a true American, who knows what you are talking about, a type of an American like President George Washington. And thinking deeper perhaps if the United States had stayed out of World War II, there would not be communism.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. J. ZINSMEISTER.

STUART, FLA., June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Let me congratulate you on your fearless opinion expressed on the "Today" show, as I have the same idea about our boys in Vietnam. Please do everything to stop this unconstitutional war. I agree with you that this is a McNamara war and that we should not send a military man as our Ambassador into that area (Taylor).

Having had four brothers in the First World War, while I was trained as a nurse, and then three nephews in the Second World War on the German side, and three nephews here on the American side, I know what families are sacrificing. I lived in Germany during the first war and as an American citizen here in the second war, doing nursing and social work.

While I do a lot of traveling in different countries now, I know how we are almost despised for meddling in everybody's business. We should let other countries decide for themselves what they want to be, but guard our own country, according to our Constitution.

More power to men like you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. THOMAS DARLING.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I have been in sympathy with your thinking on the problem in Vietnam right along, but your pronouncements this morning on the "Today" program makes me want to shout it from the rooftops that the United States should get out of southeast Asia and "rejoin" the United Nations.

It seems to me that of all nations we should not desecrate the sanctuary of peace. Keep up your good work, Mr. MORSE. Your voice may be the keystone to the arch.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LEORA D. SURRYTHNE.

EVANSVILLE, IND.,
June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A breath of fresh air this morning when I heard your fine comment on television. I personally think you're one of the smartest or most intelligent men in Washington, D.C. Keep up the good work.

Yours truly,

W. E. HALL, JR.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO,
June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I salute you on your courageous stand on American involvement in southeast Asia. We cannot correct the mistakes of 19th century imperialism by sacrificing American lives. Nor can we hope to persuade the Asians—in the throes of a colonial revolution captured by the Communists—that we are any different from their former white masters and that our brand of freedom will be any better than what they have hitherto known at the hands of the whites; that is to say, exploitation and humiliation.

I wholeheartedly support your position that our only recourse is the United Nations. Only if we direct our efforts through the United Nations can we avoid the onus of being considered the aggressor out there by the Asiatics and the other noncommitted peoples of the world. To do otherwise is to go it alone, setting our course on disaster. America has long been in need of such straight-from-the-shoulder advice as you gave this day on the "Today" show. Godspeed.

Cordially yours,

GEORGE TEHAN FISCHER.

HADDONFIELD, N.J.,
June 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you for your fine, brave statements on South Vietnam. It takes great courage to speak out against the foreign policy as you and others have done. I wish that the American newspapers would publish your statements found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for surely the American public is just uninformed about the true conditions in southeast Asia.

I consider you one of the finest patriots, because you are not afraid to speak out when you see we are not living up to our democratic ideals (and the freedom to voice opinions is a hallmark of our democracy but which should not be censored by the press).

We must try to educate the public to see that the proper place to solve international crises is in the United Nations.

Wish you would run for President.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. SALLY PRYOR.

NEWBURGH, N.Y.,
June 26, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your forthright remarks heard a few days ago on the NBC "Today" show certainly pointed up the issues—and dangers—in the Vietnam situation.

As you so rightly said, the appointment of General Taylor to the vacated Lodge post does not augur well for a peaceful settlement of the situation. The deep involve-

ment of this country in the south Asia area and the "policing" action we have undertaken seems very paradoxical in view of our own inability to control our citizens in Mississippi and Florida.

It would seem sort of like people in glass houses throwing stones—or don't do as I do, do as I say.

Please Senator, keep speaking out against further action that commits thousands of American youth to lose their lives to support regimes that are wholly unpopular with the citizens of the country.

Cordially yours,

EDWARD B. SALINGER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 22, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you for your courageous and intelligent position and stand against the present reckless U.S. involvement in Vietnam and Laos which, if allowed to pursue its present course, will surely lead to full-scale war and hatred of the whole world against us.

I have just written to President Johnson to tell him that I fully concur with your position in regard to our foreign policy in Vietnam and Laos.

It's pathetic that Congress has so few men of your caliber and stature. You will be remembered in history by your compassion and unusual degree of intelligence.

Wishing you continued success in your efforts to achieve peace for mankind.

Sincerely yours,

JACK KRIEGER.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your ready suggestions for the Vietnam situation show, as always, the long, deep thought that has gone before. Your interview on the program "Today" this morning, brought me the only comfort I have had on that situation.

I, like you, am voting and working for President Johnson this fall. I admire him very much. I feel that now at this very moment is the time that he could well adopt your plan and map out a program for our beloved country which would save the United Nations and finally solve our problem in Asia. That might take years, but we would be on the right track.

For years I have been your respectful admirer.

G. V. RAFF.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
June 24, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to let you know of my wholehearted support for your critical stand on the situation in Vietnam. Several weeks ago I heard you speak about this on the radio and was impressed by your ideas. Up until this time, I had no notion that anyone in Congress was at all opposed to our provocative and shortsighted policy in the Far East.

It is my understanding that the general goal of American foreign policy should be that of insuring the world peace and at the same time striving for the collapse of world communism. At times our efforts toward both these goals go hand in hand, but sometimes they do not. Since the advent of the nuclear age, the possibility of a military solution is considered out of the question by any thinking person. If so, then it seems the most promising opportunity for victory would consist of swinging the uncommitted peoples of the world over to our side. If we could do this, then we would have innumerable advantages over the Communists, e.g.,

economically, tradewise, and not the least, the sheer number of people who would be aligned with us.

These uncommitted multitudes in Asia and Africa are just beginning to throw off the shackles of colonialism, ignorance, and the effects of racial and economic exploitation. Communism, as taught in Moscow and Peking, lures them economically from one side. Democracy, and all of the advantages which go with personal freedom, should have at least equal appeal. But does it really? To use the Madison Avenue phrase, just what is our "image" in the eyes of the world. I wonder what sort of glowing impression our Government makes by support of a military dictatorship which is primarily engaged in the business of killing peasants. Does this really add to the stature of the world's number one power? I fear that to the many little people of the world this must take on the features of a David and Goliath struggle. This feeds beautifully into the Communist propaganda line that we are aggressive warmongers. By point of fact, in Vietnam we are doing just that.

History teaches, and teaches bitterly, that revolutionary activity cannot be effectively put down unless the Government's effort has the strong support of the people behind it. Military rulers and petty dictators of all sorts lack this popular support since by definition their rule is self-imposed and maintained by repression of the opposition. Often this is bulwarked by American dollars.

Now let us take stock of some of our supposed "allies" and "comrades in arms" in the struggle against world communism. Of what possible benefit is it to the American people to be associated with creatures such as Chiang Kai-Shek, Franco, Madame Nu, or the present military junta in Saigon, to name but a few. In time of peace, we absorb all of the rotten aspects of their reputations by the simple fact that we support and condone them. In time of war, does anyone honestly think that any of these small-time Hitlers will stand gallantly by our side. More likely than not they will flee the country with the gold we have given them as many others have before.

This letter is already much too long. But again I would say that your position in this vital issue is important, even if it is not popular at the moment. Neither are many other positions popular where real courage is required. Too often, basic political and philosophical change must be made by individuals like yourself who stand for a time alone in opposition to the compact majority.

Very truly yours,

SIDNEY L. COPEL, Ed. D.,
Clinical Pathologist.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, OF OREGON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: We see you on TV. You are right about going to war with Red China.

It should be taken to the United Nations. We don't want war; it should be solved in some peaceful way. We don't want our sons to die for such a fool cause. If they go to war with Red China it will make us weak and then Russia will step in. I think we should keep our nose out of foreign affairs. Let the United Nations do the job.

A FRIEND FROM OHIO
(With Three Sons,
not willing to see them die).

JUNE 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want you to know how we admired you for your outspoken comments on the "Today" program this morning.

You have given us a small feeling of security, but what has us baffled is that more

men, supposed to be the leaders of our country, just follow along.

Frankly we are very concerned about our Nation and its future—the TV and magazines and press distort the facts of what is really happening and the average person in our country today will not dig in and try to find the truth. They would prefer to watch a murder mystery or hillbilly program on TV.

As an individual there seems to be so little we can do—so many of our young people have been completely brainwashed.

Our America is not what it once was, or what it should be. Everyone is out for his own gain and what he can get for himself with the least amount of effort.

One of the main troubles in our world today stems from greed.

We both had the feeling that the program panel was somewhat awestruck by your comments, and we seriously doubt that had they known, you perhaps would never have been asked to appear. These are the things they are trying to hide from the people.

Please keep the courage of your convictions as we need more men in Washington, like yourself, to fight these battles.

Yours truly,

Mrs. MARVIN S. COCHRANE.

TORRANCE, CALIF.
June 22, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for the position you have taken against the continued and increasing undeclared war in Indochina. It is a small comfort that we have at least one Senator with some decency left.

I suppose the theory is that village-burning and the rest of it was legalized long ago by the British and such modern improvements as we may add are only natural, the people being "natives" who put no value on human life. Besides, they haven't any aircraft and we have a deal with the Russians.

Admiral Felt announced this weekend that we are going to risk war with China, but that China would be afraid to risk war with us, since they know we are too strong. This sounds like the thinking of Douglas MacArthur, who ended up wanting to use cobalt bombs.

Presumably Felt's statement is policy, since he is commander in chief. And presumably this is the policy of the President, the State Department, and the Government.

All I know is, we never voted for it. What seems to be the case is that the war-happy generals and the CIA invasionmakers are running the show and this business of democracy and an election is nonsense and just for the papers.

It seems hopeless to try to do something about it since it is not subject to vote or to control by elected representatives. The whole thing proceeds as though GOLDWATER had won—and he's not even nominated yet.

Sincerely,

JOHN V. MANNING.
(Copy to President Lyndon B. Johnson.)

KNOXVILLE, TENN.,
June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Not being a constituent of yours I write as an American citizen to say that I fully agree with your position stated on the TV "Today" program this date that our President does not have the constitutional right to prosecute war in South Vietnam.

However, you also said that you were going to the Democratic convention and support

the President and do all you could to insure his reelection.

This is the second time recently that I have heard a U.S. Senator seriously disagree with and oppose the President on an issue of tremendous importance—this time you say real war could result—and then heard the Senator announce that he will help elect the erring one. The logic of such a course escapes the ordinary person, and I should like to ask how we in a democracy can hope to secure the good government and peace we so earnestly desire if we continue to vote for, support, and elect those whom we say oppose such? I hope the answer is not the old worn out one that all the other prospective candidates, both Democratic and Republicans, would do worse things.

With assurance of my esteem, I am,

Very respectfully,

N. W. BOWDEN.

P.S.—The above inquiry from one born and reared a Democrat will probably seem to ignore party loyalty when the issue transcends it in importance. It is a sincere inquiry.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are writing to let you know that we agree with your views on Vietnam, and we admire you for your courageous and forceful expression of them. We hope you will continue to find it possible to talk sense even when this touches on the sensitivities of people in high places. We are confident that good sense will prevail, and that in the long run the course of world events will be determined by those who are prepared to face issues realistically and with human understanding.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET FINN.
ROBERT FINN.

(Copies President Lyndon B. Johnson and Secretary Robert S. McNamara.)

JUNE 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I agree with you every time you open your mouth. On the situation in Vietnam you make sense.

The ominous appointment of General Taylor to ambassadorship is extremely alarming. I have written the President, also.

You are, I know, a man of stature among men of a ludicrous political specie.

We cannot afford the luxury of playing this war game, lest the world be launched in a third world war, directed (I might add) at the North American Continent, as well as engulfing the entire world.

Please, take continued courage to speak out in the Halls of Government for what is politically and morally right. My husband also agrees with you.

I know you have had many well-wishers.

Sincerely,

PAT R. STACKOVICH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 26, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please let me congratulate you on your outspoken and courageous stand with regard to Vietnam. I am wholeheartedly in agreement with you, and I am sure that many, many, who, like you, are in possession of the facts, know that you speak the truth but lack your courage, and would endanger America and the future of the world rather than risk political careers.

I should think that even those who do not agree with you would have great admiration for your integrity. The tragic truth

is that history, I am sure, will prove you were right, but, I am afraid, too late to save us.

My profoundest respects to a true American.

Sincerely,

MILDRED ROGERS.

(Copy to President L. B. Johnson.)

JUNE 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your talk on TV about the U.S. policy I'm sure is shared by many—why don't they stand up and be counted.

This policy will continue only as long as the mass of the people are ignorant, or for one reason or other afraid to speak up.

Your referral to the 30 Australians doubling to 60 was an eye opener, although we should know by now how such things work.

Please, Senator MORSE, try to get on TV and radio oftener—make the people realize it's their lives and the lives of their loved ones that are at stake.

I wish there was some organization I could join to help others to wake up and be counted, as it really is later than they think—much later—maybe even too late.

Sincerely,

PEGGY KLEMPNER.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Just heard you on the "Today" program, and you are the first one I have listened to that has made any sense. I have always thought that the Congress made the decision if we were to have war, but President Johnson seems to be the one to decide. Like you I don't think Red China can be bluffed with our threats, and just might fool us, if we think they will back down.

They have 700 million people as you say; they don't care about human life and they could send waves and waves of men against us. Khrushchev would love us to have war with them that would save their men and fighting with them, and in the meantime when we were fighting China they would start something in Berlin, and also in Cuba. You're right we are the only ones in South Vietnam where are our Allies?

They are smart they are staying out. Will you please go on Meet the Press and tell the people about this mess we got ourselves in. Fighting thousands of miles away, and forgetting all about Cuba right at our doorsteps.

Mr. MORSE I have always voted Democratic but at this time I feel like thousands more people not to vote for anyone. If you were running for President I would vote for you as you are the only one I ever heard that thought the same as I do.

We are at war in Vietnam, as sure as the sun will rise tomorrow, and sending an Army man to take Lodge's place does not look good to me. What good does it do to have a United Nations if the problems can't be brought to them to settle, I have also wondered what they are doing all along about this crisis in South Vietnam? Can one man, the President, make this decision to have our boys killed as they are every day over there (he has two girls) and talk so brave we will fight to the finish.

As you said we cannot police Asia, maybe Russia (Khrushchev) is pretending to be angry at China and provoke a war with us then go in with China. Its easy to start a war, but to stop it and get out of it is another thing. Our Allies as you say are sitting on the sidelines, and saying what fools.

De Gaulle sees the folly of us doing what we are doing, and he is not going along with us in our decisions to make a fool of ourselves. That "Washington Pipeline" column the other day said Russians are

installing a new missile in Cuba that doesn't need a launching pad. Capable of being launched from a tank-type vehicle, the missile's range from 600 to 1,100 miles.

Mr. MORSE, please shout from the hilltops we are doing wrong to stay in Vietnam, also where are the Nationalist Chinese (I spelt that wrong) but will you ask will Chinese fight Chinese? Years ago when I was a kid I read a book called "Carpenter's Asia" about the yellow peril to come some day.

When Japan started the war I then figured maybe the yellow races would get together then. You never hear anything any more about Red China and Russia being at odds since we took over and are fighting Khrushchev's battles. Boy, is he jumping with glee? Just what he wanted, things couldn't be better for him. Playing right into his hands.

Please, Senator MORSE, you are the most intelligent man yet to go on TV and tell the people "wake up, America" before its too late, and gets out of hand, and brings us to war.

ALONE

Our allies are not with us in spirit. Sometimes I feel like a voice in the wilderness; there are so many things I seem to feel that are not right, but what can I do?

China? There lies a sleeping giant. Let him sleep. For when he wakes, he will move the world.

Napoleon said that years ago. Will close this letter, and don't remain quiet; Mr. MORSE, you have the right answers.

Mrs. A. ENSKO.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

P.S.—Please excuse this typewriting; its this crazy machine.

NORTH NEWTON, KANS.,

June 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are grateful to you for what you are doing in the Senate and on television to change U.S. southeast Asia policy. The enclosed copy of my letter to the Secretary of State expresses my views. Very respectfully yours,

W. F. UNRUH.

P.S.—You need not take the trouble to answer this letter. I am writing to let you know how glad we are for men like you in our Senate.

The editor of the Correspondent quotes a Japanese intellectual of Tokyo who has been in touch with some Chinese intellectuals as follows:

"My friend, there is one thing I fear more than anything else. It is that the United States may carry the Vietnam war into the North. There is absolutely no question but that the Chinese would then enter the war against the Americans. They are desperately afraid of America. Chinese on all levels see it as the aggressive and expansionist center of world imperialist reaction. They would enter the Vietnamese war as a matter of national survival. This is as certain as that we sit here."

NORTH NEWTON, KANS.,

June 24, 1964.

HON. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
State Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY RUSK: The news release that our President has appointed Gen. Maxwell Taylor, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to replace Henry Cabot Lodge in South Vietnam, and that our Government is considering going into war with China by military action against North Vietnam is frightening to us. To go to war with China I feel would be a tragic blunder because it

would cost millions of lives and would turn the world against us. A professed Christian nation surely should not do what many believe will lead to a world war.

Why does not our Government allow the United Nations to seek a solution to the southeast Asia problem? Through the United Nations world opinion would discipline China and help bring about a solution. The solution might not suit us in every respect, but it would likely be the best solution possible at this time. I feel strongly that U.S. unilateral military action is inexcusable when we have the United Nations organization to help keep the peace.

Therefore, I wish to make another plea that our Government bring the South Vietnam problem to the United Nations Assembly or to the Geneva Conference for solution.

Our Government has not lived up to the Geneva Agreements of 1954 and the world knows this. We will need to bring U.S. policy into line with the peaceful purposes of the United Nations, and respect the longing of mankind for peace. I, for one, feel that China would respect world opinion as expressed through the United Nations.

Very respectfully yours,

W. F. UNRUH.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,

June 26, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to take just a moment to tell you how much I have admired, over the years, your courageous and often single-handed fight for principle, truth and right.

Specifically I want to encourage you to continue in your opposition to our unconscionable involvement in Vietnam. This, and the Cuba business, have made me ashamed of my country, ashamed in a fundamental and permanent manner. These issues are crucial to what we as a nation believe and stand for, and if they represent the real answer, then—well, then I shall remain ashamed.

I would like to describe myself as a young college graduate—well, 32 years old—a civil servant, father, property owner and generally unexceptional. Sometimes the source of support is as important as the support itself.

Please keep up your efforts. I think you have demonstrated that the voters will support this kind of politics even more than the usual kind.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. HANSTEEN.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF.,

June 26, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I listened to your broadcast this morning on the "Today" TV program, and I am writing as an American citizen in support of your position that war is not the solution to the problems that face our government in southeast Asia.

My wife and I have spent our lives as Baptist educational missionaries in China and of late years in Japan. Our purpose has been to teach the Christian way of life to students and to the people.

We have often found ourselves unable to support our commercial and industrial interests of the United States who have too often looked upon the Chinese labor and resources as an opportunity to make money by use of cheap labor and cheap raw materials. This system also made a small number Chinese of the compradore class rich, while the lot of the farmer, the intellectuals, and the craftsmen became worse and worse.

The occupation of China by the U.S. Armed Forces during 1945-48 did nothing to help the common Chinese, indeed their lot became worse.

Since 1948 the great western powers have given up their colonial policy so-called except the United States who are now engaged in a war with Vietnam to prevent the people of Vietnam from having political and economic control of southeast Asia.

Senator CHURCH of Idaho, on the "Today" show stated in his broadcast that large scale armed intervention in southeast Asia by American Armed Forces may result in the union of all the people of Asia into a race war against the white Americans, and at the same time may result in drawing the Chinese and Russians together against the United States.

Today the Asahi paper published in Tokyo stated and I quote, "A war between United States and China would be of truly great concern to us Japanese who also live in Asia," unquote.

The hour is very late maybe too late to avoid a great war in the Pacific, but I know you will do your best to get the issues before the American people and what they face if they try to use raw military power against the nearly 2 billion people of Asia.

Please do your best Senator in this time of crisis to help us.

Respectfully your,

STERLING BEATH.

JUNE 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Yesterday I saw and heard you on the "Today" program of NBC. What you said is important, not only for the United States but for the whole world and I hope you will continue your fight to have this brought to the U.N.

If we fought a war in southeast Asia, the problems there would still be unsolved, just as they are in Korea. These problems are compounded, rather than reduced by war.

Also, I hope you can help to see that the laws of the United States apply also to the State of Mississippi. Our son Douglas is among the young voter registration educators there. The rights of citizenship must be extended to all Americans.

Greetings to TERRY OLSON.

Sincerely yours,

HARVEY F. BATZ.

P.S.—Formerly from Montana and still remembering our discussion on the plane going to India (in 1958).

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA,

June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Although I have written you before, sir, my admiration and gratitude for and to you are of such dimension that I must let you know again.

I'm grateful to providence that we have men of your caliber. You are my favorite Senator and have been for many years; may God bless you, sir.

My view runs parallel with yours, sir, from alpha to omega.

Knowing that God is just, I often tremble over my country's behavior; but I know that you intrepidly endeavor to retard the trigger-happy ones. Again Senator MORSE, "It may make a difference to all eternity whether we do right or wrong today."

May I also ask you, sir, to convey my gratitude to your fellow Senators HUMPHREY, CHURCH, and others of good will.

As for the vultures—let them shrill. Thanks again and again, sir.

Respectfully and gratefully yours,

HJALMAR JOHNSON.

ADRIAN, MICH.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I've just heard you on the "Today" show.

You have given me hope, as you undoubtedly have millions of others who heard you express your views so daringly and so clearly—that someone in Washington is aware of what is going on and even though it is going against the actions of leaders in his own party, has the courage to ask what the majority of your countrymen are asking—Why are we acting alone? Why are we bypassing the United Nations? Why are we sending our soldiers to die in the Far East?

We are rebelling against what those in high office are doing to our country—the Supreme Court making our laws and scrapping the Constitution. Taking away the rights of the majority and catering to a minority resulting in chaos. Getting us into a war which we cannot win and for which we have no heart.

Those in the highest offices have lied to us until we have no confidence in what we are told—the latest, denial of the resignation of Lodge when we know, now, he had resigned when the denial was made. The replacements weren't decided overnight.

The administration making a fool of itself to its countrymen and the whole world—Johnson expecting plaudits for trying to "settle the crisis in Cyprus" while preparing for a real war in Asia. Stating that Russia "agrees" to stay out of a war with Red China, expecting it to break a pact with Red China, but not to break that agreement.

Why have GOLDWATER and Wallace gone over so dramatically? The people see what is taking place and will vote for anyone who will promise to reverse the present trend.

Sincerely,

SESTA T. MATHEISON.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,

June 25, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for explaining on the "Today" show, why our southeast Asian war problem, has not been taken to the United Nations. It is a unique experience today to be told the truth, and I am most grateful to you, as are all of my neighbors, with whom I have spoken this morning.

Yours truly,

LUCY CHURCHILL.

DETROIT, MICH.,

June 26, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I certainly want to congratulate you on your stand regarding the expansion of our military activities in southeast Asia. I can't see where the administration is trying to save anything but face; and believe me I don't think the administrative face that they will save is worth the lives of our boys who already have been killed there. Much less the lives of the many thousands more who will be killed with an expanded war.

I further think, that it's too expensive a lesson in lives for our military to obtain practical experience in this manner. I was under the impression that the Congress had the power to declare war. Are you, worthy gentlemen, of these two legislative bodies going to surrender this responsibility to the administration?

It seems to me that too many legislative prerogatives are being surrendered to the administrative branch.

I'm sending a copy of this letter to Senators McNAMARA and HART of Michigan, and Congressman BROOMFIELD from my district.

Yours very respectfully,

J. M. ROBINSON.

(Copies to Senator HART, Senator McNAMARA, and Congressman BROOMFIELD.)

JUNE 25, 1964.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I heard Senator MORSE this morning on the "Today Show" and agree with him completely, as far as our foreign policy in the Far East is concerned. I'm sending you a copy of the letter I've written him today. I certainly solicit your activity in support of his attitude.

It seems to me that thinking men, who remember Korea, and the thousands upon thousands of American men and women who lost their lives or were otherwise maimed or severely crippled, do everything possible to avoid another conflict.

Not only did we not win the war in Korea, but we are continuing to lose the peace there; and we are destined to the same experience in southeast Asia, if we stay there.

You will notice that our European allies, with 100 years experience in Far Eastern matters, are offering little help.

I fully appreciate that the executive department has the responsibility of foreign policy but the legislative department are the ones that vote the money and can control the situation.

Very respectfully yours,

J. M. ROBINSON.

(Copy to Senator MORSE.)

JUNE 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: We are very proud of you to stand up and speak against the sending of Americans to South Vietnam. I cannot understand how we have a right to risk any kind of a war anywhere. We think you are a very wise man and know it takes rare courage to speak up in the way that you have.

Sincerely yours,

EMILY PARKER.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,

June 25, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am the costar of what has become a popular American television series, "McHale's Navy". I tell you this for purposes of identification because I know it matters little to you.

What I did want to say is that there are those of us that sleep better at night knowing you are in the U.S. Senate.

Please keep up the good fight. You represent not only Oregon, but all of us.

My deep regards,

JOE FLYNN.

OMAHA, NEBR.,

June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: When I watched you this morning on the "Today" show on NBC, when you voiced your opinion on Vietnam I was glad about the clear way you explained about a sad point in our present-day history.

Sorry that this is but the stand of a minority but we can grow. I say "we," because I fully share your viewpoint on the situation.

Wishing you success.

ILSE RUTH KUTTNER.

FLINT, MICH.,
June 26, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: After wondering aloud the last few weeks not knowing where I stood concerning South Vietnam, I now find myself compelled to urge you to continue your lonely battle against the U.S. Senate.

The American public is being pushed into a war which could feasibly ruin the United States, the United Nations, and the world—and they will have no conception of why we will be fighting.

Any assistance I, as a citizen of the United States and of this world, can do to help in your fight, I will gladly do.

Sincerely,

LEROY A. LOTT, Jr.

CANOGA PARK, CALIF.,
June 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Every effort should be made to fight against the confirmation of Gen. Maxwell Taylor.

The appointment of the military to a diplomatic post in this critical area at this critical time is an exposure of our intention to escalate the war.

This could well lead to a nuclear conflict and should be opposed with every energy at your disposal.

Respectfully yours,

PAUL STONE.

JUNE 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank goodness for the voice of WAYNE MORSE raised against the Vietnamese fiasco. That sorry, sorry war—with all those pitiful people embroiled in all that "modern" savagery.

What can the administration be thinking of—election, I suppose—and God help us if the Republicans get elected though sometimes I can't see much difference between them and us.

Of course the United Nations should be taking care of this matter.

And now—well I can't go into Cuba—this is to say—all of my friends agree with you.

Sincerely,

MARY GWEN OWEN.

SOUTH FORT MITCHELL, KY.,
June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I would be lax as an interested American and as one of your most ardent admirers and supporters, if I did not express my views on your appearance on "Today" this date.

It is a regrettable fact, but a few of us know that the policy being pursued today, is still Dulles brinkmanship, and only a new administrator, and it is far more regrettable that you, one of the best qualified supporters of a better America and world, has to get on your high horse and take out after the one leader who too stands for in most part the things you stand for, as you and I know this is the very thing the GOP, who cannot think of anything good or constructive to propose, so they spend their time trying to pick up a scrap of any difference within the Democratic ranks and exploit it using the press, and TV which they in 98 percent control.

I want to compliment you and your honest and forthright "Morse Manner" disagreeing, caused by honest differences of opinion, which I feel is too right for comfort, as I clearly understand you and from listening to you back on radio, as Republican, then Independent, and as Democrat, also in our con-

vention, as I work as a representative of the International Association of Machinists AFL-CIO and am away from home trying to assist those who struggle to make ends meet to feed, house, educate, and clothe their families.

You know and I too know that this appearance had great impact on millions who will not write, and so the GOP syndicated columnists who decry everything will use this expression for their own selfish and for most part stupid partisan purposes to try and gain political jobs, for those who would make fast GOP war.

Excuse typing as I am better machinist, rather than typist, using the hunt and peck system.

Your admirer and supporter,

MATTHEW CARR.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Listening in on your television interview yesterday, I am proud to know that we have men of your caliber in Washington.

I am 100 percent behind your suggestion to take our Vietnam problem to the United Nations.

Please continue your efforts for the good of our Nation.

Yours very truly,

MRS. JOHN FELGENHAUER.

BIRMINGHAM, MICH.,
June 25, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE.

HONORABLE SIR: I want to complement you on your views, expressed on the "Today" show concerning our foreign policy in southeast Asia.

I am the average American; voiceless, and concerned about the "American image" throughout the world. We have enough sense to know something is rotten in Denmark, judging by the gaseous bubbles emanating from the cesspool, but confused by the doubletalk. We don't know what it is.

You straightened out the string for us this morning. Let's call a spade a spade, and proceed to dig with it. America deserves better representation than some of our people are offering.

More power to people who think and speak as you do. I am a working man, 70 years old, have been a Democrat all my life. I don't have to worry about eating any more, but am still a Democrat.

I'd like to shake your hand.

WINFRED KOLLARS.

JUNE 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know how grateful I am to you for trying to keep us out of a war. The nuclear weapons today, in case of a war, will destroy our civilization that took centuries to build.

FANNIE LANDER.

CHICAGO, ILL.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up the resistance to Johnson's brinkmanship. This alleged war for self-determination once seemed ridiculous and now seems disgusting. Clearly the people of Vietnam, north and south, are quite determined that their future shall not be dictated to them by the United States. I don't know what the Buddhists in Saigon want, or what Ho Chi Minh wants, or what the prisoners in those "free" and fortified hamlets want, nor do I think they are sure of their aims either, but I am pretty damn sure that they do not want more U.S. generals, advisors, planes, guns, murder, and mayhem.

Please push for U.N. guaranteed neutrality, U.N. border patrols and inspectors, etc., for the whole of southeast Asia. A neutral buffer belt around China seems to be our best hope.

Why don't you and Senators GRUENING, MANSFIELD and any other rational or semi-rational Senators put together a policy statement, get signatures from both Houses, publicize it, embarrass people (L.B.J., Taylor, Lodge, et al.) with it.

See if you can't hold up Senate approval of Maxwell's appointment. Will there be hearings first? Then grill him on his "unique" qualifications for the ambassadorial job.

What can be done to curtail L.B.J.'s power in this area? How best to expose the hypocrisy of our southeast Asia policy?

Yours,

CHARLES KEIL.

SARASOTA, FLA.,
June 25, 1964.

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

Until today, when I listened to what you had to say about our policy in Asia, I thought you were a maverick, but now I'm one of the millions who are behind you 100 percent.

When will Congress take inventory, and start taking back many of the powers it has delegated to the White House and put the executive branch of our Government in the right constitutional perspective.

As you so aptly put it, why not use the United Nations. It is our money that runs most of that debating club, and if it no longer serves any worthwhile purpose, let's get out of it.

My hat's off to you sir, for saying what few, if any other Senator, would have the courage to say. There is still hope for us with men like you on the Hill. I was almost ready to fly my flag at half mast come the 4th, for all the freedoms and constitutional rights I have lost.

F. J. JAKES.

P.S.—Written in person, and since I have no sight, I hope you will forgive any misspelling, and/or typographical errors. Thanks.

SHERMAN OAKS, CALIF.,
June 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Yeah, man.

You said a mouthful.

Pour it on.

In the great tradition of Abraham Lincoln, you have dared stand up and say that the Government of the United States is war-mongering and must stop. You perform an inestimable service to the American people. Believe that we people, though confused, disoriented, and scared (not only by fear of war, but by fear of persecution if we voice our fear of war) will stand up and support a man of your stature who will carry a consistent fight to the people on this question.

What can I do to help?

Sincerely,

FREDERIC I. RINALDO.

AFTON, WYO.,
June 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: If we only had more Senators like you the world would be a better place.

We could expend our energies on China and be a pushover for Russia. We do not want war. We should pull out of Vietnam. God bless you.

Mr. and Mrs. ROY GARDNER.

P.S.—Keep speaking up for that which is right.

BENTONVILLE, ARK.,

June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Some "unthinkable thoughts" which should be publicized.

We (the United States) refused to sign the 1954 Geneva Conference Agreement on Far Eastern Affairs which stipulated that a plebiscite be held in North and South Vietnam in 1956.

We instead strengthened our ties with Ngo Dinh Diem (later recognized as a fraud and murdered).

We sent a general in civilian clothes to assist the Diem regime "as an adviser."

We sent more than 16,000 armed men without the necessary approval of Congress to carry on a war.

We now call it a war and decorate casualties accordingly.

We now send another general, presumably in civilian clothes, as Ambassador to South Vietnam.

We now threaten to attack North Vietnam from South Vietnam and the South China Sea and Laos from Thailand.

We call the rebels of South Vietnam and Laos Vietcong or Communists, not "Washington rebels."

Congress has not declared war and the mass of people of the United States do not want war.

Who is running this country? Is it McNamara who represents the capitalistic interests?

The voices of Senators MORSE, FULBRIGHT, and GRUENING must be louder and persistently echoed throughout the land. Let no one be so greedy or puerile and fail to be aware that, if the United States attacks North Vietnam and China, Soviet Russia will not remain idle. Our own treatment of the Negroes and Asians will limit aid and friendship from the African and Asian Continents.

This is the nuclear age where dollar diplomacy is on the wane because the Baruch plan failed which left the United States without a monopoly of nuclear power.

Just as the industrial-military complex assumes the privilege of issuing almost daily press releases which promote the interests only of the industrial-military complex so should our Foreign Relations Committee, our elected Senators and Representatives, who represent the people and not special interests, issue as many releases which reveal a deep concern for our country as a whole, without ulterior motives limited to a powerful minority.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

WM. P. ENGEL.

NORTH NEWTON, KANS.,

June 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We were downright relieved to hear the ideas you expressed on the "Today" show this morning. We wish these convictions were more widespread. It seems to us, too, our military activities in Vietnam are just for nothing—for nothing. We have high regard for President Johnson and we can't understand why he and Dean Rusk and MacNamara, etc., are for going on with this futile war. How can we bring about a change in policy? It's so tragic to see what's happening.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIS RICH.

P.S.—South Vietnam should be a United Nations problem.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations for a rare and courageous voice speaking out for a sane and sober approach to our South Vietnamese policy.

As you mentioned, the Vietnamese war is McNamara's war—but it also seems true, as a reporter questioner put it to you—whether the forthcoming election was not a reason for the President's warlike activity?

I believe it is true, that with cessation of war, our economy will suffer, unless our economic planners work out a program of reconversion to peacetime industrial production—the future does not look too bright.

We all look forward to your good health and clear thinking.

Sincerely,

ROSE KARSHMER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,

June 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have written President Johnson urging him not to extend the war in Vietnam, but we also want to thank you for your tremendous efforts in preserving peace in the world. Your stand moved us to write to the President and I am sure that it will serve as a rallying point—indeed it already seems to be doing so—for those who want to live in peace. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JERRY RICHARD.

OSKALOOSA, KANS.

SENATOR MORSE: I turned on the TV program June 25, "Today" and must say keep up the good work for peace.

I have felt all along it is such a mistake to send our boys to Vietnam to mix in that war. Our poor boys sent all over the world to fight in other nations, it's time someone tells the folks who are responsible for it. What is wrong with our U.N. representatives? I sent a son to the Second World War and I know what it means for a mother to send her dear sons to fight on foreign soil. He started in North Africa and got clear around to France. Was gone 3 years. I think we mothers might put a stop to it if we would fight a little too. I've been a Republican but when a see a Democrat who gets things done I'm for him. I don't want to see my grandsons have to go and fight in other nation's wars. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mrs. RAY ENGLE.

PROVIDENCE, KY.,

June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was with a great deal of pleasure that I listened to your interview yesterday.

Please talk this over with other Senators, the U.N., and President Johnson.

Thanking you.

Most sincerely,

Mrs. ORVILLE G. WITHERS.

INK, ARK., June 26, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: These few words to compliment you on your stand in South Vietnam. The whole blame country and all the American capital invested there isn't worth the life of one American soldier. Sooner or later we are going to have to get out and the sooner the better.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. GILBERT.

NEWTONVILLE, MASS.,

June 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE OF OREGON,
Foreign Relations Committee,
U.S. Government.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for speaking the truth so openly about the mistaken

policy of the United States of America in South Vietnam.

The International League for Peace and Freedom founded by Jane Addams and Emily Balch is working as hard as we know how for the change in policy that you advocate.

All the forces there should be under the U.N. as you suggest. Ho Chi Minh tries to run a socialistic government in North Vietnam. He does not want to be ruled by the Chinese Communists.

Mr. Chakravarty, an Indian intellectual, who teaches at Boston University, recently spent 3 weeks in and about Saigon. He says that it is a reign of terror there, that these gentle people had a good agriculture on their fertile soil, but you said, I think that U.S. Army troops occupy the peninsula, which contained the best ricefields.

Yes, we are letting the Pentagon and the arms manufacturers run our foreign relations. When Japan's military clique got power, they brought Japan into the war on the side of Hitler.

The "Today" show is watched by millions all across the country. I am writing to congratulate them on having such an able, forthright speaker on their program as Senator MORSE, from Oregon.

I have cousins living in the beautiful city of Portland, Brener, and Snowhill, and Dee.

Gratefully yours,

ALICE L. MURDOCH.

GLEN ELLYN, ILL.,

June 27, 1964.

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE,
Chicago Tribune, Chicago, Ill.

SENATOR MORSE's suggestion that the Vietnam problem be placed before the United Nations is an excellent one.

I hope this can be done, and quickly, too.

KATHARINE K. MOORE.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You can always be depended upon for sensible suggestions with regard to our ever-increasing problems.

I hope you will continue to grace the Senate for many years to come.

Sincerely yours,

KATHARINE K. MOORE.

FOXBORO, MASS.,

June 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I congratulate you on your efforts to bring the Senate to a meaningful consideration of the space authorization bill.

In the past—Telstar, Vietnam—in your role as devil's advocate you have indeed proven yourself a statesman.

I do wish I were a constituent of yours that this letter and my feelings on your performance would be of tangible value.

Best wishes for your future efforts.

Sincerely,

JOHN G. AYLWARD.

SCHWEIZ, SWITZERLAND.

To Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, Senator Morse, Senator Fulbright, Kiplinger Washington Letter, Stone's Weekly Letter:

One of the best European newsletters, Zuericher Wirtenhaftsbrief, who has excellent sources of information, reported from Paris that De Gaulle fears President Johnson might be forced, still before elections, into a "strike of violence" against China (perhaps to prove that he is as "hard" as GOLDWATER).

One of the two leading Swiss weeklies, Zuericher Woche of Zurich, published on June 26, 1964, an editorial with the title "America's Janus Head," comparing America's policy in Cyprus and in southeast Asia.

After a positive comment on America's policy in Cyprus, it comments on America's policy in southeast Asia with the following sentences which are doubly remarkable be-

cause Switzerland is the most anti-Communist country in West Europe:

"In the last 14 days the American warnings, or rather threats, against North Vietnam and China have been so frequent that it is not too early to speak of a dangerous situation. The former commander in Saigon, General Harkins, could publicly declare, without being reprimanded, that it would be very advantageous to risk war with China, in order to protect South Vietnam against a Communist takeover. Between May 17 and June 21, American planes, in undisputable violation of the Laos agreements, made more than 200 reconnaissance and bombing flights over the Pathet Lao territory.

"The appointment of the Chief of the General Staff, Maxwell Taylor, as Ambassador of the United States of America in Saigon shows who commands in South Vietnam and what is planned. What would the Americans say if Marshal Malinowski would be appointed as Ambassador of the German Democratic Republic (East Germany)?

"Obviously, the American circles who decide policies, concluded the rift between Moscow and Peking became so deep and irreparable that China can be treated the hard way without Moscow considering this as need to assist its ally. Perhaps these people assume even a silent Russian consent. One must warn against this. Similarly, as the Soviet Union went into a trap in Cuba, so Washington can get into a trap in southeast Asia. Such action could end very badly."

In 1939, the German Government risked war with Poland, assuming that England would stay out. This error has cost the lives of 30 million men, women, and children. A similar error about China might cost the lives of 300 million people in America, Asia, and Europe.

K. KAUFFMANN,

*Citizen of the United States of America,
Democratic Voter, Never a Communist
or Member of Any Communist-Front
Organization.*

HOUSTON, TEX.,

June 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: We have tried to the best of our abilities to follow the developments in South Vietnam and find ourselves constantly at odds with the concept of a military solution.

It is therefore with particular pleasure that we have followed your repeated requests that the problems of southeast Asia be put before the United Nations.

We sincerely hope that you will continue to pursue this course.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. M. A. ZUCK.

(Copies to the President of the United States and the Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH.)

ROGERS PARK COMMITTEE FOR A
SANE NUCLEAR POLICY,
Chicago, Ill., June 10, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Rogers Park Chapter, National Committee for a SANE Nuclear Policy wishes to praise the courageous and enlightened stand you have taken on Vietnam.

In the struggle of rival ideologies it is often difficult to think in terms of what is best for humanity as a whole. We would like to encourage your work in hopes of changing the devastating course which our administration has embarked upon in Vietnam.

Please continue your efforts in this field.

Very truly yours,

MELVIN KATZ,
Chairman.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just written the President opposing the appointment of General Taylor as Ambassador to South Vietnam and opposing our dangerous role in that area. I urged him to support your position placing the entire matter before the United Nations and letting that body solve this problem.

I want to express my wholehearted support to you and to your colleagues in the Senate for speaking out and alarming the American people to this grave threat to the peace of the world and to the United Nations. I congratulate you and wish you good health and the strength to carry on.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. ANNETTE CIMRING.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF.,

June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: With reference to the press interview on the TV "Today" show that was broadcast at 7:30 a.m., P.s.t. on June 25, 1964.

We most heartily agree with you on all points. The Vietnam situation should be the function of the United Nations to resolve. We as a nation have no business whatsoever to send our boys to be killed in what is really a domestic affair of another nation. That wornout slogan, "To Fight Communism" was used by Hitler as the excuse for the Germans to conquer the entire world.

No nation need have any fear of communism, unless, the people of a nation are suffering injustices, such as: unemployment, racial discrimination, military dictatorship, or the tendency thereto, economic inequalities where a portion of the nation live in luxury and a portion live in dire poverty.

Our country is fortunate indeed to have a Senator with your courage and rationalism, and to fearlessly state the facts as you have. We are proud of your, Sir. We regret that we do not have a greater number of Senators with the same attributes.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. and NEVA BOURNIER.

JUNE 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wholeheartedly support your position that we should not get involved in a war on the mainland of southeast Asia, and should withdraw our military forces from South Vietnam.

Keep up the good work. I have just finished writing to President Johnson supporting your position, and am going to write my Congressmen and Senators.

Sincerely,

BEN W. ANDERSON, Jr.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.,

June 26, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I'm sure that a great number of concerned people were relieved and given fresh hope by your views on yesterday's "Today" show of NBC.

More strength and courage to you and others who have now for months given us subscribers to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD hope that the U.N. may be brought into a peace settlement in Asia. It seems as if the press and news media of all kinds have guessed wrongly that your views and points in favor of legal action through U.N. should be suppressed. May the new awareness be heightened also by a more tolerant view of

JUNE 25, 1964.

U.N. by Senator CHURCH's remarks on "Today" this morning.

Thank you and blessings on your vigorous stand for some way to have world authority replace U.S. military domination in a new world which will not accept the latter.

Sincerely,

MERWIN HUMPHREY.

JUNE 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Just to let you know we are behind you in your effort to open the eyes of the American people on what is happening in southeast Asia.

We will do our part to bring your message to the people of California.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. CARLTON MOSS.

JUNE 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

SIR: Listening to you on the "Today" program.

Am only an old woman, but I do now and have always admired you. You talk like I feel. But what can we little people do. I do not like McNamara and never have, he even looks too stern. Our Senator YOUNG is also a good man and does not like this business in Asia. It bothers me because of our boys getting killed out there. Does our country want to rule the world. Thought we were for peace. Also, I know plenty of people who do not like to have our country and our boys over in Asia. But we are nothing. It does not matter how we feel or talk, in Washington, they will go ahead and do just whatever they like. I wish they in Washington would get rid of the war mongers. This is not a fine letter, but this Asian thing bothers me a lot.

And please do all you can to help our boys. And we talk about Russia. Who are we to say anything.

Respectfully,

Mrs. J. DUARANT.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

JUNE 27, 1964.

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

SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed is a carbon of a letter I sent to President Johnson today with regard to the dangerous situation in southeast Asia. I want you to know that I will do what little I can to see that the U.S. military presence is removed from that part of the world and that I am grateful for the stands that both you and Senator GRUENING have taken on that U.S. presence.

Sincerely,

HENRY KLEIN.

WANAQUE, N.J.

JUNE 27, 1964.

President JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: The increasing involvement of U.S. money, equipment, and troops in southeast Asia is for me a source of rising apprehension. It troubles me that when the Attorney General of this country can say, with regard to three civil rights workers in Mississippi, that there is little he can do under existing laws, that this same country, in southeast Asia, can pursue a policy in blatant disregard of the law, the Geneva Accord, as well as the sentiments of the peoples of both South Vietnam and Laos.

What can the justification be when the Vietcong are fighting a legitimate civil war with popular support in South Vietnam, and the situation in Laos arises out of the right-wing coup d'etat earlier this year rather than the withdrawal of the Pathet Lao from the coalition government which the coup made inevitable. There can be no justification for a policy that risks total war in an

area in which we have no rights save that in withdrawing we might lose face. Do we not have a greater obligation to all mankind to preserve peace?

If I am called up to fight in southeast Asia, I cannot with conscience do anything else but refuse. I will not help to bolster a regime so terribly repressive as that of South Vietnam, and though I would not hesitate to fight for the legitimate defense of our own country, I will not fight in Southeast Asia.

Sincerely,

HENRY KLEIN.

WANAQUE, N.J.

OLNEY, TEX.,

June 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Yesterday I saw you on the "Today" program and I believe you are right in your thinking on the southeast Asia question. I hope you can put your program over and if there is anything that we Americans can help, let us know.

Yours Truly,

R. N. LUNN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

June 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heartily endorse and applaud your valiant efforts to extricate this country from the war in South Vietnam. I am appalled that this administration publicly admits plans for extending the conflict into another sovereign state, and am even more appalled by the degree of apathy and resignation in this country, that approves by its silence all the monstrous machinations of genocidal war.

God bless you.

STEPHEN LEIPER.

LANSING, MICH.,

June 25, 1964.

Senators GEORGE D. AIKEN and WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Please accept our support for your courageous position on American policy in the Far East as expressed in your recent TV news statements. We hope other Senators, including our own, will have the courage to join you.

Unless our completely bankrupt brute force approach to Far East problems is reversed we may find that our country will have to pay dearly for the widespread tendency to put political considerations above all else. We can see no other honest explanation for our so obviously ineffective (not to mention immoral) Far East policy.

Sincerely,

ROBERT WASSERMAN.

MARGARET L. WASSERMAN.

(Copies to Senators HART and McNAMARA.)

Mr. MORSE. I shall speak at greater length on the subject today outside the morning hour, but I wish to say that the war should not be made our war in Asia. We have no right to make it our war in Asia. We have no right to kill American boys in Asia. There is no basis for the United States not to have taken it to the United Nations long ago. That is our treaty obligation. There is no basis for our allies not having taken it to the United Nations. I am sad to see my country putting itself in the image and the posture before the world that we are going to exercise our military might first, and then after everyone has surrendered, to us, we shall be willing to negotiate.

Mr. President, we could not make a greater historic mistake than that. One of the great mistakes being made is that we have leaders in this country talking

about this as our war in Asia. Who made it our war in Asia? How did it become our war in Asia? It happens to be a threat to the peace of the world, and it ought to be a subject of concern to all peace-loving nations in the world. We ought to be trying to keep the peace in Asia and not make war.

I disassociate myself from all the talk about the war being our war, because we have no right to be making war in Asia.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed the bill (S. 6) authorizing the subsidy of mass transportation systems throughout the United States. Other Senators as well as I voted against the measure primarily, I believe, in the fear that the program would grow interminably and involve a cost far in excess of what anyone could now imagine.

Some discussion took place about the construction of the Interstate Highway System in connection with the bill. We know that the Interstate Highway System has been financed through a trust fund into which moneys have flowed. Those moneys coming from excise taxes imposed specifically for the purpose of financing the program. Yesterday I stated that in 1962 the Congress directed that a study be made as to ways and means of solving the mass transportation problems of our metropolitan communities. The report on that study is to be made on January 1, 1965. Whether or not in the study the establishment of a mass transportation system trust fund will be contemplated, I do not know.

I am having prepared a resolution which will direct the Secretary of Commerce to make a study of the feasibility of establishing a trust fund to finance the mass transportation system. My resolution will specifically request that a study be made to ascertain whether, out of the fares of each community that is being helped, there may be taken a one-cent or a two-cent charge, to be paid into the trust fund, so as, at least in part, to finance the subsidy. I shall have that resolution ready for introduction sometime within the next week.

I make this statement to call the attention of my colleagues to the advisability of studying whether or not we can, in part, make self-sustaining this huge new subsidy.

I yield the floor.

CHEROKEE TRIBE PRAISED

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Cherokee Indians over many years have made a vital contribution to the development and culture of Oklahoma. Recently the Kansas City Star, of June 7, 1964, published a full-page story on William W. Keeler, principal chief of the Cherokee Tribe and a top official of the Phillips Petroleum Co. As an accompaniment to the biography of Keeler as "a big chief, both of oil and Indians," the Star devoted an article to the traditions and culture of the Cherokee's. The tribe's religion, laws, education, and cus-

oms are described with such interest that I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The author says that the Cherokee culture is revered by Cherokee descendants. I also admire it, as do most other Oklahomans.

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

PROGRESS OF FAMED INDIAN TRIBE A SOURCE OF PRIDE IN OKLAHOMA

The traditions and culture of the Cherokee Indians are revered by their thousands of descendants, but by none more than their present principal chief, William W. Keeler, Phillips Petroleum executive who is the subject of the accompanying article.

Keeler's ancestors were among the more than 13,000 Cherokees who were forced to leave their homes in Georgia in the 1830's by a white man's government that, in retrospect, appears to have been singularly unenlightened. More than 4,000 of the Indians, men, women, and children, died on the tortuous 1,000-mile march on the "Trail of Tears" to Oklahoma Territory.

Signifying changes wrought by the passing years, it was 2 years ago that the eastern capital of the Cherokees at New Echota, Ga., restored at a cost of \$95,000, was dedicated at a special homecoming program attended by Keeler and other distinguished members of the ancient tribe.

Although Keeler does not worship in the Seven Clan religion of his ancestors, he believes it is a source of inspiration for the full-blood Cherokees who do. In the ritual of the Seven Clan, the members stand at seven points around an eternal fire (the supreme great spirit).

Young members of the clan respect and treat one another as brothers and sisters and consider all of the older members as their mothers and fathers and pledge to protect and care for them.

The "eternal flame," fed by fuel of wood, is brought forth from a hiding place for regular worship ceremonies. Believers say it was lighted back in antiquity, when lightning probably was the only source of fire, and has been kept alive by the tribe ever since.

The flame was borne along the Trail of Tears in a brazier or earthen vessel from a hiding place in the fastness of Georgia hills. It has a tribal significance the Cherokees do not divulge. Only faithful keepers know its hiding place.

In the Civil War, the Cherokee Nation fought on the side of the Confederacy. Members of the tribe owned slaves, but emancipated them February 18, 1863.

Long before Columbus discovered America, the Cherokees, one of the five civilized tribes, possessed tribal customs preserving the rights of property ownership and providing punishment for crimes. Tribal customs served with the force of law until 1808, when the written statutes first came into existence.

The tribe's first organic law, patterned somewhat on the U.S. Constitution, was adopted in 1817. Ten years later it was broadened to set up legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the government. As far back as the 1820's the tribe members were building roads and schools.

From the beginnings, Cherokee laws characteristically encouraged education. Compulsory attendance of schoolchildren was pioneered by the Cherokees. They elected their chieftains by popular vote.

Intermarriage of relatives, extending to cousins, was prohibited. A complete system of courts, corresponding to our courts today, included a supreme court and an attorney general. Until 1875, most crimes were punishable by whipping. Hanging was the penalty for murder and rape. Larceny of

stock was a serious offense, the punishment being 50 lashes upon the bare back for the first offense and 100 for the second. On their third conviction, the culprits were hanged.

The Cherokees held truth in high regard, and perjury was one of the most serious offenses under their laws.

The Cherokee Advocate, the first newspaper in Oklahoma, was established in 1845 and printed in both Cherokee and English. The first long distance telephone west of the Mississippi River was between Tahlequah and Fort Gibson. Greek and astronomy were in the curriculum of tribal seminaries operating in 1851.

When statehood was granted to Oklahoma in 1907, the Cherokees and the other four civilized tribes—Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole—ceased to exist as political entities because their property passed into the domain of the 46th State.

ALLEGHENY AIRLINES, A CARRIER SERVING WEST VIRGINIA, STUDIES ACQUISITION OF JET-PROP AIRCRAFT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Allegheny Airlines is one of three local service air carriers which bring benefit to the citizens of West Virginia. Serving three major cities and areas of the Mountain State—Huntington, Parkersburg, and Wheeling—this progressive company provides vital airfreight, airmail, and passenger transportation capability on a daily scheduled basis. As a partner in West Virginia's drive toward increased prosperity and growth, Allegheny has consistently exhibited a spirit of cooperation which is reflected in its own expansion and in rising levels of commerce for our businessmen and the traveling public.

An indication of the importance of effective travel by air can be gained from examinations of data compiled and made available by company officials. They point out that in March of 1964, Allegheny Airlines boarded 31 percent more passengers in Parkersburg, W. Va., than during the same month in 1963. Huntington showed a rise of 20 percent, and Wheeling figures were up by 15 percent. Here is ample proof that more and more of our men, women, and children are learning to rely on local service carriers for fast, dependable, and reasonably priced transportation.

Mr. President, I am pleased to report that Allegheny Airlines has progressed even further in its eagerness to contribute to the public interest. In order to bring about faster, more frequent non-stop service at communities on its 38 airport system, Allegheny is studying a new type of jet-prop aircraft.

Referring to it as "the first airplane ever designed specifically to serve the smaller traffic hubs" able President Leslie O. Barnes said the company's board of Directors has authorized management to undertake a detailed study leading to the purchase of 10 such aircraft.

Without naming the candidate models, Barnes indicated that those selected will "significantly benefit the small and medium-sized communities, the passenger, the taxpayers, and the airline."

The positive influence of such a purchase in West Virginia is obvious since the new pressurized jet-prop will be

smaller but considerably faster than the aircraft now in use.

President Barnes says that "because the airplane will operate with fewer passengers on board than are required for break-even operations with airplanes in local service today, we will be able to schedule more flights, often flying non-stop to and from primary cities, at the intermediate airports."

He forecast that the introduction of this new plane "can have a major impact in reducing the dependence of these smaller communities on Federal subsidy for their needed air services."

Mr. President, I heartily commend the management and personnel of Allegheny Airlines for their progressive and constructive attitudes, and for the manner in which they have worked with West Virginians in the building of a better way of life for citizens of the Mountain State.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, earlier this month Mr. Samuel F. Pryor, one of our outstanding Connecticut citizens, made what I consider to be a very fine address before the Meriden, Conn., Boys' Club.

Sam Pryor has devoted many hours of his life to good causes and perhaps the most important of these activities has been his work as a director of the Boys' Clubs of America for 30 years.

So Sam Pryor spoke with a firm knowledge of his subject when he discussed the need for proper guidance in the home and in the community for American boys, so that they will be ready and willing to assume positions of leadership in the United States when they reach maturity.

The Meriden Boys' Club, which has been in continuous operation for 76 years and similar clubs throughout the United States are doing an excellent job helping combat juvenile delinquency and preparing boys for the responsibilities of adulthood.

Juvenile crime has increased dramatically during the last 10 years, but in the words of J. Edgar Hoover:

I shudder to think what the juvenile crime rate would be without such organizations as the Boys' Clubs of America.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in the RECORD Sam Pryor's speech, a letter he received from J. Edgar Hoover, and a column entitled "Frankly Speaking," by Frank R. Corkin, Jr., which appeared in the Meriden Journal on this subject.

There being no objection, the speech, letter, and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. PRYOR

Since December, because of the nature of my business, Mrs. Pryor and I have been to 5 continents—visiting 26 of the capital cities of our world. We in business have long ago learned that we must face facts—that difficult problems can be put aside but can never be dismissed. Travel around the world brings facts into sharper focus. World travel opens our eyes to new horizons, to new understanding, to exchange of ideas. But above all, world travel also often opens our eyes to dangers which lie at our very feet.

Looking objectively at human life in these many world areas, one must come to the con-

clusion that the most important subject before us, not only in Meriden, in Connecticut, in the United States—but in the world, is—boys.

The world—whether it be our city, our town, our State, our country, or any country—is desperately hungry for leadership.

In this country we should include girls as well as boys for leadership because, sadly, only in this country do girls have an equal responsibility with boys to be future leaders.

So, when we talk about world leadership, we must confine our thoughts to boys. I spoke a few weeks ago to the girls of the Junior League about the position of women around the world. I told them I did not think they would like the position of women inside or outside the Iron Curtain—facts are that in the Near East they are penned up like livestock there; in Africa a woman is worth 4 goats; a chief Mrs. Pryor and I talked with this winter had 132 wives; in India girls are married off by their parents at ages of 8 or 9; and in the Far East baby girls are disposed of still today like unwanted girl puppies here in America.

Regretfully we must say it will be boys who will have greater responsibility for leadership in the world of tomorrow unless girls get aroused again as they were here in the 1920's.

Just a few weeks ago, during a trip to Japan, I spent some time with a prominent Japanese Government official who said to me, "Mr. Pryor, the United States will survive another 10 years because your generation has inherited strength. But what about 15 years from now, when the children who are now 9 or 10 years old become men? Mr. Pryor," he went on, "unless you do something to make them strong morally, physically, and spiritually, your Nation can be destroyed—not from without, but from within."

Arnold Toynbee has documented, in the case of civilization after civilization, that complete destruction comes from within. Egypt, Babylon, Crete, Greece, Assyria—and in our own hemisphere the Mayas and the Incas were not destroyed from without. In each case the conqueror found a civilization that had begun its self-destruction from within.

It has been my privilege to visit many ancient cities now in ruins or buried under desert sands. Some of these civilizations have been dead more than 2,000 years. Each at its peak stood at the forefront of civilized achievement and accomplishments. Each asserted its influence throughout the then known world. Each was the leader of its time. Pondering over these ruins caused me to wonder about ourselves.

I called my secretary last Friday from the Island of Maui and asked her to get the latest youth crime report from J. Edgar Hoover. Let me read you his personal letter to me in answer:

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1964.

HON. SAMUEL F. PRYOR,
Greenwich, Conn.

DEAR SAM: In response to the request from your secretary, I am enclosing some material. The complete statistics on juvenile crime in 1963 are not available as yet; however, I can give you the following information:

During the last 10 years arrests of persons under age 18 have increased 121 percent while our juvenile population has gone up only about 43 percent. In other words, juvenile crime is growing almost three times faster than juvenile population.

In 1963, juveniles were involved in 46 percent of all arrests for serious crimes. Juveniles were involved in 8 percent of the arrests for murder, 18 percent for forcible rape, 26 percent for robbery, 14 percent for aggravated assault, 50 percent for burglary, 51

percent for larceny of \$50 or more and 63 percent for automobile theft.

I certainly wish we could spread the good influence of Boys' Clubs of America to reach all children, and I shudder to think what the juvenile crime rate would be without such organizations.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

EDGAR.

This last year I had the privilege of addressing the graduation class of our Connecticut State police, and may I say, as a citizen, I am very proud of our State police. I addressed them because I am adviser to the Narcotics Bureau of the U.S. Treasury Department and have graduated from their advanced narcotic training school, and 2 years ago represented our Commissioner at the Interpol Convention in Copenhagen. Narcotics are a major problem in the world—so much so that Communist countries have taken an active part in its distribution. While they have our eyes directed to the heavens for nuclear weapons, they are sowing heroin on earth—not in their own countries but in ours and other free countries. Not only does a teenage boy who experiments with the "kicks" of addiction become a potential dangerous criminal, but government officials and adult leaders can and have become traitors through drug addiction. Narcotics and crime go hand in hand and are truly a world problem—particularly for youth.

The average person today does not realize that we are actually living in the one world that Wendell Willkie so vividly described 20 years ago. No place today is farther than a day from Meriden—and this is nothing to what will happen within 6 years.

Pan Am has already placed an order with the French-British group that is developing a prototype 1,450-mile-per-hour mach 2 plane. We expect delivery of our first Concorde supersonic jet sometime in 1969. We are also at work with our Government in helping design, develop, and produce a mach 3 supersonic jet. At mach 3, this plane, built of steel and titanium, would have a cruising speed of 2,000 miles per hour and carry 200 passengers up to 5,500 miles.

For an idea of mach 3 flying times from New York, here are a few figures:

To:	Statute miles
Buenos Aires (6 hours 49 minutes) . . .	5,305
Rio de Janeiro (4 hours 45 minutes) . . .	4,804
London (2 hours 31 minutes)	3,443
Paris (2 hours 37 minutes)	3,625
Rome (4 hours 22 minutes)	4,282
Tokyo (7 hours 31 minutes)	6,757
New Delhi (14 hours 16 minutes)	7,299

Even more dramatic, not long after the availability of mach 3, we shall have flights to the moon and to the planets beyond. It took our ancestors longer to come from London to Boston than it will take to reach the moon. These pilgrimages into space will come. Rocket engines to make these voyages possible are already under construction. The same is true of space capsules, which will be the forerunners of large space planes. We are truly about to live in one world.

Last month I had the privilege of being briefed for 2 days at our SAC base in Omaha, Nebr.

It does something strange to your thinking to sit by a gold telephone far underground that is in instant communication with 52 military bases in the world, to say nothing of the surveillance planes continually aloft day and night, and the red telephone over which, on one command from our Chief Executive and no one else, our guided missiles could be released, missiles that can travel at 18,000 miles per hour, then pinpoint the target over 5,000 miles away. The 100-ton megaton bomb has a destructive power equivalent to 100 million tons of TNT. If it ex-

ploded in New York, it would obliterate all the city of New York, most of New Jersey, all of Westchester County, and all of lower Connecticut, including Meriden.

Anywhere a nuclear bomb explodes radiation will bar human beings from the area for many years.

The call on this red telephone could destroy every city in Russia within 26 minutes, which is the most dramatic example of the mechanics of the leadership through which our United States has kept the peace of the world today. Winston Churchill said that except for the power of this force and our ability to control it, all of Europe would have been communized today.

Besides the guided missiles ready to go any minute of the day are the bomber squadrons. These bomber squadrons have a much greater total power than the power of all the missiles. I saw them go into the air in 8 minutes after the go signal. These bomber squadrons are strategically located around the world. The Soviets are also likewise equipped but with no comparison to our strength. Today we are stronger than all our known enemies put together—but how about tomorrow? We must face the facts about the present tensions of Saigon, Laos, Cuba, Berlin, India, and the dozens of other potential trouble spots all over the globe.

World leadership, with the exception of Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries, is today in the hands of tough hard-boiled politicians—highly educated—many of whom have attained their leadership through brutal power, but fortunately now know that if they are to maintain their position, they must have law and order. Prime Minister Kenyatta of Kenya said this to me in person—that is why he called for the British paratroopers at the first sign of rebellion against his government.

We must guide our youngsters in our homes, even before their boys club training, toward knowing that the beginning of life in any community in the world, whether it be in Meriden or the Congo, is to have law and order. We must guide our youngsters to believe that they must play their part some day in Government—that politics is not a dirty mess, that it is the business of governing ourselves. The only way to good government is through practical politics—if you make politics right, you make government right.

Then we will develop the leadership so desperately needed; then we can continue to fight and settle our world battles politically—not with nuclear weapons.

Having been a director of the Boys' Club of America for 30 years, I can enthusiastically join in with Edgar Hoover—the greatest proponent for law and order in the world—and say there is no better influence for these objectives than the Boys' Clubs of America. You have done a splendid job here in Meriden. Joe Coffey has been an excellent leader of boys. If we can only continue here and spread our boys club gospel further around the United States—yes, and around the world—I can tell my Japanese friend not to worry about our country 15 years from now—that we are developing world leaders.

Thank you and may God bless your work for boys.

SICKNESS, DECAY, AND THE BOYS CLUB

(By Frank R. Corkin, Jr.)

J. Edgar Hoover, America's real-life gang buster, wrote a letter to the Meriden Boys Club.

It was delivered personally by Samuel F. Pryor, Jr., vice president of Pan American World Airways, to the directors at the club's annual meeting at Frank O'Brien's 1711 Monday night.

G-man Hoover said teenagers were causing more trouble and at a faster rate than ever before. Serious trouble, like murder and rape. Boys Clubs, and the teachings of Boys

Clubs, said Hoover, offer the best therapy to cure the mental and moral and physical and emotional sickness of juveniles.

"Tell the story of Boys Clubs, and spread the good influence of Boys Clubs," wrote Hoover.

On the debit side of the ledger, Hoover wrote, arrests of teenagers under 18 increased 121 percent last year, while the population in the same age bracket rose only 45 percent. The crime rate, he said, is moving ahead three times faster than the population. Forty-six percent of all arrests on the books in 1963 were charged to youngsters under 18, and 8 percent were for murder.

Pryor, who commutes to Europe and his home in Hawaii with the nonchalance of an insurance employee driving to an office in Hartford, related the warning told him personally by a friend in Japan.

"America," said the Japanese, "will remain strong for the next 10 years because it has inherited strong leadership. But will it survive after that? That is when your young people will have grown up, and your destruction will come from within."

Decay from within has been a repeated theme in history—Egypt, Greece, Rome. Internal rotting.

Pryor echoed a warning which has been voiced with alarming consistency by respected authorities in the sports world. Athletic dominance by the United States is nearing the end of the line. Russia has already embarrassed Americans in recent Olympics in athletic combat with the eyes of the world on the games that were propagandized as miniature wars. Cuba whipped representative baseball teams from the United States with humiliating ease.

This week Bob Cousy, the accepted Mr. Basketball of the professional ranks, returned home from a sweaty tour of Europe and solemnly predicted that American basketball teams in the future were in serious danger of getting their collective ears pinned back. Earlier gentlemanly Ray Oosting, a brilliant player before he turned to coaching at Trinity, reported the same warning.

In the wake of our Olympic defeats we rationalized and said it was the European girls who defeated our American girls in events that were foreign to our dolls. But there is nothing foreign about basketball or baseball. We claim the patent on these sports. If we lose face in games we boast that we invented, the cancerous decay may be beyond therapy.

"The most important subject before us," Pryor told the hushed corporators, "not only in Meriden but in the United States, is boys."

Although women play a dominant role in the affairs of this Nation, it is on the shoulders of boys that world leadership rests. "Only in America do women have equal rights," said Pryor. In the Far East, girl babies are discarded like unwanted puppies and kittens.

The subject of boys is of vital importance to the Meriden Boys Club, too. The local club is the fourth oldest in the United States. Its growth to 1,300 members, and its expansion into its handsome facilities on Lincoln Street, are a tribute to civic leaders in the community who recognize its value, and to Joe Coffey, who is a living symbol of the club's greatness.

Eighty-three of the members are over 16 years of age; 211 are in the 14 to 15 bracket, and 468 in the 11 to 13 range. These are formative years, critical years. The Boys Club is a forceful, molding influence. Interested, understanding parents are still the primary influence.

The local club has been in continuous operation for 76 years. It began in a single room in the Turner Hall on Veteran Street. Even in these humble, shabby beginnings, it made good boys out of potentially bad ones; better ones out of the average. For 30 of

these 76 years, the lives and the futures of countless thousands of boys have been in the hands of Joe Coffey. His have been strong hands, guiding hands, friendly hands, capable hands.

Pan American Pryor referred to narcotics as one of the most crucial problems in the world today. "While the Communists direct our attention to the heavens in the race for control of space, they plant heroin on the ground."

"Today," he said, "we are stronger than all our known enemies combined, but we must teach our youth respect for law and order because law and order are the fundamentals of all successful governments."

Our success in sports is an element in our total strength and, as flaws develop in our athletic strength, flaws in our moral and spiritual and physical strength will follow.

Once we dominated the Olympics as if we had invented the games, and this superiority was accepted by the weaker nations as evidence that our way of life was the best, and the example to be followed by the smaller countries.

Now our athletic supremacy is slipping. There is increasing evidence that the Communists can run faster, jump higher, throw weights farther than American athletes, and this physical weakness on the athletic field is interpreted by some as a weakness in the American way of life. It is a simple rule of survival that the smaller and weaker nations must align themselves with the most powerful. They cannot afford to support the second best. We cannot afford to be second best.

The Meriden Boys Club has already performed near miracles in the past. It has even greater responsibilities and a more difficult assignment in the future.

SOVIET ANTIRELIGIOUS CAMPAIGN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, discrimination against religious minorities is a persistent feature of life in the Soviet Union. The widespread campaign against religious worship and practice in Russia is abhorrent to this legislative body, to all Americans, and indeed to all men of the free world.

For a number of years, there has been an alarming increase in the Soviet antireligious campaign. And tragic as it is for the history of mankind, anti-Semitism has been a key element in this wretched campaign.

Why is it, Mr. President, that in the third quarter of the 20th century we must again witness hate and derision against the Jews? Why is it that men cannot shed the blind chains of their inhumanity toward men?

The Soviets, of course, have their answer. They say they cannot tolerate the free expression of the Jewish faith because a tenant of Russian communism is atheism.

Yet, just as other Communist principles have failed so the principle of atheism and antireligion will fail. The question is how long must we wait until the Russians realize the fantastic horror of their mistaken efforts to exterminate religion? I, for one, cannot stand quietly by to wait for time and history to take their course. I join today, with thousands of Missourians and millions of Americans, who are protesting the Soviet anti-Semitic program.

We appeal to the Soviet Government to reexamine history, reexamine the misery of anti-Semitism under Czarist

Russia, reexamine the consequences of Nazi persecution of the Jews, reexamine the sheer inhumanity of Stalin's postwar anti-Semitic campaign.

We appeal to the Soviet people who are seeking increased social, economic, and political freedom. We hope that the process of declining restrictions in some areas of Russian life will not come at the expense of rising curtailment in freedom of religion.

And finally, we appeal to our own Government to continue "to support moves designed to bring about an improvement in the lot of Soviet Jewry, reduce the negative pressures on their religious life, and restore their opportunities to enjoy their rich cultural heritage."

We must continually remind the Soviet Government of the urgent humanitarian concern of the American people for religious and ethnic tolerance in the Soviet Union.

The United States has too much invested in the cause of individual and international freedom, too much invested in the fundamental principles of equality and democracy, too much invested in the hope of a peace without hate and persecution, to fail to take all steps that are appropriate to alleviate the oppressive anti-Semitic campaign now underway in Soviet Russia.

SYNTHETIC POVERTY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it is indeed regrettable that in our Nation, so blessed with wealth and plenty, there are some who are and have been unable to enjoy these fruits and who are living in true poverty. Those unfortunate citizens have been very much in the minority, however, and their burdens have been substantially lightened and corrective opportunities offered them by philanthropic individuals and organizations, together with local, State and Federal governments.

While those in true poverty have been exceedingly in the minority, now comes the Federal Government with its \$3,000 yardstick and as a result places 9.3 million families, one-fifth of the total number of families in the United States, in the category of poverty.

Mr. President, this is purely "synthetic" poverty and places a stigma upon millions of proud and independent families—proud because they have been able to provide, although not luxuriously, their daily needs. Placing them in synthetic poverty, is striking fear into their hearts. They are beginning to realize, especially those living on pensions or other small fixed incomes, that eventually as the Federal Government continues to spend so far beyond its means, their limited dollars will be worth less and less and they will be forced from synthetic poverty to actual poverty.

Mr. President, this feeling is well-expressed in a letter received by me from a retired railroad brakeman residing in Cincinnati, Ohio, whose name and address I will not reveal. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

CINCINNATI, OHIO,
June 1, 1964.

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LAUSCHE: I am appealing to you because I am both hurt and frightened by President Johnson's statement that his "Appalachian program" will place all families, whose income is below \$3,000 per year, in the poverty class.

I am a retired railroad yard brakeman (40 years on the B. & O.) and I receive \$174.70 from the Railroad Retirement Act and \$36.15 from my B. & O. Railroad annuity each month, which will make a yearly total of \$2,530.20.

Now, I have always prided myself on being a good provider and have been able to possess a small home in the suburbs—with garden, fruits, and chickens—and had expected these annuities to be altogether adequate for my wife and I. She does not receive an annuity because she is only 53 years of age.

I will admit that the constant rise of expenses such as Blue Cross (we cannot afford Blue Shield) and our real estate taxes—caused by the ever-increasing school population—do make us wonder at times.

We are aware that all of labor is "straining at the leash" for a wage increase and this will again start the vicious spiral of product prices, which will help those who are working but will surely play havoc with those who have a fixed income.

Now, I can find no other interpretation of President Johnson's classification of \$3,000 as the poverty line except that he expects labor's demands to be made, complied with, and the resulting cost of living going high enough to make the poverty a reality.

Will greatly appreciate your opinion and information of what is being planned in Washington that should increase the cost of living this much.

LETTER SHOWS NEED FOR COLLEGE AID BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, many people have written to me since I introduced the comprehensive college student assistance bill, S. 2490, in which so many of my colleagues have joined as cosponsors. Often these letters have gone into specific detail about the situation of the family whose member is writing in support of the bill. They confirm by case study, as it were, the need which exists for assistance to higher education by aid directly to the student.

One of these reached me some time ago from a rural delivery address in a town on the Indiana-Illinois border in the northern part of Indiana. It is from the mother of a typical American family with two boys and one girl. She begins:

I want to say that we are for your bill to finance students' college education. We have three children aged 22, 21, and 17. The boys are 22 and 21 and our daughter is 17. All of the children went to Catholic schools.

She continues to say that the older boy graduated a year ago from John Carroll University in Cleveland:

He received \$2,800 in Government loans. He also borrowed \$1,000 from a bank his last year. When he graduated he went to work for Western Electric in Chicago as an engineer. February 6 he was drafted into the

Army and is now stationed at Fort Sill, Okla., taking officer training. He is paying the bank loan, but will be allowed to wait until he is discharged to pay the Government loan.

Here is an illustration of the tremendous assistance the National Defense Education Act loans have been to the completion of college education. From the size of the loan, and from the circumstances of the family, whose father is a welder, it is probable that this young engineer, now training for leadership as an Army officer, would have had great difficulty otherwise. As Senators know, my bill provides for extension and enlargement of the National Defense Education Act loan provisions as one of its features.

The mother continues concerning the situation of the second son:

Our second son is a junior at St. Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa. He received \$700 the first 2 years from Government loans. However, last year he had low grades because he had to work part time during the school year, because he couldn't get a good paying summer job. He didn't get a Government loan. We had to carry the burden of his education. He had to work part time this year and probably will have low grades again.

Low grades because of the necessity for unrelated work in order to pay expenses—this is the story of countless numbers of college students who are hampered in their education by the effort to do more paid work on the side than they are justified in doing from a scholastic standpoint. When their education suffers, they are losing something from their own potential qualification, and society is likewise losing. The work-study provisions of my bill would allow productive course-related work for remuneration, assisting an estimated 330,000 students to learn as well as earn on such jobs. And where requirements of the National Defense Education Act cannot be met scholastically, the guaranteed bank loan would be an alternative at reasonable rates. Mrs. Sallak continues:

Our daughter would like to go to school also. She is a junior in high school. We live in a rural area and have to have two cars. It's also difficult for our children to get summer work. It takes most of their father's salary to keep the children in school. My husband and I are in our fifties. We have never had a vacation and don't know what golf or bridge clubs are. The only trips we make are the ones taking our children back and forth to college each year. We have a home but feel we need something for our future. My husband is a mild diabetic and must have medicine. Still he makes a good salary and our children are never eligible for scholarships. We are the inbetween class.

"We are the inbetween class." This is the group of people who in some ways are the hardest put to finance college education. It cannot be done without help of some kind, usually including student earnings and loans, but as in this case they do not qualify for scholarships.

Here, Mr. President, is a typical case study in the mother's own words, of a family where there is need for the kind of aid my bill will furnish. I trust it will be reported as soon as possible, and that this body will pass it.

LEGISLATIVE APPORTIONMENT IN ARIZONA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Supreme Court decision on apportionment seriously affects my State, as I am sure it does nearly every State in the Union. Our Governor, Paul Fannin, has taken immediate steps to solve this problem and has announced his intention to appoint a special commission of citizens of Arizona to study, analyze, and submit recommendations in time for the 1965 Arizona legislative session in order to arrive at the best solution to this problem.

So that my colleagues may know the steps which are being taken in Arizona I ask unanimous consent that the June 22 statement of Governor Fannin be inserted in the RECORD at this point. In addition to this I also ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a memorandum prepared by the assistant attorney general of Arizona, Philip Haggerty, and John P. Frank and Robert Kelso, special counsel for Arizona Secretary of State Wesley Bolin on the subject of legislative apportionment decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

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

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR FANNIN

The recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court on legislative redistricting present serious problems for Arizona.

I have consulted concerning these problems with the president of the senate, the speaker of the house, and the attorney general, and we have all received such other legal advice as can be quickly obtained.

We must proceed at once to solve the problems created by the decisions. At first glance, a complete revision of our constitutional system for electing not only the senate, but to a lesser degree the house as well, may be required. The problems are so large that we cannot solve them speedily, but they are so pressing that we must certainly start speedily.

It is my intention to appoint a special commission of representative citizens of Arizona to study, analyze, and bring in recommendations in time for the 1965 session for the best solution to this problem. This special commission, it is contemplated, would be a dedicated group of people who would require no payment of salaries, such as, select people from the universities and perhaps citizens with legislative and judicial experience, as well as lay citizens who might be especially qualified to consider the problems involved—the whole purpose being not only to get the benefit of what they might suggest, but as well to give substance to the effort on the part of the State to come to a solution of this matter with speed.

The legislature began work on the congressional redistricting this spring, and a measure passed the house. Substantial progress was made, but the issue was then referred to the legislative council and its staff for final recommendations. The president of the senate and the speaker of the house and I are directing that this work proceed at full speed until done.

We must, at the same time, deal with the problem of legislative districting. I am requesting information from other States in addition to conferring with other officials and vitally interested citizens of Arizona. I am requesting the attorney general to make his staff fully available to assist in this project.

If funds are needed, we shall find ways to procure them. We are determined that Arizona shall solve its own problems. We shall get at them at once.

JUNE 18, 1964.

Memorandum to: Senators Clarence Carpenter, and Harold Giss.

From: Assistant Attorney General Philip Haggerty; John P. Frank, and Robert Kelso, special counsel for Secretary of State Wesley Bolin.

Subject: Legislative apportionment decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

I. THE DECISIONS

The Supreme Court has decided cases on legislative apportionment from Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, New York, and Virginia. The opinions run well over 200 printed pages. The essence of them is that in State senates as well as in State houses of representatives, representation must be essentially proportional. The Court holds that there must be "equal participation by all voters in the election of State legislators" and that the weight of the voters cannot be affected by the "place of residence." The clearest single portion of the holding is that "the weight of a citizen's vote cannot be made to depend on where he lives. Population is, of necessity, the starting point for consideration and the controlling criterion for judgment in legislative apportionment controversies."

The Court considers and rejects the Federal analogy by which one house is constructed according to population and the other according to geographical and traditional considerations.

While there are strenuous dissents, the foregoing is clearly what the Court is saying. In the case arising from Colorado, a geographical system had been approved by the voters themselves only a year or so ago and had not only been approved but had been approved by the voters in every single area of the State, urban as well as rural. Moreover, Colorado has a good working initiative system, so that the people can readily change the pattern if they want to. With reference to the initiative, the Court says,

"Except as an interim remedial procedure justifying a court in staying its hand temporarily, we find no significance in the fact that a nonjudicial, political remedy may be available for the effectuation of asserted rights to equal representation in a State legislature * * *. While a court sitting as a court of equity might be justified in temporarily refraining from the issuance of injunctive relief in an apportionment case in order to allow for resort to an available political remedy, such as initiative and referendum, individual constitutional rights cannot be deprived, or denied judicial effectuation, because of the existence of a nonjudicial remedy through which relief against the alleged malapportionment, which the individual voters seek, might be achieved."

II. REMEDIES

A. The 1966 elections: The next Maryland election will not be held until 1966. The Court notes that "sufficient time exists for the Maryland Legislature to enact legislation reapportioning seats in the general assembly prior to the 1966 primary and general elections. Since primary responsibility for legislative apportionment rests with the legislature itself, and since adequate time exists in which the Maryland General Assembly can act, the Maryland courts need feel obliged to take further affirmative action only if the legislature fails to enact a constitutionally valid State legislative apportionment scheme in a timely fashion after being afforded a further opportunity by the courts to do so. However, under no circumstances should the 1966 election of members of the Maryland Legislature be permitted to be conducted

(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) of section 504 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted as of the effective date of this section, as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

(3) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for his grade, he shall receive (A) the maximum rate for his grade in the new schedule, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation if such existing rate is higher.

(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to section 2(b)(4) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111), plus subsequent increases authorized by law, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of his existing aggregate rate of compensation, on the day preceding the effective date of this section, plus the amount of increase made by this section in the maximum rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purpose of section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing rate of compensation of the employee.

(5) If the officer or employee is in a position in grade 16 or 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to which he was promoted on or after the first day of his first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1964, and if he holds such position, or another position in the same grade, on the effective date of this section, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted, as of such effective date, to that rate of basic compensation to which he would have been entitled if the compensation schedule in subsection (a) of this section had been in effect on the date of his promotion.

SEC. 103. (a) Section 801 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1131), relating to new appointments, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 801. All new appointments shall be made at the minimum rate of the appropriate grade, except that in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commission which provide for such considerations as the candidate's existing salary, unusually high or unique qualifications, or a special need of the Government for his services, the head

of any department may, with the approval of the Commission in each specific case, appoint individuals to positions in grade 13 and above of the General Schedule at such rate or rates above the minimum rate of the appropriate grade as the Commission may authorize for this purpose."

(b) Section 505(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1105(b)), relating to the limitation on numbers of positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of such Act, is amended by inserting "(1)" after the words "in addition to", and by striking out "which may be placed in such grades" and inserting in lieu thereof ", and positions placed under this Act pursuant to section 309 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, which may be placed in such grades, and (1) two hundred and forty examiner positions under section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 244; 5 U.S.C. 1010) which may be placed in grade 16 and nine such positions which may be placed in grade 17".

(c) Section 604(d)(3) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 944(c)(3)), is amended to read as follows:

"(3) All rates shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent."

Postal field service employees

SEC. 104. Section 1 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following:

"revenue unit" means that amount of revenue of a post office from mail and special service transactions which is equal to the average sum of postal rates and fees received by the Department during the fiscal year for 1,000 pieces of originating mail and special service transactions determined in accordance with section 2331 of this title."

SEC. 105. Section 702 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 702. Classes of post offices

"(a) Effective at the beginning of each fiscal year the Postmaster General shall divide post offices into four classes on the basis of the revenue units of each office for the second preceding fiscal year. He shall place in the first class those post offices having 950 or more revenue units. He shall place in the second class those post offices having 190 or more revenue units, but fewer than 950 revenue units. He shall place in the third class those post offices having 36 or more revenue units, but fewer than 190 revenue units. He shall place in the fourth class those post offices having fewer than 36 revenue units.

"(b) The Postmaster General shall exclude from the revenue credited to a post office for the purposes of this section money received at that office for—

"(1) setting meters for patrons beyond the area served by the office unless authorized by the Department;

"(2) stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards sold in large or unusual quantities to be used in mailing matter at other offices; and

"(3) stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards sold for mailing matter diverted from other offices and mailing of matter so diverted without stamps affixed.

"(c) Whenever unusual conditions prevail at a post office of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may advance such office to the appropriate class based on his estimate of the number of revenue units which the office will have during the succeeding twelve months. Any office so advanced need not be relegated to a lower class before the end of the second fiscal year after the advancement. At that time, the office shall be assigned to the appropriate class in accordance with subsections (a) and (b) of this section."

SEC. 106. Section 704 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting "of the first, second, or third class" appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "(other than one for which the postmaster furnishes quarters, equipment, and fixtures on an allowance basis)".

SEC. 107. Subsection (b)(1) of section 2102 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) for post offices at which the postmaster does not furnish quarters on an allowance basis;"

SEC. 108. (a) Section 3501 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting a new subsection (c) following subsection (b) as follows:

"(c) The Postmaster General shall determine and, effective at the beginning of the first pay period in each calendar year, shall adjust the rankings of all positions for which the number of annual revenue units of a post office or its class is a relevant factor of the ranking, using the revenue units of the preceding fiscal year and the class in which the office will be placed at the beginning of the next fiscal year. The Postmaster General also may adjust rankings of such positions at other times of the year based upon substantial changes in service conditions."

(b) Chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (c) of section 3513—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POST-OFFICE CLERK. (KP-4)"; and

(B) Add the following new sentence to the end of paragraph (1): "This office has fewer than 190 revenue units annually."

(2) In subsection (e) of section 3516—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-18)";

(B) Delete "third class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately \$1,700" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 40 revenue units annually".

(3) In subsection (b) of section 3517—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-20)";

(B) Delete "third class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately \$4,700" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 110 revenue units annually".

(4) In subsection (b) of section 3518—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-22)";

(B) Delete "third class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately \$6,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 140 revenue units annually".

(5) In subsection (b) of section 3519—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-24)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of approximately \$63,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 1,490 revenue units annually".

(6) In subsection (c) of section 3519—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-25)";

(B) Delete "second class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately \$16,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 380 revenue units annually".

(7) In subsection (b) of section 3520—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-27)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately \$63,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "ap-

Sec. 111. (a) Section 3544 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 3544. Fourth Class Office Schedule

“Revenue units	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
30 but less than 36	\$3,769	\$3,894	\$4,019	\$4,144	\$4,269	\$4,394	\$4,519	\$4,644	\$4,769	\$4,894	\$5,019	\$5,144
24 but less than 30	3,485	3,600	3,715	3,830	3,945	4,060	4,175	4,290	4,405	4,520	4,635	4,750
18 but less than 24	2,877	2,974	3,071	3,168	3,265	3,362	3,459	3,556	3,653	3,750	3,847	3,944
12 but less than 18	2,258	2,351	2,404	2,477	2,550	2,623	2,696	2,769	2,842	2,915	2,988	3,061
6 but less than 12	1,628	1,680	1,732	1,784	1,836	1,888	1,940	1,992	2,044	2,096	2,148	2,200
Less than 6	1,313	1,355	1,397	1,439	1,481	1,523	1,565	1,607	1,649	1,691	1,733	1,775”.

“(b) The basic salary of postmasters in fourth-class post offices shall be readjusted for changes in revenue units at the start of the first pay period after January 1 of each year. When a post office is restored to a revenue unit category held by it prior to relegation to a lower revenue unit category, the postmaster's basic salary may be adjusted to the highest salary step held by him when the post office was in the higher revenue unit category. In all other cases, in adjusting a postmaster's basic salary under this section, the basic salary shall be fixed at the lowest step which is higher than the basic salary received by the postmaster at the end of the preceding fiscal year. If there is no such step the basic salary shall be fixed at the highest step for the adjusted revenue units of the office. Each increase in basic salary because of change in revenue units shall be deemed the equivalent of a step increase under section 3552 of this title and the waiting period, for purposes of advancement to the next step, shall begin on the date of adjustment.

“(c) The basic salaries of postmasters at newly established offices of the fourth class shall be fixed at the lowest salary rate. Whenever unusual conditions prevail at any post office of the fourth class the Postmaster General may advance such office to the appropriate category based on his estimate of the number of revenue units which the office will have during the succeeding twelve months. Any fourth-class office advanced to the appropriate category pursuant to this subsection shall not be reduced in category until the start of the first pay period after January 1 of the calendar year following the calendar year in which it was so advanced, at which time it shall be assigned to the category indicated by the revenue units for the preceding fiscal year.

“(d) Persons who perform the duties of postmaster at post offices of the fourth class where there is a vacancy or during the absence of the postmaster on sick or annual leave, or leave without pay, shall be paid the same basic salary to which they would have been entitled if regularly appointed as postmaster.

“(e) The Postmaster General may allow to postmasters in fourth-class post offices additional compensation for separating services and for unusual conditions during a portion of the year, in lieu of an allowance for clerical services for this purpose.

“(f) At seasonal post offices of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may authorize the payment of the basic salary prorated over the pay periods the office is open for business during the fiscal year.

“(g) Where the revenue units of a post office of the third class for each of two consecutive fiscal years are less than 36, or where in any fiscal year the revenue units are less than 33, the post office shall be relegated to the fourth class and the basic salary of the postmaster shall be fixed in the manner provided in subsection (b) of this section.

“(h) When required by the Postmaster General a postmaster at a fourth-class office

“(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Fourth Class Office Schedule and for which the symbol shall be ‘FOS’, for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class which is based

“FOURTH-CLASS OFFICE SCHEDULE

shall, and any other postmaster in PFS level 5 when permitted by the Postmaster General may, furnish quarters, fixtures, and equipment for an office on an allowance basis. The allowance for this purpose shall be an amount equal to 15 per centum of the basic compensation for the postmaster at the office.”

Sec. 112. (a) Subsection (a) of section 6007 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) The Postmaster General shall pay to persons, other than special delivery messengers at post offices of the first class, for making delivery of special delivery mail such fees as may be established by him not in excess of the special delivery fee.”

(b) Section 2009 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting “at any price less than eight cents per piece” and inserting in lieu thereof “at any price less than the fees established pursuant to section 6007(a) of this title.”

Sec. 113. Section 3560 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out “gross receipts” in subsection (a) (3) and inserting in lieu thereof “revenue unit”; and

(2) by striking out “gross receipts” in subsection (f) (1) and inserting in lieu thereof “revenue unit”.

Sec. 114. (a) Section 3552(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) (1) Each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule, each employee subject to the Rural Carrier Schedule, and each employee subject to the Fourth Class Office Schedule who has not reached the highest step for his position shall be advanced successively to the next higher step as follows:

“(A) to steps 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of fifty-two calendar weeks of satisfactory service; and

“(B) to steps 8 and above—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of one hundred and fifty-six calendar weeks of satisfactory service.

“(2) The receipt of an equivalent increase during any of the waiting periods specified in this subsection shall cause a new full waiting period to commence for further step increases.”

(b) Section 3552 of title 39, United States Code, is further amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

“(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, the Postmaster General is authorized to advance any employee in PFS level 9 or below who—

“(1) was promoted to a higher level between July 9, 1960, and October 13, 1962; and

“(2) is senior with respect to total postal service to an employee in his own post office promoted to the same position since October 13, 1962, and is at a step in the level below the step of the junior employees.

Any increase under the provisions of this subsection shall not constitute an equivalent

on the revenue units of the post office for the preceding fiscal year. Basic compensation shall be paid to postmasters in post offices of the fourth class in accordance with this schedule.

increase and credit earned prior to adjustment under this subsection for advancement to the next step shall be retained.”

Sec. 115. (a) Section 711 of title 39, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) The table of contents of chapter 7 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting

“711. Method of determining gross receipts.”

Sec. 116. The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or the Fourth Class Office Schedule, immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall be determined as follows:

(1) Each employee shall be assigned to the same numerical step for his position which he had attained immediately prior to such effective date. If changes in levels, receipts categories, or steps would otherwise occur on such effective date without regard to enactment of this Act, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion

(2) If the existing basic compensation is greater than the rate to which the employee is converted under paragraph (1) of this section, the employee shall be placed in the lowest step which exceeds his basic compensation. If the existing basic compensation exceeds the maximum step of his position, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

Employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration

Sec. 117. (a) Section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, relating to the appointment and annual salaries of certain staff positions in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 4103. Office of the Chief Medical Director
“(a) The Office of the Chief Medical Director shall consist of the following—

“(1) The Chief Medical Director, who shall be the Chief of the Department of Medicine and Surgery and shall be directly responsible to the Administrator for the operations of the Department. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator.

“(2) The Deputy Chief Medical Director, who shall be the principal assistant of the Chief Medical Director. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator.

“(3) Not to exceed five Assistant Chief Medical Directors, who shall be appointed by the Administrator upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director. One Assistant Chief Medical Director shall be a qualified doctor of dental surgery or dental medicine who shall be directly responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the Dental Service.

“(4) Such Medical Directors as may be appointed by the Administrator, upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director, to suit the needs of the Department. A Medical Director shall be either a qualified doctor of medicine or a qualified doctor of dental surgery or dental medicine.

"(5) A Director of Nursing Service, who shall be a qualified registered nurse, appointed by the Administrator, and who shall be responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the Nursing Service.

"(6) A Chief Pharmacist and a Chief Dietitian, appointed by the Administrator.

"(7) Such other personnel and employees as may be authorized by this chapter.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), any appointment under this section shall be for a period of four years, with reappointment permissible for successive like periods, except that persons so appointed or reappointed shall be subject to removal by the Administrator for cause.

"(c) The Administrator may designate a member of the Chaplain Service of the Veterans' Administration as Director, Chaplain Service, for a period of two years, subject to removal by the Administrator for cause. Redesignation under this subsection may be made for successive like periods. An individual designated as Director, Chaplain Service, shall at the end of his period of service as Director revert to the position, grade, and status which he held immediately prior to being designated Director, Chaplain Service, and all service as Director, Chaplain Service, shall be creditable as service in the former position."

(b) The table of contents of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"4103. Appointments and compensations." and inserting in lieu thereof:

"4103. Office of the Chief Medical Director."

(c) Section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U.S.C. 62), shall not apply to any individual appointed, before January 1, 1964, as Chief Medical Director under section 4103 of title 38, United States Code; but section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a), shall apply, in

accordance with its terms, to any such individual.

SEC. 118. Section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, relating to grades and pay scales for certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"(a) The per annum full-pay scale or ranges for positions provided in section 4103 of this title, other than Chief Medical Director and Deputy Chief Medical Director, shall be as follows:

"SECTION 4103 SCHEDULE

"Assistant Chief Medical Director, \$24,500. "Medical Director, \$21,445 minimum to \$24,445 maximum.

"Director of Nursing Service, \$16,460 minimum to \$21,590 maximum.

"Director, Chaplain Service, \$16,460 minimum to \$21,590 maximum.

"Chief Pharmacist, \$16,460 minimum to \$21,590 maximum.

"Chief Dietitian, \$16,460 minimum to \$21,590 maximum.

"(b) (1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"PHYSICIAN AND DENTIST SCHEDULE

"Director grade, \$18,935 minimum to \$24,175 maximum.

"Executive grade, \$17,655 minimum to \$23,190 maximum.

"Chief grade, \$16,460 minimum to \$21,590 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$14,170 minimum to \$18,580 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$12,075 minimum to \$15,855 maximum.

"Full grade, \$10,250 minimum to \$13,445 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$8,650 minimum to \$11,305 maximum.

"NURSE SCHEDULE

"Assistant Director grade, \$14,170 minimum to \$18,580 maximum.

"Chief grade, \$12,075 minimum to \$15,855 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$10,250 minimum to \$13,445 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$8,650 minimum to \$11,305 maximum.

"Full grade, \$7,220 minimum to \$9,425 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$6,315 minimum to \$8,205 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$5,505 minimum to \$7,170 maximum.

"(2) No person may hold the director grade unless he is serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, center, or outpatient clinic (independent). No person may hold the executive grade unless he holds the position of chief of staff at a hospital, center, or outpatient clinic (independent), or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic, or comparable position."

Foreign Service officers; staff officers and employees

SEC. 119. Section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended to read as follows:

"FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

"SEC. 412. There shall be ten classes of Foreign Service officers, including the classes of career ambassador and of career minister. The per annum salary of a career ambassador shall be at the rate provided by law for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. The per annum salary of a career minister shall be at the rate provided by law for level V of such schedule. The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

Table with 10 columns representing salary classes and 8 rows representing different grades. Values range from \$6,450 to \$24,500.

SEC. 120. Subsection (a) of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There shall be ten classes of Foreign Service staff officers and employees, referred to hereafter as staff officers and employees.

The per annum salaries of such staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

Table with 10 columns representing salary classes and 10 rows representing different grades. Values range from \$4,480 to \$19,495.

SEC. 121. Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates provided by section 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, shall receive basic compensation, on and after such effective date, at the rate of their class determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.

Agricultural stabilization and conservation county committee employees

SEC. 122. The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 102 of this Act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

Miscellaneous provisions

SEC. 123. Section 504 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 842; 5 U.S.C. 1173) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The rate of basic compensation, established under this section, and received by any officer or employee immediately prior to the effective date of a statutory increase in the compensation schedules of the salary systems specified in subsection (a) shall be initially adjusted on the effective date of such new compensation schedules in accordance with conversion rules and regulations prescribed by the President or by such agency or agencies as he may designate."

SEC. 124. Subsection (b) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838; 3 U.S.C. note

fol. 102), is amended by striking out "\$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$65,000".

Absorption of costs

SEC. 125. (a) The cost of not less than 10 per centum of the aggregate amount of the increases in compensation provided by this title for the fiscal year 1965 shall be absorbed by the departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in the executive branch; and no amount beyond the additional sum for such compensation increases proposed in the budget for the fiscal year 1965 is authorized to be appropriated by any provision of this Act. The total amount of such absorption shall be allocated by the Bureau of the Budget among such departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in such manner and to such extent as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget deems appropriate in the light of their essential functions.

(b) Pursuant to the objective of this section, heads of the executive branch activities concerned are directed to review with meticulous care each vacancy resulting from voluntary resignation, retirement, or death and to determine whether the duties of the position can be reassigned to other employees or whether the position can be abolished without seriously affecting the execution of essential functions.

(c) Nothing contained in subsection (a) of this section shall be held or considered to require (1) the separation from the service of any individual by reduction in force or other personnel action or (2) the placing of any individual in a leave-without-pay status.

TITLE II—FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE SALARIES

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Federal Legislative Salary Act of 1964".

SEC. 202. (a) Each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation in an amount equal to the greater of the following amounts, as applicable:

(1) an amount equal to 3½ per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law) in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section plus 1 per centum of such gross rate for each whole multiple, or part of a multiple, of \$500 basic compensation; or

(2) an amount equal to 5 per centum of such gross rate.

(b) The total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section of each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and is not increased by reason of any other provision of this title, shall be increased by an amount which is equal to the amount of the increase provided by subsection (a) of this section in that gross rate which is nearest in amount to the total annual compensation of such officer or employee.

(c) Each of the limitations on gross rate per thousand and gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives shall be increased by 7 per centum. The amount of each increase under this subsection shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.

(d) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and the following).

(e) Section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a(e)), is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$8,880" where it first appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,"; and

(2) by striking out "\$8,880" at the second place where it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended".

(f) (1) This subsection is enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rule amended by this subsection at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of

any other rule of the House of Representatives.

(2) Clause 28(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended—

(A) by striking out "\$8,880" where it first appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,"; and

(B) by striking out "\$8,880" at the second place where it appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

(g) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator is hereby adjusted, effective on the effective date prescribed by section 501(a), to the lowest multiple of \$60 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior thereto, except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act, the Senator by whom such employee is employed notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he does not wish such provisions to apply to such employee. In any case in which, at the expiration of the time within which a Senator may give notice under this subsection, such Senator is deceased such notice shall be deemed to have been given.

(h) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (i), the rates of gross compensation of the Secretary for the Majority of the Senate, the Secretary for the Minority of the Senate, the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Senior Counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, and the Chief Clerk of the Senate are hereby increased by an amount which is equal to the amount of the increase which would be provided by subsection (a) of this section in that gross rate determined without regard to the provisions referred to in subsection (i) of this section which is nearest in amount to the total annual compensation of such officer or employee.

(i) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading "SENATE" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (74 Stat. 304; Public Law 86-568), is amended by striking out "\$18,880" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$22,945".

(j) The limitation on gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the Senate is hereby increased by 7 per centum. The amount of such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent. The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to employees whose compensation is subject to such limitation.

(k) The gross rate of compensation of the Postmaster of the Senate shall be \$18,420, and the gross rate of compensation of the Assistant Postmaster of the Senate shall be \$14,570. The provisions of section 106 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1963, shall not hereafter apply to employees referred to in this subsection.

SEC. 203. (a) The compensation of the Comptroller General of the United States shall be at the rate of \$30,000 per annum.

(b) The compensation of the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States shall be at the rate of \$28,000 per annum.

(c) The compensation of the General Counsel of the United States General Accounting Office, the Librarian of Congress,

the Public Printer, and the Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of \$26,000 per annum.

(d) The compensation of the Deputy Librarian of Congress, the Deputy Public Printer, and the Assistant Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of \$24,500 per annum.

(e) The compensation of the Second Assistant Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of \$22,500 per annum.

(f) The compensation of the Chaplain of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of \$12,500 per annum.

(g) The compensation of the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the Legislative Counsel of the Senate shall be at the rate of \$27,500 per annum.

(h) The compensation of the Chaplain of the Senate shall be at the rate of \$15,000 per annum.

SEC. 204. Section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 31), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of \$30,000 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of \$43,000 per annum."

SEC. 205. No officer or employee subject to section 202(a) or 202(b) of this title shall receive, by reason of any provision of this title, an increase in gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law), or in total annual compensation, which is in excess of the amount of the increase in basic compensation provided by the amendment made by section 102(a) of title I of this Act for positions in grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

TITLE III—FEDERAL EXECUTIVE SALARIES

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964".

SEC. 302. There is hereby established for offices and positions to which section 303 of this title applies a basic compensation schedule, to be known as the "Federal Executive Salary Schedule", which shall be divided into five salary levels.

SEC. 303. (a) Level I of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be \$35,000:

- (1) Secretary of State.
- (2) Secretary of the Treasury.
- (3) Secretary of Defense.
- (4) Attorney General.
- (5) Postmaster General.
- (6) Secretary of the Interior.
- (7) Secretary of Agriculture.
- (8) Secretary of Commerce.
- (9) Secretary of Labor.
- (10) Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) Level II of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be \$30,000:

- (1) Deputy Secretary of Defense.
- (2) Under Secretary of State.
- (3) Administrator, Agency for International Development.
- (4) Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
- (5) Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
- (6) Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.
- (7) Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.
- (8) Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.
- (9) Chairman, Council of Economic Advisors.
- (10) Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
- (11) Director of the Bureau of the Budget.
- (12) Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

(13) Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

(14) Director of the United States Information Agency.

(15) Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent: *Provided*, That thereafter the position shall be placed in level III.

(16) Director of Central Intelligence.

(17) Secretary of the Air Force.

(18) Secretary of the Army.

(19) Secretary of the Navy.

(c) Level III of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be \$28,500:

(1) Deputy Attorney General.

(2) Solicitor General of the United States.

(3) Deputy Postmaster General.

(4) Under Secretary of Agriculture.

(5) Under Secretary of Commerce.

(6) Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

(7) Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(8) Under Secretary of the Interior.

(9) Under Secretary of Labor.

(10) Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs or Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

(11) Under Secretary of the Treasury.

(12) Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.

(13) Administrator of General Services.

(14) Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(15) Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

(16) Deputy Administrator, Agency for International Development.

(17) Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board.

(18) Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission.

(19) Chairman, Federal Communications Commission.

(20) Chairman, Board of Directors, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

(21) Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

(22) Chairman, Federal Power Commission.

(23) Chairman, Federal Trade Commission.

(24) Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission.

(25) Chairman, National Labor Relations Board.

(26) Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission.

(27) Chairman, Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

(28) Comptroller of the Currency.

(29) Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

(30) Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense.

(31) Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(32) Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(33) Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

(34) Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

(35) Director of the Peace Corps.

(36) Director of Selective Service, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent: *Provided*, That thereafter the position shall be placed in Level IV.

(37) Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

(38) Director of the National Science Foundation.

(39) Deputy Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

(40) President, Export-Import Bank of Washington.

(d) Level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following

offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be \$27,000:

(1) Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State.

(2) Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

(3) Deputy Administrator of General Services.

(4) Associate Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(5) Assistant Administrators, Agency for International Development (6).

(6) Regional Assistant Administrators, Agency for International Development (4).

(7) Under Secretary of the Department of the Air Force.

(8) Under Secretary of the Department of the Army.

(9) Under Secretary of the Department of the Navy.

(10) Deputy Under Secretaries of State (2).

(11) Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture (3).

(12) Assistant Secretaries of Commerce (4).

(13) Assistant Secretaries of Defense (7).

(14) Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force (3).

(15) Assistant Secretaries of the Army (3).

(16) Assistant Secretaries of the Navy (3).

(17) Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare (2).

(18) Assistant Secretaries of the Interior (4).

(19) Assistant Attorneys General (9).

(20) Assistant Secretaries of Labor (4).

(21) Assistant Postmasters General (5).

(22) Assistant Secretaries of State (11).

(23) Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury (4).

(24) Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission.

(25) Chairman of the National Mediation Board.

(26) Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board.

(27) Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission.

(28) Commissioner, Community Facilities Administration.

(29) Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration.

(30) Commissioner, Public Housing Administration.

(31) Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration.

(32) Director of Civil Defense.

(33) Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

(34) Deputy Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

(35) Deputy Director, Office of Emergency Planning.

(36) Deputy Director, Office of Science and Technology.

(37) Deputy Director of the Peace Corps.

(38) Deputy Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

(39) Deputy Director of the United States Information Agency.

(40) Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

(41) Assistant Directors of the Bureau of the Budget (3).

(42) General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

(43) General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

(44) General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

(45) General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(46) Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

(47) Solicitor of the Department of Labor.

(48) General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

(49) General Counsel of the Post Office Department.

(50) Counselor of the Department of State.

(51) Legal Adviser of the Department of State.

(52) General Counsel of the Department of the Treasury.

(53) First Vice President, Export-Import Bank of Washington.

(54) General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission.

(55) Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

(56) Inspector General, Foreign Assistance.

(57) Members, Atomic Energy Commission.

(58) Members, Civil Aeronautics Board.

(59) Members, Council of Economic Advisers.

(60) Members, Export-Import Bank of Washington.

(61) Members, Federal Communications Commission.

(62) Members, Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

(63) Members, Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

(64) Members, Federal Power Commission.

(65) Members, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(66) Members, Federal Trade Commission.

(67) Members, Interstate Commerce Commission.

(68) Members, National Labor Relations Board.

(69) Members, Securities and Exchange Commission.

(70) Members, Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

(71) Members, United States Civil Service Commission.

(e) Level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be \$26,000:

(1) Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture.

(2) Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture.

(3) Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.

(4) Administrator, Farmers Home Administration.

(5) Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture.

(6) Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture.

(7) Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.

(8) Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior.

(9) Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

(10) Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

(11) Deputy Administrators of the Small Business Administration (4).

(12) Associate Administrator for Administration, Federal Aviation Agency.

(13) Associate Administrator for Development, Federal Aviation Agency.

(14) Associate Administrator for Program, Federal Aviation Agency.

(15) Associate Administrator for Advanced Research and Technology, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(16) Associate Administrator for Space Science and Applications, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(17) Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(18) Associate Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(19) Deputy Associate Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(20) Associate Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

(21) Archivist of the United States.

(22) Area Redevelopment Administrator, Department of Commerce.

(23) Assistant Secretary of Administration, Department of Agriculture.

(24) Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(25) Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Interior.

(26) Assistant Attorney General for Administration.

(27) Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Labor.

(28) Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Treasury.

(29) Assistant General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission.

(30) Assistant and Scientific Adviser to the Secretary of the Interior.

(31) Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

(32) Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense.

(33) Chairman of the Renegotiation Board.

(34) Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

(35) Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury.

(36) Chief Forester, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

(37) Chief Postal Inspector, Post Office Department.

(38) Chief, Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce.

(39) Commissioner of Customs, Department of the Treasury.

(40) Commissioner, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration.

(41) Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(42) Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.

(43) Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(44) Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Justice.

(45) Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

(46) Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission.

(47) Associate Commissioners, Indian Claims Commission (2).

(48) Commissioner of Patents, Department of Commerce.

(49) Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration.

(50) Commissioner of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.

(51) Commissioner of Social Security, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(52) Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(53) Commissioner of Welfare, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(54) Director, Advanced Research Projects Agency, Department of Defense.

(55) Director of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture.

(56) Director, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

(57) Director, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior.

(58) Director, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

(59) Director, Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.

(60) Director, Office of Research and Engineering, Post Office Department.

(61) Director, National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce.

(62) Director of Regulation, Atomic Energy Commission.

(63) Director of Science and Education, Department of Agriculture.

(64) Deputy Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs, Department of the Treasury.

(65) Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury.

(66) Deputy Director, National Science Foundation.

(67) Deputy Director, Policy and Plans, United States Information Agency.

(68) Deputy General Counsel, Department of Defense.

(69) Deputy General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission.

(70) Associate Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

(71) Associate Director for Volunteers, Peace Corps.

(72) Associate Director for Program Development and Operations, Peace Corps.

(73) Assistants to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice (2).

(74) Assistant Directors, Office of Emergency Planning (3).

(75) Assistant Directors, United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (4).

(76) Federal Highway Administrator, Department of Commerce.

(77) Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

(78) General Counsel of the Agency for International Development.

(79) General Counsel of the Department of the Air Force.

(80) General Counsel of the Department of the Army.

(81) General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission.

(82) General Counsel of the Federal Aviation Agency.

(83) General Counsel of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

(84) General Counsel of the Department of the Navy.

(85) General Counsel of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

(86) Governor of the Canal Zone.

(87) Manpower Administrator, Department of Labor.

(88) Maritime Administrator, Department of Commerce.

(89) Members, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

(90) Members, Maritime Commission.

(91) Members, National Mediation Board.

(92) Members, Railroad Retirement Board.

(93) Members, Renegotiation Board.

(94) Members, Subversive Activities Control Board.

(95) Members, United States Tariff Commission.

(96) President of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

(97) Special Assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(f) In addition to the offices and positions listed in subsections (d) and (e) of this section, the President is authorized from time to time to place offices and positions held by not to exceed twenty persons in levels IV and V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule when he deems such action necessary to reflect changes in organization, management responsibilities, or workload in any Federal department or agency. Any such action with respect to an office to which appointment is made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall be effective only at the time of a new appointment to such office. Each action taken under this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register, except when it is determined by the President that such publication would be contrary to the interest of the national security. No action shall be taken under this subsection with respect to an office or position the compensation for which is fixed at a specific rate by this title or by statute enacted subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 304. (a) Section 104 of title 3, United States Code (relating to the compensation of the Vice President), is amended by striking out "\$35,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$43,000".

(b) Section 105 of title 3, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 105. Compensation of secretaries and executive, administrative, and staff assistants to President

"The President is authorized to fix the compensation of the six administrative assistants authorized to be appointed under section 106 of this title, of the Executive Secretary of the National Security Council, of the Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, and of eight other secretaries or immediate staff assistants in the White House Office at rates of basic compensation not to exceed that of level II of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule."

Conforming changes in existing law

SEC. 305. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(1) The Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2201-2209), establishing rates of basic compensation for heads of executive departments and other Federal officials.

(2) Section 3012(h) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of \$22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Army.

(3) Section 3013(b) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the annual salaries of the Under Secretary and each Assistant Secretary of the Army at \$20,000 a year.

(4) Section 5031(d) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of \$22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Navy.

(5) Section 5033(c) of title 10, United States Code, providing the annual salary of \$20,000 a year for the Under Secretary of the Navy.

(6) Section 304 of Public Law 87-651, approved September 7, 1962 (76 Stat. 526; 10 U.S.C. 5034, note), providing compensation of \$20,000 a year for Assistant Secretaries of the Navy.

(7) Section 8012(g) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of \$22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Air Force.

(8) Section 8013(b) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the annual salaries of the Under Secretary and each Assistant Secretary of the Air Force at \$20,000 a year.

(9) Section 137(c) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the compensation of the General Counsel of the Department of Defense at the rate prescribed by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments.

(10) (A) The last sentence of section 22 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 924; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2032 (a)), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of such Commission, which reads: "Each member, except the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of \$22,000 per annum; and the member designated as Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of \$22,500 per annum."

(B) That part of the first sentence of section 27a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 926; 42 U.S.C. 2037(a)), relating to the salary of the Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee which reads: ", and who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for an Assistant Secretary of Defense".

(11) That part of Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1958 (72 Stat. 1799 and 861; 75 Stat. 630; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15, note)—

(A) In section 2(b), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, which reads: "and shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the heads of executive departments";

(B) In section 2(c), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Director of such Office, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the under secretaries referred to in section 104 of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 (5 U.S.C. 2203);" and

(C) In section 2(d) relating to the annual salaries of three Assistant Directors of such Office, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments."

(12) (A) That part of the second sentence of section 202(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2472(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which reads: "and shall receive compensation at the rate of \$22,500 per annum".

(B) That part of the first sentence of section 202(b) of such Act (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2472(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Administration, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate of \$21,500 per annum".

(13) (A) That part of section 201(f) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 428; 42 U.S.C. 2471(f)), relating to the annual salary of a civilian executive secretary in the National Aeronautics and Space Council, which reads: "and shall receive compensation at the rate of \$20,000 a year".

(B) That part of section 204 of such Act (72 Stat. 431, 432; 42 U.S.C. 2474(a) (1), and (d)), relating to the annual salary of the Chairman of the Civilian-Military Liaison Committee, as follows:

In subsection (a) (1), that part which reads: "and shall receive compensation (in the manner provided in subsection (d)) at the rate of \$20,000 per annum".

In the second sentence of subsection (d), that part which reads: "fixed by subsection (a) (1)".

(14) (A) That part of the second sentence of section 2(a) of the Act of May 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 111; 5 U.S.C. 151b(a)) as amended, relating to the rank and salary of the Counselor and of the Legal Adviser of the Department of State, which reads: "and shall receive the same salary as".

(B) The last sentence of section 2(a) of the Act of May 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 111; 5 U.S.C. 151b(a)) as amended, relating to the rate of basic compensation of the Deputy Under Secretaries of State, which reads: "Unless otherwise provided for by law, the rate of basic compensation of the Deputy Under Secretaries of State shall be the same as that of Assistant Secretaries of State".

(C) That part of the second sentence of section 2(b) of the Act of May 26, 1949, as amended (73 Stat. 265; 5 U.S.C. 151b(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs or for Economic Affairs, as designated by the President, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate of \$22,000 a year and".

(15) The last sentence of section 210(a) of title 38, United States Code, relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, which reads: "He shall receive a salary of \$21,000 a year, payable monthly".

(16) (A) The last sentence of section 201(a) (2) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 741; 49 U.S.C. 1321(a) (2)), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which reads: "Each member of the Board shall receive a salary at the rate of \$20,000 per annum, except that the member serving as Chairman shall receive a salary at the rate of \$20,500 per annum".

(B) That part of the second sentence of section 301(a) of such Act (72 Stat. 744; 49 U.S.C. 1341(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, which reads: "and who

shall receive compensation at the rate of \$22,500 per annum".

(C) That part of the second sentence of section 302(a) of such Act (72 Stat. 744; 49 U.S.C. 1342(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Agency, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate of \$20,500 per annum, and".

(17) (A) The last sentence of section 22 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (75 Stat. 632; 22 U.S.C. 2562), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which reads: "He shall receive compensation at the rate of \$22,500 per annum".

(B) The second sentence of section 23 of such Act (75 Stat. 632; 22 U.S.C. 2563), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Director of such Agency, which reads: "He shall receive compensation at the rate of \$21,500 per annum".

(C) The second sentence of section 24 of such Act (75 Stat. 632; 22 U.S.C. 2564), relating to the annual salaries of the four Assistant Directors of such Agency, which reads: "They shall receive compensation at the rate of \$20,000 per annum".

(18) Section 3 of the Act of March 2, 1955 (69 Stat. 10; 5 U.S.C. 294, 293, 295a), relating to the annual salaries of certain officials of the Department of Justice, which reads:

"Sec. 3. (a) The compensation of the Deputy Attorney General shall be at the rate of \$21,000 per annum.

"(b) The compensation of the Solicitor General shall be at the rate of \$20,500 per annum.

"(c) The compensation of each Assistant Attorney General, other than the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, shall be at the rate of \$20,000 per annum".

(19) (A) The last sentence of section 102(c) of Reorganization Plan Numbered 7 of 1961 (75 Stat. 840; 5 U.S.C. 1332-15, note), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of the Federal Maritime Commission, which reads: "The Chairman of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of \$20,500 per annum, and each of the other Commissioners shall receive a salary at the rate of \$20,000 per annum".

(B) That part of section 201 of such reorganization plan (75 Stat. 842; 5 U.S.C. 1332-15, note), relating to the annual salary of the Maritime Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "shall receive a salary at the rate of \$20,000 per annum".

(20) That part of the fourth sentence of section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (74 Stat. 408 and 913; 15 U.S.C. 78d(a)); relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and Commissioners of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which reads: "shall receive a salary at the rate of \$20,000 a year, except that the Chairman shall receive additional salary at the rate of \$500 a year and".

(21) Section 8 of the Food Additives Amendments of 1958 (72 Stat. 1789; 5 U.S.C. 2205, note), fixing the annual salary of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs at \$20,000 per annum.

(22) That part of the first sentence of section 3 of the Area Redevelopment Act (75 Stat. 48; 42 U.S.C. 2502), relating to the annual salary of the Area Redevelopment Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to that received by Assistant Secretaries of Commerce".

(23) The last sentence of section 203(b) (1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (72 Stat. 520; 5 U.S.C. 171c(b) (1)), relating to the annual salary of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense, which reads: "The compensation of the Director is that prescribed by law for the Secretaries of the military departments".

(24) In section 303(a) of title 23, United States Code,

(A) That part of the second sentence, relating to the annual salary of the Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "shall receive basic compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of executive departments and"; and

(B) The last sentence, relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Federal Highway Administrator in such department, which reads: "The Deputy Federal Highway Administrator shall receive basic compensation at a rate \$1,000 less than the rate provided for the Federal Highway Administrator".

(25) The last proviso in the paragraph under the heading "IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE" and under the sub-heading "SALARIES AND EXPENSES" in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 251; 5 U.S.C. 2206, note), relating to the annual salary of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which reads: "Provided further, That, hereafter, the compensation of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall be \$20,000 per annum".

(26) The second paragraph of section 3 of title 35, United States Code, relating to the annual salary of the Commissioner of Patents which reads: "The annual rate of compensation of the Commissioner shall be \$20,000".

(27) That part of section 4(a) of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612; 22 U.S.C. 2503(a)), relating to the annual salaries of the Director and of the Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, which reads: "whose compensation shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of \$20,000 per annum," and "whose compensation shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of \$19,500 per annum".

(28) (A) Section 308 of title 39, United States Code, fixing the annual rate of basic compensation of the position of Chief Postal Inspector in the Post Office Department at \$19,000.

(B) That part of the table of contents of chapter 3 of title 39, United States Code, which reads as follows: "308. Chief Postal Inspector".

(29) That part of the first sentence of section 4 of the International Travel Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 130; 22 U.S.C. 2124), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the United States Travel Service in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "who shall be compensated at the rate of \$19,000 per annum".

(30) Section 14(b) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 716; 5 U.S.C. 3013(b)), which fixes the compensation of the Executive Director of the United States Civil Service Commission at \$19,000 per annum.

(31) That part of the first sentence of section 107(c) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended (73 Stat. 211; 50 U.S.C. App. 1217(c)), relating to the annual salary of the General Counsel of the Renegotiation Board which reads: "and shall receive compensation at the rate of \$19,000 per annum".

(32) (A) That part of the third sentence in section 201(a) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 538; 40 U.S.C. 661(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency, which reads: "and who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to the maximum rate for grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, plus \$500 per annum".

(B) That part of the first sentence of section 201(b) of such Act (74 Stat. 538; 40 U.S.C. 661(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Agency, which reads: "and who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to the maximum rate for grade 18 of the General Schedule

of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended".

(33) The last sentence of section 624(d) (1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 447; 22 U.S.C. 2384(d)(1)), as amended, fixing the compensation of certain officials in the Department of State, which reads: "The Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall receive compensation at the rate of \$20,000 annually; the Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall receive compensation at the rate of \$19,000 annually."

(34) That part of section 202 of the Act of July 1, 1960 (74 Stat. 305; 5 U.S.C. 623g), relating to the annual salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, which reads: ", and whose annual rate of basic compensation shall be \$19,000".

(35) That part of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1963, under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR" and under the caption "BUREAU OF RECLAMATION" and the subheading "ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS" (76 Stat. 1223; 43 U.S.C. 373a-1), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, which reads:

"After September 30, 1962, the position of Commissioner of Reclamation shall have the annual rate of compensation as provided for positions listed in section 2205(a) of title 5, United States Code, so long as held by the present incumbent."

(36) That part of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1962, under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR" and under the caption "BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION" and the subheading "CONSTRUCTION" (75 Stat. 728; 16 U.S.C. 832a-1), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, which reads:

"After October 1, 1961, the position of Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, shall have the same annual rate of compensation as that provided for positions listed in section 2205(b) of title 5, United States Code, so long as held by the present incumbent."

(37) Section 205 of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 423; 5 U.S.C. 483-1 note, 2206 note), as amended, relating to the salary of the present incumbent of the position of Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the Department of the Interior, and to the salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of such Department, which reads:

"SEC. 205. After August 31, 1957, the salary of the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration shall be the same as the salary of the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, so long as held by the present incumbent; and the salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Department shall be the same as the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior."

(38) The proviso in the first paragraph under the heading "FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION" and under the subheading "SALARIES AND EXPENSES" in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1964 (77 Stat. 782; Public Law 88-245), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which reads: "Provided, That the compensation of the Director of the Bureau shall be \$22,000 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent" and provisions to the same effect contained in other appropriation Acts enacted prior to the effective date of this section relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(39) That part of section 7801(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended,

relating to the annual salary of the Assistant General Counsel of the Treasury Department who shall be the Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, which reads: "and shall receive basic compensation at the annual rate of \$19,000".

(40) (A) Sections 3018, 5014, and 8018 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the compensation of the general counsels of the military departments.

(B) The respective tables of contents of chapters 303, 503, and 803 of title 10, United States Code, are amended by striking out "3018. Compensation of General Counsel."; "5014. Compensation of General Counsel."; and "8018. Compensation of General Counsel."

(41) (A) That part of section 2(a) of Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1962 (76 Stat. 1253; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15, note), relating to the compensation of the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, which reads: "and shall receive compensation at the rate of \$22,500 per annum".

(B) That part of section 2(b) of such reorganization plan (76 Stat. 1253; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15, note), relating to the compensation of the Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology, which reads: "and receive compensation at the rate of \$20,500 per annum".

(C) That part of section 22(a) of such reorganization plan (76 Stat. 1255; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15, note), relating to the compensation of the Director of the National Science Foundation, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate of \$21,000 per annum and".

(42) That part of section 624(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 447; 22 U.S.C. 2384(a)), relating to the compensation of twelve officers in the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of such Act, which reads: "of whom—

"(1) one shall have the rank of an Under Secretary and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate authorized by law for any Under Secretary of an Executive Department;

"(2) one shall have the rank of Deputy Under Secretary and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate authorized by law for any Deputy Under Secretary of an executive department; and

"(3) ten shall have the rank of Assistant Secretaries and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate authorized by law for any Assistant Secretary of an executive department."

(43) That part of the first sentence of section 104(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 174; 8 U.S.C. 1104(b)), relating to the rank and compensation of the Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, which reads: "and compensation".

SEC. 306. (a)(1) Section 508 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 508. Salaries

"Subject to subsection (f) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, the Attorney General shall fix the annual salaries of United States attorneys, assistant United States attorneys, and attorneys appointed under section 503 of this title at rates of compensation not in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

(2) Subject to section 303(f) of this Act, each incumbent United States attorney and assistant United States attorney shall be paid compensation at a rate equal to that of attorneys of comparable responsibility and professional qualifications, as determined by the Attorney General, whose compensation is prescribed in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) Section 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (70 Stat. 704; 22 U.S.C. 866), relating to the per annum sal-

aries of chiefs of mission, is amended by striking out the second sentence of that section and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The per annum salaries of chiefs of mission within each class shall be at the rate provided by law for the levels of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule as follows: class 1, the rate for level II; class 2, the rate for level III; class 3, the rate for level IV; and class 4, the rate for level V."

(c) That part of section 201(f) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 428; 42 U.S.C. 2471(f)), fixing a limit of \$19,000 on the compensation of seven persons in the National Aeronautics and Space Council, is amended by striking out "compensated at the rate of not more than \$19,000 a year," and inserting in lieu thereof "compensated at not to exceed the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

(d) Clause (A) of section 203(b)(2) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2473(b)(2)), as amended, is amended to read as follows: "(A) to the extent the Administrator deems such action necessary to the discharge of his responsibilities, he may appoint not more than four hundred and twenty-five of the scientific, engineering, and administrative personnel of the Administration without regard to such laws, and may fix the compensation of such personnel not in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and".

(e) Section 6(f) of the Act of September 24, 1959 (73 Stat. 706; 5 U.S.C. 2376(f)), relating to the maximum compensation payable to employees of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, is amended by striking out "at a rate in excess of \$20,000 per annum" and by inserting in lieu thereof "at a rate in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended".

(f) The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) In the last sentence of section 24 a. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2034(a)), relating to the annual salary of the General Manager of such Commission, (A) by inserting "and" immediately before "shall be removable by the Commission" and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of \$22,000 per annum";

(2) In the last sentence of section 24 b. (71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2034(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy General Manager of such Commission, (A) by inserting "and" immediately before "shall be removable by the General Manager" and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but not in excess of \$20,500 per annum";

(3) In the last sentence of section 24 c. (71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2034(c)), relating to the annual salaries of the Assistant General Managers (or their equivalents) of such Commission, (A) by inserting "and" immediately before "shall be removable by the General Manager" and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but not in excess of \$20,000 per annum";

(4) In the second sentence of section 25 a. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(a)), relating to the annual salaries of directors of program divisions of such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: "and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of \$19,000 per annum";

(5) In section 25 b. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(b)), relating to the an-

nual salary of the General Counsel of such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: "and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of \$19,500 per annum";

(6) In the first sentence of section 25 c. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(c)), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the Inspection Division in such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: "and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of \$19,000 per annum";

(7) In the last sentence of section 25 d. (71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(d)), relating to the annual salaries of certain executive management positions in such Commission, (A) by inserting "and" immediately before "shall be removable by the General Manager" and (B) by striking out that part which reads: "and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but not in excess of \$19,000 per annum"; and

(8) In the second sentence of section 28 (68 Stat. 926; 42 U.S.C. 2038), relating to the compensation of the active member of the Armed Forces serving as Director of the Division of Military Application in such Commission, by striking out that part which reads "and the compensation prescribed in section 25" and inserting in lieu thereof, "and the compensation established for this position pursuant to section 303 or section 309 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964".

(g) Section 2 of the Act of July 30, 1946, as amended (60 Stat. 712; 70 Stat. 740; 22 U.S.C. 287n), relating to the compensation of the United States representatives and alternates at sessions of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, is amended by striking out "Such representatives and alternates shall each be entitled to receive compensation at such rates, not to exceed \$15,000 per annum, as the President may determine," and inserting in lieu thereof "Such representatives and alternates shall each be entitled to receive compensation at such rates

"Class 10.....
Fire Chief.....
Chief of Police."

is amended to read as follows:

"Class 10.....
Fire Chief.....
Chief of Police."

(j) (1) The catchline of section 3012 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(2) The table of contents of chapter 303 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "3012. Secretary of the Army: powers and duties; delegation by; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"3012. Secretary of the Army: powers and duties; delegation by."

(3) The catchline of section 5031 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(4) The table of contents of chapter 505 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "5031. Secretary of the Navy: responsibilities; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"5031. Secretary of the Navy: responsibilities."

(5) The catchline of section 5033 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(6) The table of contents of chapter 505 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "5033. Under Secretary of the Navy: appointment; duties; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"5033. Under Secretary of the Navy: appointment; duties."

provided for Foreign Service officers in the schedule contained in section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, as the President may determine."

(h) The third sentence of section 2 of the Act of May 29, 1959 (73 Stat. 63; 50 U.S.C. 402, note), is amended to read as follows: "Except as provided in subsection (f) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, no officer or employee of the National Security Agency shall be paid basic compensation at a rate in excess of the highest rate of basic compensation contained in such General Schedule."

(i) (1) Sections 2 and 3 of the Act of July 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 414; D.C. Code, secs. 1-204a and 1-204b), relating to the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, are amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. Except as otherwise provided by this section and section 3 of this Act—

"(1) the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of \$25,500 each per annum; and

"(2) the Commissioner detailed from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army shall receive an annual compensation which, when added to any compensation he receives as an officer of the United States Army, will equal the compensation authorized by paragraph (1) of this section.

"Sec. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) the compensation of the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of \$26,000 per annum; and

"(2) if the Commissioner detailed from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army is chosen President of the Board of Commissioners, he shall receive, as President of the Board, an annual compensation which, when added to any compensation he receives as an officer of the United States Army, will equal the compensation authorized by paragraph (1) of this section."

(2) Section 11-702(d) of the District of Columbia Code (77 Stat. 484; Public Law 88-241), relating to the rates of annual salary

17,000	17,400	17,800	18,200	18,600	19,000
--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

is amended to read as follows:

20,000	20,500	21,000	21,500	22,000	22,500
--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

(7) The catchline of section 8012 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(8) The table of contents of chapter 803 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "8012. Secretary of the Air Force: powers and duties; delegation by; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"8012. Secretary of the Air Force: powers and duties; delegation by."

Changes in position titles

SEC. 307. Whenever reference is made in any law or reorganization plan to the—

Administrative Assistant Attorney General,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Labor,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Treasury,

or

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, such reference shall be held and considered to mean the—

Assistant Attorney General for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Administration,

of the chief judge and the associate judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, is amended—

(A) by striking out "\$19,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$25,000"; and

(B) by striking out "\$18,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$24,500".

(3) Section 11-902(d) of the District of Columbia Code (77 Stat. 487; Public Law 88-241), relating to the rates of annual salary of the chief judge and the associate judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, is amended—

(A) by striking out "\$18,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$24,000"; and

(B) by striking out "\$17,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$23,500".

(4) The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 2 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2402), relating to the compensation of the person appointed to the District of Columbia Tax Court, is amended by striking out "\$17,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$23,500".

(5) That part of the salary schedule in section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended (76 Stat. 1229; D.C. Code, sec. 31-1501), relating to the compensation of the Superintendent of Schools, and Deputy Superintendent of Schools, of the District of Columbia, which reads:

Class 1: Superintendent of Schools.....	\$19,000
Class 2: Deputy Superintendent.....	16,500

is amended to read as follows:

Class 1: Superintendent of Schools.....	\$25,000
Class 2: Deputy Superintendent.....	21,000

(6) That part of the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 480), as amended (sec. 4-823, et seq., D.C. Code, 1961 edition), relating to the compensation of the Fire Chief and the Chief of Police, which reads:

17,000	17,400	17,800	18,200	18,600	19,000
--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

20,000	20,500	21,000	21,500	22,000	22,500
--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of Labor for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Administration, or

Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Administration, respectively.

Limitation on salaries fixed by administrative action

SEC. 308. Except as provided by this Act and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the head of any executive department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch who is authorized to fix by administrative action the annual rate of basic compensation for any position, officer, or employee shall not fix such rate in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to impair the authorities provided in the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended (50 U.S.C. 403a and following), in section 3 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (16 U.S.C. 831b), in section 9 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1819), in section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248), or in section 5240 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 481), relating to the Comptroller of the Currency.

Positions placed under Classification Act of 1949

SEC. 309. Each office or position in the executive branch specifically referred to in, or covered by, any conforming change in law made by section 305 of this Act, or any other office or position in the executive branch for which the annual salary is established pursuant to special provision of law enacted prior to July 1, 1964, at a figure of \$18,500 or above, which is not placed in a level of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule pursuant to section 303 of this Act, shall receive pay equivalent to a grade and step of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. All actions taken under this section shall be reported to the United States Civil Service Commission and published in the Federal Register, except when it is determined by the President that such report and publication would be contrary to the interest of national security.

Saving provisions

SEC. 310. (a) Except as provided by this Act, the changes in existing law made by this Act shall not affect any office or position existing immediately prior to the effective date of any such changes in existing law, the compensation attached to such office or position, and any incumbent thereof, his appointment thereto, and his entitlement to receive the compensation attached thereto, until appropriate action is taken in accordance with this Act or other law.

(b) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the rate of basic, gross, or total annual compensation received by any officer or employee immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall not be reduced by reason of enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL JUDICIAL SALARIES

SEC. 401. This title may be cited as the "Federal Judicial Salary Act of 1964".

SEC. 402. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18, United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, sections 672 to 675, inclusive, or section 604(a)(5), of title 28, United States Code, insofar as the latter section applies to graded positions, are hereby increased by amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees holding ungraded positions and whose salaries are fixed pursuant to section 604(a)(5) may be increased by the amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by amounts which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) Section 753(e) of title 28, United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts), is amended by striking out the existing salary limitation contained therein and inserting a new limitation which reflects the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(d) Section 40a of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 68(a)), as amended, relating to the compensation of full-time and part-time referees in bankruptcy, is amended by striking out the existing compensation limitations contained therein and inserting new limitations of "\$22,500" and "\$11,000", respectively.

SEC. 403. (a) Section 5 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the salaries of the Chief Justice of the United States and of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, is amended by striking out "\$35,500" and substituting therefor "\$43,000", and by striking out "\$35,000" and substituting therefor "\$42,500".

(b) Section 44(d) of title 28, United States Code, relating to circuit judges, is amended by striking out "\$25,500" and substituting therefor "\$33,000".

(c) Section 135 of title 28, United States Code, relating to district judges, is amended by striking out "\$22,500" and substituting therefor "\$30,000", and by striking out "\$23,000" and substituting therefor "\$30,500".

(d) Section 173 of title 28, United States Code relating to judges of the Court of Claims, is amended by striking out "\$25,500" and substituting therefor "\$33,000".

(e) Section 213 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, is amended by striking out "\$25,500" and substituting therefor "\$33,000".

(f) Section 252 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Customs Court, is amended by striking out "\$22,500" and substituting therefor "\$30,000".

(g) The first paragraph of section 603 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the compensation of the Director and the Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, is amended to read as follows:

"The Director shall receive a salary of \$27,000 a year. The Deputy Director shall receive a salary of \$26,000 a year."

(h) Subsection (b) of section 792 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the compensation of commissioners of the Court of Claims, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each commissioner shall receive basic compensation at the rate of \$26,000 a year, and also all necessary traveling expenses and a per diem allowance as provided in the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, while traveling on official business and away from Washington, District of Columbia."

(i) Section 7443(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (68A Stat. 879), as amended, relating to judges of the Tax Court of the United States, is further amended by striking out "\$22,500" and substituting therefor "\$30,000".

(j) Section 867(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Military Appeals, is amended by striking out "\$25,500" and substituting therefor "\$33,000".

TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 501. (a) Except to the extent provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, this Act and the increases in compensation made by this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1964.

(b) Section 204 of this Act, relating to increases in compensation for Members of Congress, shall become effective at noon on January 3, 1965.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act (but except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section)—

(1) no rate of compensation which is equal to or in excess of \$22,000 per annum shall be increased in any amount, by reason of section 202 of this Act, until the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1965; and

(2) no rate of compensation which is less than \$22,000 per annum shall be increased to

a amount per annum in excess of \$22,000, by reason of section 202 or 203(g) of this Act, until the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the precedents of the Senate, the committee substitute for this bill is considered as original text for the purpose of amendment, and is therefore subject to amendment in two degrees. Amendments to the House text or any amendment thereto has precedence over the committee substitute or any amendment to it.

The vote on the substitute, whether amended or not, will not come until after all perfecting amendments, either to the original bill or the substitute itself have been disposed of.

The committee amendment, when agreed to, is not subject to further amendment.

OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule of germaneness be waived for the duration of my comments.

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

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, last Thursday afternoon, nearly a week ago, the Secretary of the Interior announced the Government's decision on the level of oil imports under the mandatory oil import program for the last half of 1964.

This decision came after strong appeals from dozens of U.S. Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, 20 Governors, and strong grassroots support for a substantial reduction in the level of crude oil imports.

What was the decision?

Instead of a substantial reduction, the program announced increased oil imports into the United States for the last half of 1964 by more than 100,000 barrels per day over the same period of last year. This was done in spite of the Department's conclusion in its Thursday announcement that:

The Department also announced the preliminary results of a review of the basic economic position confronting the domestic producing industry. The tentative conclusions from the study indicate that there has been a gradual erosion in the crude price structure throughout the United States, and that despite moderate increases in crude production, domestic producers are being confronted with increasing difficulties.

Mr. President, I find this action incomprehensible in light of the seriously depressed conditions now prevailing in this vital domestic industry.

Why did 16 Senators, including myself, and my colleague from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] join in a strong bipartisan appeal to the President for a substantial reduction in oil imports?

Why did dozens of other Senators and Members of the House address individual appeals to the President, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense, imploring them to greatly reduce the levels of oil imports into this country?

Why did 20 State Governors send a telegram to President Johnson declaring:

Governors of several oil States request your assistance in the establishment of oil import quotas which comply with the congressional mandate aimed at insuring continued domestic exploration and the development of domestic supplies adequate to meet the needs of our national security.

Why did the Independent Petroleum Association of America, representing 10,000 oil and gas producers, joined by more than 30 State and local associations, petition the President and the Secretary of the Interior for prompt relief from this evergrowing tide of foreign oil?

Mr. President, I will tell you why.

This Nation is facing a steady deterioration of one of the basic industries—an industry which in my mind is the most important national security tool this Nation has.

It is even more important, relatively speaking, to my own State of Wyoming, where it constitutes by far the largest segment of our State's economy. Wyoming ranks fifth among the oil-producing States.

We are witnessing the continual decline of an industry which in the past has been called upon to produce the petroleum so vital to successfully prosecute wars, stand off and deter war threats, help other friendly nations in time of crisis, and also supply at reasonable prices the petroleum products needed for an ever-expanding national economy.

What do I mean when I refer to a declining industry? Picture this, if you will.

Since 1956, the year the industry did such a marvelous job during the Suez crisis, we have seen the following:

First. Exploratory drilling for new oil and gas reserves last year was down 34 percent from 1956.

Second. The number of rotary rigs operating last year, the vehicle by which the drill bit finds new oil and gas reserves, was down 43 percent from 1956.

Third. Additions to crude oil reserves last year, for the third time in the past 4 years, were less than this Nation produced. Our reserves declined 369 million barrels in 1962 and 419 million barrels in 1963—not because there is insufficient oil to find, but because the incentive for drilling is dying because of sour economic conditions in the industry brought on principally by this glut of foreign oil flowing into the United States at the rate of more than 2 million barrels per day.

The domestic oil-producing industry is finding more oil per well drilled today than in years past; but the trouble is we are drilling fewer and fewer wells.

Fourth. Add to this the fact that the purchasing power of a barrel of crude oil today is 50 cents a barrel less than it was a short 15 years ago. This has taken place in spite of the fact that the general economy has, during this period, increased very substantially.

Fifth. Employment in the petroleum producing industry has also been on the decline—having gone from 344,000 employees in 1957 to 293,400 last year, a drop of more than 50,000 or 15 percent.

Mr. President, the "whys" for the many petitions to our Government are overwhelming. The real question is, Why has this matter been treated as it has by our Government? What more evidence of concern is needed? What more basic facts are needed? What more can Senators, Congressmen, Governors, and citizens do to bring this matter home to those who can do something about it?

Mr. President, I recognize that our Government, in view of our international commitments and for good cause, must not turn this Nation's back on our friendly neighbors to the south of us, to our Middle East friends, and to other important factors affecting international relations. But when one looks at the facts, the only conclusion that can be reached is that this domestic oil producing industry has already done and is doing more than its fair share of meeting this Nation's obligations to our friends overseas.

As a matter of fact, this Nation's oil producing industry has been asked for the past decade to move over more and more to make room for unneeded foreign oil to such an extent that since 1956 we have seen our domestic production remain almost static while crude oil production in Canada has increased 50 percent, in Venezuela by 32 percent, and other Western Hemisphere countries have increased during this period by 70 percent. Oil production in the Middle East has gone up 98 percent since 1956, as has the Soviet Union by 136 percent. Other Eastern Hemisphere countries have increased their production by 284 percent during this period.

In terms of barrels per day, the figures show actual production gains as follows:

<i>Change in crude oil production worldwide 1956-1963</i>		<i>Barrels per day</i>
1. United States.....	-----	+391,000
2. Canada.....	-----	+236,000
3. Venezuela.....	-----	+791,000
4. Other Western Hemisphere..	-----	+450,000
5. Middle East.....	-----	+3,382,000
6. Soviet Union.....	-----	+2,555,000
7. Other Eastern Hemisphere....	-----	+1,543,000

Mr. President, the real point of the table is the overwhelming rise in the production of oil in other portions of the globe.

Mr. President, of course not all of this great increase in worldwide oil production has sought a market in the United States. However, we see that 42 percent of all the oil produced in Venezuela comes into the United States, 35 percent of the oil in Canada comes here, and 15 percent from all other Western Hemisphere countries.

I realize that providing a market for foreign goods in the United States is an important factor in this Nation's bid to strengthen the free world in its fight against communism. However, I feel the time is long overdue that our leaders ask themselves this question, "Just how much does an industry, one so vital to our survival, have to give up in this cause?"

The value of petroleum imports into the United States since 1947-49 have quadrupled, while the value of all other commodities have doubled.

Last year oil imports increased to a value of in excess of \$1.7 billion.

These constant inroads into U.S. markets must be stopped if we expect to have a domestic petroleum producing industry capable of doing the job our Government and citizenry expect of it at all times.

Mr. President, back in 1957 a Presidential Committee made up of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Labor, studied the matter of oil imports and at that time concluded:

It is clear that there is a direct relationship between the Nation's security and adequate and available sources of energy. Oil and gas account for two-thirds of all the energy that is consumed in this country. Furthermore, there is no adequate substitute in sight for the foreseeable future. Therefore, we must have available adequate supplies of oil.

We have concluded, for reasons that are set forth later in this section of the report, that if we are to have enough oil to meet our national security needs, there must be a limitation on imports that will insure a proper balance between imports and domestic production.

The Committee also stated:

In summary, unless a reasonable limitation of petroleum imports is brought about, your Committee believes that:

(a) Oil imports will flow into this country in ever-mounting quantities, entirely disproportionate to the quantities needed to supplement domestic supply.

(b) There will be a resultant discouragement of, and decrease in, domestic production.

(c) There will be a marked decline in domestic exploration and development.

(d) In the event of a serious emergency, this Nation will find itself years away from attaining the level of petroleum production necessary to meet our national security needs.

Later in 1959 when the President of the United States established the mandatory oil import program, he declared:

The new program is designed to insure a stable, healthy industry, in the United States capable of exploring for and developing new hemisphere reserves to replace those being depleted. The basis of the new program, like that for the voluntary program, is the certified requirements of our national security which make it necessary that we preserve to the greatest extent possible a vigorous, healthy petroleum industry in the United States.

In addition to serving our own direct security interests, the new program will also help prevent severe dislocations in our own country as well as in oil industries elsewhere which also have an important bearing on our own security. Petroleum, wherever it may be produced in the free world, is important to the security, not only of ourselves, but also of the free people of the world everywhere.

Mr. President, the mandatory oil import program has been a great help in stemming the rising tide of foreign oil, but it is now all too clear that the program as it is now operating is not serving its national security goals as laid down by our Government when it was first established.

Also it can readily be seen that in view of the deteriorating conditions in the industry, which I outlined earlier,

proves all too conclusively the truth of the Cabinet Committee statement as to what would happen "unless a reasonable limitation of petroleum imports is brought about."

Mr. President, it has happened, although there is a 3-million-barrel-per-day shut-in capacity in the United States for lack of a market, the program has operated to cause the far western part of the United States, including the State of California, which is the site of one of this Nation's largest military complexes, to become increasingly dependent on foreign oil.

Ten years ago imports into the west coast were equal to less than 6 percent of the local crude oil production. At that time, California was the second largest oil producing State in our Nation. Today, a short 10 years later, under the program just announced, imports will amount to almost 60 percent of local crude oil production. Can anyone be heard to say that the program is achieving its national security goals in view of such facts?

Mr. President, a thumbnail sketch of the existing situation shows:

First. Total U.S. oil imports—crude and all products—to have continued to increase in relation to domestic crude oil production.

	Percent
1954.....	16.6
1959.....	25.2
1964 (estimated).....	30.0

Second. Total U.S. oil imports, excluding residual fuel oil, also have continued to increase in relation to domestic crude oil production.

	Percent
1954.....	11.0
1959.....	16.6
1964 (estimated).....	18.6

Third. Total imports, excluding residual fuel oil, into districts I-IV—United States east of the Rockies—have remained at approximately the same ratio to domestic production for the past 5 years. Yet drilling and other domestic activity has seriously declined during this period indicating that the present level should be reduced.

Fourth. Total imports, excluding residual fuel oil, into district V—United States west of the Rockies—have increased very rapidly under the present program. In 1954, imports were 5.8 percent of crude oil production in that area but now are over 50 percent.

Fifth. The military purchases over 200,000 barrels daily of jet fuel and gasoline, about 35 percent of their requirements, are from foreign sources. Of this total purchased abroad, 35,000 barrels daily are imported into the United States where these same products are already available here.

Mr. President, my real concern is: How long can we continue to turn our backs on our domestic industry and invite foreign oil to share more and more of our U.S. market?

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

Mr. McGEE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. One of the interesting points about this problem is that the Government is still maintaining a high interest rate on the national debt, on the theory that to do otherwise would invite the flight of American dollars away from this country.

Sometime next month we shall be asked to vote for legislation that would tax money that goes overseas for investment purposes, in order to slow down the flight of American dollars. This would be no problem if we could export a sufficient amount over and above what we import.

The Senator from Wyoming well knows that one of the principal causes of the gold drain is the tremendous amount of money our Government spends in buying overseas oil and hauling it to this country, all of which tends to displace the domestic industry, which is fully capable of producing our needs.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator is entirely correct. I salute him not only as one of the leaders in understanding all the implications of the forces now preying on the oil industry of this country, but also as an effective leader in the Committee on Finance. I fully appreciate the consequences of the added burden of these imports as we are trying to slow down the outflow of dollars from our country at this time. I thank the Senator for his comment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator knows that a law was enacted in the previous Congress, if I recall correctly, limiting American tourists to bringing back only half of what they could bring back tariff free previously. Once again, that law was aimed at the same problem, the problem of curtailing our unfavorable balance of payments. Compared with what is being lost through oil imports, the amount that would be saved from the tourist traffic by such measures would be only a drop in the ocean. The Senator is aware of that, because we have figures that show what is saved by cutting down on what American tourists may bring back. That amount would pale into insignificance by comparison, if we consider what the oil imports mean so far as our balance of payments is concerned.

Mr. McGEE. Oil imports consume the entire impact of the shift in tourist dollars.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, having cited some of the factors that are depressing conditions in the oil industry, I should like to turn to some suggestions as to what can be done and ought to be done.

I have tried to show that foreign oil has taken the lion's share of growth in United States and world markets in the last 8 or 10 years. I have tried to show the great dollar value of oil imports into the United States. I have tried to show what is happening to our domestic oil industry. I have tried to show what our national leaders have concluded concerning the importance of a strong and healthy domestic oil-producing industry. I have told you of the Interior Department's recognition of conditions now existing in the industry. What more needs to be said?

Mr. President, reasonable men, in view of what I have outlined here today, certainly should be willing to take a hard look at these facts with a view to promptly correcting this serious situation.

I suggest that a minimum revision in the program to reverse the serious adverse conditions would include the following steps:

First. A realistic import level is of first importance in returning the domestic oil-producing industry to the vigor and health so vitally needed for national security.

Second. Reduce the present ratio of 12.2 percent of domestic production to a ratio no higher than existed prior to the declining trends in the domestic industry—at or below 10 percent in districts I-IV, east of the Rocky Mountains.

Third. Include within the allowable relationship of all nonresidual imports such as shipments from Puerto Rico, bonded imports of distillate fuel, and bonded imports of jet fuel for commercial use.

Fourth. Eliminate estimating procedures by basing import relationships on actual production during prior periods.

Fifth. Base the quantity of overland imports on certification from importing companies, rather than estimates by the Interior Department.

Sixth. Eliminate imports of light finished products that are unnecessary and should be supplied by domestic oil.

Seventh. Eliminate nonresidual imports for military use, with a corresponding reduction in total imports.

Eighth. Eliminate the importation of unfinished oils which were developed as a means of circumventing the voluntary import program.

Ninth. Use the full capacity of all pipelines from other domestic areas in determining available supply in setting district V imports allowable; provide incentives for additional district V production, additional movements from districts I-IV, and new pipelines into district V; and eliminate excess shipments from district V to districts I-IV as a part of the demand on which district V imports are based.

Tenth. Treat U.S. military purchases of light petroleum products from foreign sources as imports which would be deducted from the total permissible import level.

These recommendations would:

First. Reduce total districts I-IV imports, exclusive of residual fuel oil, by about 300,000 barrels daily from current levels, by reducing the overall import ratio from 12.2 to 10 percent of actual production and by including within the program those imports now excluded.

Second. Result in diversion to U.S. sources of at least 100,000 barrels daily of present U.S. military purchases of light petroleum products in foreign areas.

Third. Treat as imports the remainder of foreign military purchases amounting to about 100,000 barrels a day, by deducting these purchases from total imports permitted under the 10-percent ratio.

The aggregate effects of these changes would be to increase the market for domestic petroleum liquids by about 500,000

barrels daily, which would go far in providing the funds and incentives needed by the domestic industry if our security as to energy is to be maintained.

Mr. President, I urge that our Government take the necessary steps promptly to revise the mandatory program as just outlined.

Then, too, Mr. President, I call on the importing companies, each of which is well acquainted with the serious conditions existing in the domestic oil producing industry, immediately to voluntarily reduce their import quotas by at least 25 percent. This action would be a first but important step in returning health and vigor to our domestic oil producing industry. I feel this is a reasonable suggestion and I would hope it will not be necessary for Congress to look into the necessity of a stronger import quota and the tax provisions dealing with income earned abroad.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will join me in urging those in the executive department in charge of the oil import program, as well as the importing companies, to do all within their power to promptly and substantially reduce the flood of foreign oil into this Nation. Failure to do this will serve to further aggravate an already critical situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an excellent statement on this situation by Mr. H. A. True, Jr., of Casper, Wyo. Mr. True serves as president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America and operates an oil drilling company in Casper. He is a good friend of mine and an outstanding citizen of our State of Wyoming. He has rendered excellent service as president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America through his far-seeing leadership.

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

STATEMENT ON IMPORTS BY H. A. TRUE, JR., CASPER, WYO., PRESIDENT, INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, JUNE 25, 1964

The administrator's decision announced today that oil imports (excluding residual fuel oil) into the United States for the next 6 months are to be increased more than 100,000 barrels daily over the same period of last year and 70,000 barrels over the current level, is not only discouraging, but wholly unacceptable in view of the seriously depressed conditions of the domestic petroleum industry.

A strong and meritorious case for a substantial reduction in imports was presented to the Department of Interior on May 25 by a united group of independent producing associations. Since that time, the recommendations for a reduction have received widespread support from Governors, Members of Congress, and the Interstate Oil Compact Commission.

It is an established fact that the domestic oil producing industry is in a serious and deteriorating condition which is now recognized by the Interior Department. The situation can only worsen in the absence of Government action to strengthen the import program.

In spite of this convincing evidence, the action to increase imports shows more concern for the possible effects of the import program on Venezuela and other foreign pro-

ducing countries than on the 32 oil-producing States of this Nation.

The import program has one purpose and one only—to maintain a strong domestic oil industry in the interest of national security. It, therefore, is shocking to find that the apparent primary concern of our Government is for the foreign producing countries which have enjoyed continued substantial increases in imports into the United States.

Independent domestic oil producers with their backs to the wall will find the action by the administration today a bitter pill, difficult to comprehend.

It is all too clear that the program as now constituted is not serving its security objective. Although there is a large surplus producing capacity in the United States which is shut in for the lack of market, the program has operated to cause the entire western part of the United States to become increasingly dependent on imports. Ten years ago, imports on the west coast were equal to less than 6 percent of local crude oil production: Currently, they are equal to almost 50 percent and under the new program, will be almost 60 percent. It is difficult to see how this trend of dependency can be justified.

Even though the mandatory import program has undoubtedly prevented the complete collapse of the domestic industry, exploration, drilling, development, and employment have gone constantly down. Crude oil price erosion has been constant and is intensifying. These conditions are resulting in declining U.S. oil reserves.

While we are discouraged, we are not defeated. We will continue through every proper means and every available forum to advocate the changes which we believe necessary to serve the national security. We have by our efforts gained some recognition. There is increased evidence of understanding of the problems and position of the domestic industry. Our further immediate efforts for corrective action will include:

1. A petition to the President of the United States to take whatever steps are necessary to provide an oil import program under which the domestic producing industry can perform its essential function of supplying adequate petroleum for an expanding economy and national security.

2. A petition to Secretary Udall for reconsideration of our recommendation for a substantial reduction in the level of imports for the last half of 1964, including the encouragement of the use of domestic oil in the west coast States rather than increased imports.

3. A petition to Secretary of Defense McNamara urging that, pending decisions from current discussions with Interior, actions be taken as follows:

- (a) During the last half of this year the Defense Department forego the exercise of its import quota of 35,000 barrels daily of jet fuel and gasoline which are readily and abundantly available within the United States; and

- (b) That the Department of Defense take steps to divert as soon as feasible to domestic sources a minimum of 65,000 barrels daily of light petroleum products now being purchased from overseas sources.

It remains our conviction that a substantial reduction in imports is not only justified but increasingly necessary. We believe the plain facts as to the conditions now existing in the domestic industry require that something more be done. In addition to our petitions to the administration, we will continue to bring these facts to the attention of Governors, the Congress, and all others concerned with preserving the domestic petroleum industry. The future security of our Nation demands corrective action.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the able and distinguished Senator from

Wyoming has made an irrefutable case for limiting further the imports of foreign petroleum products into this country. His statement is one of the best documented and most factual presentations I have heard in a long time.

At a time when the Russian oil industry is growing by leaps and bounds, when its production has become a major factor in the world of oil commerce, we are imposing policies permitting excessive imports that are practically stopping the exploration and development of new oil sources. We are eliminating from our economy the vital element of independent producers.

It is not as if this problem were unnoticed. All of the members of the Oklahoma delegation recently signed a letter to Secretary Udall urging that foreign oil imports be restricted. I joined with 15 other Senators from oil-producing States in writing to the President and urging that proposals along the line advocated by the capable Senator from Wyoming be adopted and put into effect immediately. However, instead of even a token surcease from the inhibiting influence of foreign oil, we were answered with an increase in imports amounting to over 100,000 barrels a day.

The power to alleviate this problem rests not only in the Secretary of the Interior, but also in the Secretary of Defense, as the Senator from Wyoming has so perceptively noted. The military has been steadily increasing its purchases overseas of light petroleum products. The purchase of kerosene, gasoline, and distillate fuel oil overseas has risen from 46,000 barrels a day in 1954 to 212,000 barrels a day last year. The military is purchasing 35 percent of its total requirements abroad.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I wrote to Secretary McNamara on June 5, 1964, urging that he give serious consideration to the proposals which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] has so eloquently advocated today. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter I received from Lt. Gen. W. O. Senter, Director of Petroleum Logistics Policy, replying on behalf of Secretary McNamara to my letter of June 5, and a copy of my letter to General Senter dated June 29.

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

JUNE 5, 1964.

THE HONORABLE ROBERT MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: One factor which has contributed to the difficulties of the domestic petroleum industry in recent years has been the steadily increasing purchases overseas of light petroleum products for military use. I am advised that military purchases of kerosene, gasoline, and distillate fuel oil from abroad have risen from 46,000 barrels daily in 1954 to 212,000 barrels per day last year.

These purchases abroad represented 35 percent of the 1963 total military purchases of these products. My figures come from the Office of Oil and Gas at the Interior Department.

I have been advised further that the Independent Petroleum Association of America

has previously been in touch with you concerning this problem and has requested that you reduce these purchases from abroad at least 100,000 barrels a day, in order to bolster our domestic industry.

I am sure that so far as you are concerned the importance of a strong domestic petroleum industry to our national defense posture needs no substantiation. I take this means of expressing my own deep concern over the growth of these purchases from abroad and respectfully request that you give all appropriate consideration to the IPAA's request.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,
Very truly yours,

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., June 15, 1964.

The Honorable MIKE MONRONEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONRONEY: This is in reply to your letter of June 5, 1964, addressed to Secretary McNamara, requesting that appropriate consideration be given to the recommendation of the Independent Petroleum Association of America that the Department of Defense (DOD) reduce its offshore procurement of petroleum products in order to bolster the domestic industry.

The recommended diversion to the United States of such offshore procurement has long been, and continues to be, a matter of careful study in connection with our gold flow problem. Undoubtedly, any return of our offshore procurement will inure to the benefit of the domestic industry in both the production and refining areas and, at the same time, might in some degree, improve our balance of payments. However, there are other factors which play an equally important part in the consideration and evaluation of this matter. Some of these are:

- (1) Logistical facts of life (e.g., no Government-owned transportation and/or storage facilities in some overseas areas).
- (2) Advantageous long-term contracts, principally to supply our Pacific naval special fuel oil requirements while recognizing the need to procure from the same supplier those light petroleum products which represent the output of a balanced refinery yield.
- (3) Impact on potential worldwide sources of supply required to fulfill DOD's global commitments.
- (4) Disproportionately higher domestic procurement costs.

In this connection, the Secretary of the Interior has requested the Oil Import Administrator to confer with representatives of this Department in order that further study and evaluation can be made of our offshore procurement activities. We welcome this opportunity and wish to advise that arrangements are now underway for the new analysis. You may rest assured that our offshore procurement will be diverted to the United States wherever practicable.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.
Sincerely,

W. O. SENTER,
Lieutenant General, USAF, Director of
Petroleum Logistics Policy.

JUNE 29, 1964.

Lt. Gen. W. O. SENTER,
Installations and Logistics,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL SENTER: Thank you for your letter of June 15, 1964, concerning the procurement overseas of petroleum products by the Department of Defense. I was pleased to learn that representatives of both the Department of Interior and the Department of Defense are conferring on this matter.

I would hope, however, that the study of the Department's procurement policy will take into account not only the balance-of-

payments problem, but other factors as well which are equally important.

While I am aware that the Department certainly cannot bear the responsibility for maintaining a healthy domestic petroleum industry, the Department's policy, in my opinion, should be to purchase domestic petroleum products where logistics permit and where disparity between the price of the foreign and domestic product is not unreasonably high. In this regard, I understand that the Department has an imports allocation under which it has been importing into the United States 35,000 barrels a day of jet fuel and gasoline. Would you please advise me why this is being done when domestic products are readily available? This is one particular instance where I feel the Department could cut its overseas purchases without detriment to the Department and with corresponding benefit to the domestic industry.

I would appreciate being advised of the results of your conferences with the representatives from the Interior Department.

With best wishes, I am,
Very truly yours,

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, at the present time, the Department of Defense has an imports allocation from the Interior Department under which it has been importing into the United States itself 35,000 barrels a day of jet fuel and gasoline. There is certainly no logistical benefit or requirement for importing this oil. Any other alleged justification, in my opinion, must be secondary to a policy of purchasing domestic oil when such purchases are necessary, in order to preserve our domestic producing capability. There is certainly precedent for this policy. The military in recent months has reduced its purchases of beef overseas and has bought instead substantial quantities of domestic beef. The same policy and the same action should be applied to the domestic oil industry.

The purpose of the Government's mandatory oil import program is to help the domestic industry so that we shall always have an industry capable of meeting the Nation's emergency oil requirements on short notice. There is nothing sacrosanct about the overall import level which was established at the inception of the mandatory program. It was thought at that time that the level set was reasonable and would contribute to the economic well being of the domestic producers. After 5 long years' experience, we now know that this imports level is not doing the job. It is not fulfilling the objectives which were sought. While a decrease in military purchases overseas will help, there can be no substantial relief of the magnitude required until the overall imports level set some years ago is reduced. If it is not, the economic condition of the domestic oil industry will continue to decline and it will no longer be able to supply our peacetime and emergency petroleum requirements.

The Interior Department and the Defense Department have advised that they are going to confer on this problem and make a study. I say that the time for studies is past. The plight of the domestic industry is apparent and openly admitted. The program outlined today by the Senator from Wyoming is reasonable, practical, and most urgently

needed. I strongly urge that action along the lines proposed by him be adopted.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his comments, along with those of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. The Senator from Oklahoma has long been noted as one of the most decisive minds in the Senate. He fully understands the many complexities and the importance of the oil industry to the country as a whole. On the basis of what he has just said, it should come as some measure of relief to Senators that we are plagued with problems everywhere around the world which seem to be insoluble, and here we are confronted with an elementary question as to what is wrong with the oil industry. We know what to do about our oil difficulties. It does not require any complexity of negotiations in order to solve them.

It seems to me that it behooves all Senators to join hands and insist that every department of the Government move in the areas which we have indicated, that Senators show a spirit of cooperation and move in the areas which I have intimated in my remarks. I believe that with determination to act and knowing the facts as we know them, we can arrive at a solution to this question before it is too late.

It is much later than we would wish it to be right now.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am very glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. SIMPSON. I wish to comment on the statement made by my colleague from Wyoming. I compliment him on the research which he has done, and on his excellent statement, which is irrefutable—as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has just stated.

I would ask the Senator from Wyoming, with his permission, if I might insert in the RECORD at this point—if it has not already been done—the letter which 16 Senators signed and sent to the President, dated June 15, 1964, with respect to this problem. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

JUNE 15, 1964.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned are very much concerned about the serious decline in activities suffered by the domestic petroleum industry in recent years. For this reason, we believe that the recommendations which have been submitted to Secretary of Interior Udall by independent producers for a reduction in the import level and the revision in the policy of the military in purchasing petroleum from foreign sources, are justified and urgently needed. It is our understanding that these recommendations would result in an increase in domestic production of about 500,000 barrels daily. It is our considered judgment that an increase of this magnitude is essential if the declining trends in the industry are to be reversed.

Total oil imports (excluding residual fuel oil) into districts I-IV (United States east of Rockies) for the past 5 years have been fairly well stabilized at a ratio to production of about 13 percent. Even so, industry

activity has continued to seriously decline. This to us strongly suggests that the present ratio must be substantially reduced.

In district V (United States west of Rockies) a most serious situation has developed which is gravely adverse to the national security. In 1954, imports (excluding residual fuel oil) into this area were equal to less than 6 percent of petroleum production. They are now 43 percent. This increased dependency on foreign oil in this large and important portion of the United States has developed while there is a large shut-in producing capacity in other areas of the United States. It seems to us that the dependency of this area on foreign petroleum has reached a dangerous degree which warrants and strongly suggests that corrective action is in order.

In 1955 a Presidential Cabinet Committee found that if imports exceed the 1954 ratio the national security would be endangered. In 1954, total imports (excluding residual fuel oil) into the United States were less than 10 percent of production. Currently, imports are more than 16 percent.

If imports were reduced by 300,000 barrels daily as recommended to Secretary Udall by independent producers, the ratio would still be almost 12 percent. It seems, therefore, that the recommendations before the Secretary are reasonable and justified.

It is our understanding that recommendations have also been submitted to Secretary Udall and to Secretary of Defense McNamara for a change in the policy with respect to military purchases of petroleum from foreign sources. It is our information that the military purchases over 200,000 barrels daily of jet fuel and gasoline from foreign sources. This constitutes 35 percent of the military's total requirements for these products. In 1954, only 13 percent of requirements were purchased abroad. These products are readily available in the United States where there is a large surplus of crude oil and substantial unused refinery capacity. The policy of the Defense Department of purchasing more and more of that requirement from foreign sources runs directly contrary to the objective of the oil import program. It is particularly significant and seemingly completely unjustifiable that the Defense Department import into the United States 35,000 barrels daily of these products.

It is our understanding that it has been recommended to Secretary Udall and Secretary McNamara that 100,000 barrels daily of these foreign purchases be diverted to domestic sources and that the remaining 100,000 barrels daily be treated as imports.

If the recommendations which have been submitted by independent producers to Secretaries Udall and McNamara concerning both the import program and military purchases are accepted, total imports into the United States (excluding residual fuel oil) would still be about 11 percent of domestic production; whereas this ratio in 1954 was less than 10 percent.

In view of the widespread importance of the domestic petroleum industry to both the peacetime economy and the national security, it is most respectfully urged that this matter be given your consideration.

Respectfully yours,

MILWARD L. SIMPSON, Republican of Wyoming; GALE W. MCGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming; WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, of Utah; PETER H. DOMINICK, Republican, of Colorado; GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado; FRANK CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas; MILTON R. YOUNG, Republican, of North Dakota; JAMES B. PEARSON, Republican, of Kansas; CARL T. CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska; FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah; ROMAN L. HRUSKA, Republican, of Nebraska; JOHN G. TOWER, Republican, of Texas; RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana;

J. HOWARD EDMONDSON, Democrat, of Oklahoma; CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico; A. S. MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma.

Mr. SIMPSON. My colleague well knows that the foundation for approximately 50 percent of the tax base in the State of Wyoming is based upon the oil industry.

I concur in what the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from Wyoming, and the Senator from Oklahoma have said. I assure them all, as Dave True said in his recent release, to which the Senator has referred, that we are discouraged but we are not defeated.

Mr. MCGEE. I thank my colleague for his contribution. He is close to this question. As a former Governor of the State of Wyoming, and now as Senator, he has been of great help in trying to unravel the many perplexing aspects of this question, in order to get at the hard facts and to get at the truth, and arrive at a sensible solution in the national interest.

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

Mr. MCGEE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I congratulate the Senator from Wyoming on the excellent address he has made on the subject of oil imports.

Some time ago, I analyzed the balance of trade between this country and foreign nations, and reached the conclusion that if we leave out of consideration those items which we do not produce in this country, such as coffee and bananas, if we leave out those items which we are incapable of producing, such as tin, and various scarce materials, which we must stockpile for security reasons, if we leave out of consideration those items with respect to which we have never had a domestic industry because we were always a high-cost producer, and then consider those items which America does produce, which we can produce in competition with the rest of the world, and once again take out those items which we export more than we import, what do we find?

We find that of all the industries, the oil industry represents approximately two-thirds of our entire imports in dollar volume.

If that same formula were to be applied to the textile industry, that industry could not survive. If the same thing were done to the beef industry, we would hear the complaints which we are presently hearing increased 100-fold.

Mr. MCGEE. I can hear them right now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; and we can hear them very loudly. The beef industry is really bellowing these days—and for good cause.

If the same thing were done to almost any other industry in America, Senators would be in the Chamber protesting even more loudly than Senators are concerning the oil industry. We are taking a real beating on oil imports. The profits being made in the oil industry today are overseas—in Venezuela, in Saudi Arabia, elsewhere than in the United States.

Fortunately, I suppose, the State of Louisiana is doing as well as any oil-

producing State because of the vast holdings on the Continental Shelf. Some of those holdings have vast deposits, but they are what we call security oil; in other words, if we have to fight a war short of an atomic war of extermination, which might be over in 48 hours with everyone in the world, practically, killed, if we had to fight a war such as World War I, World War II or the 20-odd wars we have fought in various stages since, a war in which the two sides would still survive after a military decision had been reached, we would have to have a vast supply of oil.

The Senator knows what happened when England found its shipping lines cut at the time of the Suez Canal crisis and they realized the significance of having their fuel cut off in the Near East and were ready to go to war about it.

We all remember the old song, "You Never Miss the Water, Till the Well Runs Dry." Then we realize how important it is.

This particular industry will be compelled to ask all of its friends to join in any restrictive trade program necessary to survive, and to join with others to protect their industry, unless the President does for the oil industry what has been done for the textile industry, and what has been done for other industries to give them sufficient control over imports so that the domestic industry will remain healthy.

I am very much disappointed that the President, who well understands this problem, is being far too timid with regard to his old friends whom he once represented on the floor of the Senate—and he represented them very well while he was a Senator from the great State of Texas.

He represented them very well while he was a Senator from Texas, in not demanding for them what would be done and has been done for other industries.

I hope that the press reports will recognize their responsibility. This responsibility that rests over in the Pentagon, in the event it is called upon to defend this great Nation, would simply mean that they would take from this Nation all its oil. Those who would take the oil from the country remind me of the fellow who goes a mile down the road to buy from the supermarket until the war comes along. Then, when the butcher has to ration meat, he goes to the fellow next door that he has been bypassing. He says: "My friend, I am your neighbor. I want to buy some meat." That is when the butcher wants to say, "All during the time when it was in plentiful supply, you would not deal with me. You went to the supermarket and let them take care of you. As far as I am concerned, you would not do business with me when times were good. I would just as well bypass you and take care of the fellow who was dealing with me before."

The same principle is involved on the question of oil. They propose to buy it from foreign countries, from Communist countries. Then, when the emergency hits them, they will be back on the doorsteps of the same American domestic producers who are being crushed by the imports.

I think it is unfair for the Defense Department to want to trade with the foreign nations during good times, and buy all of the oil that they can get over there in good times, and expect those people to pay their bills and keep themselves in a position to see them through an emergency. I think it is unfair. The Defense Department ought to buy their requirements, or the major portion of them from those at home on whom they would have to rely in an emergency.

The Defense Department expects them to be present and help in an emergency. The Defense Department should be prevailed upon to keep this industry in a healthy condition so that it could provide for a need in the event an emergency occurs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a number of suggestions that occurred to me along that line.

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

STATEMENT ON OIL IMPORT SITUATION
RECENT ACTION UNFORTUNATE

The recent action of Secretary of Interior Udall increasing oil imports for the last half of this year is most unfortunate. There is strong evidence that there is urgent need for a substantial cut-back in imports. Instead, however, we are now faced with a further increase in imports and further cut-backs in domestic production. Independent oil producers throughout the Nation joined together in a united request to the Secretary of Interior seeking a cut-back in imports of 300,000 barrels daily. The order of the Interior Department issued last Thursday completely ignores these pleas and disregards the serious economic position of the domestic industry. The order covering the last half of this year calls for an increase in imports of 100,000 barrels daily over the same period of last year and 70,000 barrels daily over the level that existed during the first half of this year.

It seems to me that this action constitutes a serious mistake. An analysis of the pertinent facts seems clearly to call for some emergency action if this vital domestic industry is to avoid irreparable harm. This becomes an important national question because of the essentiality of this industry to our national security.

EVIDENCE CALLS FOR REDUCTION

Ten years ago the Congress became concerned about the high level of oil imports and the rapid increase that was taking place. As a result, the Defense Amendment was first enacted in 1954 and then strengthened by amendments in 1955 and in 1958. Concern about increasing oil imports was one of the principal reasons for this action by the Congress. At that time, total U.S. oil imports, including crude oil and all products, were equal to 16.6 percent of domestic crude oil production. Currently, imports are about 30 percent of domestic production and now we are faced with a further increase.

It should be made clear that the Senator from Wyoming and I today are talking about oil imports, excluding residual fuel oil. Residual fuel oil imports are under a separate program. The order of the Secretary of Interior issued last week, therefore, covers crude oil and all products, except residual fuel oil.

The historical trend of increasing imports of crude oil and products, excluding residual fuel oil, however, is equally impressive. Even eliminating residual fuel oil, the increasing trend since 1954 is alarming, having increased from about 11 percent to almost 20

percent. In view of the seriously depressed conditions throughout the oil-producing areas of the Nation, I do not see how a continuation of this increasing trend can be justified. Under the present program the United States is divided into two parts which have separate import programs. An examination of both of these programs seems to me to demonstrate clearly a need for a reduction—not an increase in the import level.

Looking first at the United States east of the Rockies, we find that the level of imports has been fairly well stabilized for the past 5 years. This is under the Presidential proclamation which requires that imports into this area be held to 12.2 percent of domestic production. Despite this fact the domestic industry has continued to decline seriously during this 5-year period which demonstrates that the present level is too high and should be reduced. Independent producers have requested that this ratio of imports to domestic production be reduced from 12.2 percent to 10 percent, and in view of the circumstances, it seems to me that this is a reasonable request. Certainly, experience shows that the 12.2 ratio is too high.

Now looking at the other program which covers the United States west of the Rockies, we find an even more alarming picture. Imports have increased very rapidly under the mandatory oil import program. In 1954 when there was much concern about the then existing level of imports and the dangers of growing dependency on foreign oil, we find that imports into this western part of the United States were equal to about 6 percent of crude oil production. What has happened under the program is shocking. Currently, imports into that important part of the Nation are now equal to about 50 percent of local production and under the new program which Secretary Udall announced last week, this ratio will go to about 60 percent.

The whole purpose of the defense amendment enacted by Congress and the mandatory oil import program now being administered by the Interior Department is to serve the national security. Yet it can be seen that since 1954 imports have continued to increase, thereby placing our Nation more and more dependent upon uncertain sources for its oil supply. It seems to me that the record is clear, strong, and persuasive for early corrective action.

MILITARY PURCHASES FROM FOREIGN SOURCES

Another matter which concerns me gravely and seems to call for immediate corrective action is the policy of the Department of Defense in purchasing military requirements of petroleum from foreign sources.

Currently, the military purchases over 200,000 barrels daily of jet fuel and gasoline, about 35 percent of their requirements, from foreign sources. Again here, like imports, we find a record of more and more reliance upon foreign sources. Whereas, 10 years ago, the military purchased 10 to 15 percent of these requirements from foreign sources. Today, they are purchasing over one-third of their requirements for these products. There is no justification for this trend in view of the readily available jet fuel and gasoline within the United States.

Even more incredible is the fact that the military imports 35,000 barrels daily of these products into the United States where there is a surplus of petroleum and depressed conditions throughout the domestic industry in all the producing areas.

This policy of the Department of Defense seems to me to be completely indefensible. Of all the departments of Government which should be sensitive to the national security requirements of the Nation and the national security purpose of the oil import program, it seems the Department of Defense should be first. Yet, here we find that their policy with respect to military purchases is running

directly contrary to the purpose of the import program.

Here is a situation which calls for the immediate attention of the administration. The policies of the military and the oil import program should be coordinated. They should not be permitted to continue to operate in opposite directions.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Oil imports and also the policy of the military in purchasing more and more of its requirements overseas both serve to aggravate the serious balance-of-payments problem which has faced this Nation for the past several years.

The deficit in U.S. petroleum trade is a significant item in our balance-of-payments problem. Despite a staggering oil surplus in the United States, oil is now our No. 1 import, dollarwise. For the last 6 years, the oil trade deficit has exceeded a billion dollars annually. In 1963, the excess of U.S. petroleum imports over exports amounted to \$1.3 billion. This does not include payments to foreign tanker owners for transporting the oil and it likewise does not include more than \$300 million which the military spends for foreign purchases of petroleum. If these two items are added, the total petroleum factor in our balance-of-payments deficit nears the \$2 billion mark out of the total payments deficit for 1963 of \$2.7 billion.

This shows that there is a need on the part of the administration to coordinate its programs with respect to the balance-of-payments problem, the import problem, and military purchases of petroleum.

EMERGENCY ACTION NEEDED

I am deeply concerned. The independent oil producers are in serious trouble. Industry activity is depressed. The oil producing States and localities are drastically affected. The economies of the local communities are disrupted and the tax revenues are down. It is a widespread problem.

I do not believe we can wait for another 6 months to study and review the situation. Emergency action is called for.

The oil producing States are faced with further cutbacks. Already, during the past 2 months oil States have been forced to curtail production. For example, Louisiana has cut back 50,000 barrels daily; Kansas 25,000 barrels daily and just recently Texas reduced July production rate by 50,000 barrels daily.

At least as a temporary emergency measure, imports should share this burden.

Action is needed now during the next 3 months. Surely a way under the present program can be found to do this and I hope that Secretary Udall will do so without delay.

In addition, the Defense Department should take steps to assist in this crisis.

As a temporary matter, at least, the military should forgo the importation of 35,000 barrels daily of jet fuel and gasoline.

The military should also immediately take steps to cut back its foreign purchase of jet fuel and gasoline to not more than 100,000 barrels daily.

The Defense Department can assist materially in this situation and by doing so it would also contribute some \$125 million annually to the balance-of-payments problem. I urge Secretary McNamara to take these actions.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his interest. I pay tribute to him. It should be made clear, since it is something that many of the people in our great Nation may not realize, that the exploration for oil is largely and overwhelmingly in the hands of the small independents. They are the ones who are being pushed to

the brink of disaster. They are the ones who are going out of business. It is not a matter of being fair. It is not a question of whether one is going to do business with someone in an emergency, or whether we shall go along with the policy of the Pentagon or the administration. It is a matter of whether we shall have oil.

We cannot produce oil merely because Congress passes a law saying that we should produce. We must find it. We have to know whether the reserves are. We are protesting against a policy now that discourages us from finding adequate oil reserves.

I say to my colleague from Louisiana that it behooves us all to face this question now, before we threaten ourselves with national suicide at a time of great national crisis in the future.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator for the fine statement that he has made. I also congratulate those who joined with him. I assure the Senator that I will use my best interests, and I hope he shall do likewise, to see that the President reads what he has said. I think he is correct. I believe the President knows it.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I had the pleasure of cosponsoring the letter by the junior Senator from Wyoming, which was addressed to the President, in an effort to do something for this industry. I believe we all receive the same expression from the President. He said he appreciated our expression of views and would turn the problem over to the Secretary of the Interior for some study. The Secretary of the Interior indicated that he had received the communication and that he would try to reduce oil imports. It developed that he not only did not reduce the oil imports in the next 6 months, but expanded them.

It is the most completely contemptuous attitude, as far as I am concerned, toward the position of legitimate American industry trying to do something for the defense of the country that I have seen in some time.

This is not a single instance. It is a pattern that has existed. We have it in the livestock industry, as has been said, and in the lead and zinc mining business. As the Senator from Wyoming knows, we have been almost completely wiped out.

There is a problem in the steel industry. The various industries are vital to the economy of the country. The position taken seems to be that we must take care of the nations overseas before we do anything for the people in our own country. This is the same problem that we have facing us in the question of the oil imports.

I subscribe to what the Senator has said. I am glad that he brought the matter to the floor. I hope it will result in obtaining some action that will be helpful to our defense and economy.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe it should be made clear

that the oil industry is in need of help in more areas than oil imports. That makes it even more imperative that some additional consideration be given to this industry.

As the Senator knows, the American producers have really led the way in improved refining methods to the extent that we now get more gasoline from a barrel of oil than we used to—more gasoline, and more jet fuel. We have more and better methods of refining. We get better results and more high-quality fuel.

It should be pointed out that, contrary to the popular conception, gasoline is the one thing that we can buy as cheaply now as we could 30 years ago, back before World War II. People get the mistaken notion that the price of gasoline has gone up because we pay 32 cents and 34 cents a gallon for gasoline at the gas station.

This is occasioned because of taxes that the State and Federal legislators put on the fuel. If we look at the price, we discover that gasoline is one of the few important items that we can buy today, at the same price that we were paying 30 years ago. In other words, when the product is put on the tank the price at the refinery gate is the same. When the product is put on the tank the price at the refinery gate is the same. It did 30 years ago. That is one instance where automation, refinement, and improved methods of producing this fuel have caused the price to stay down, while values went up.

The industry does not get credit for that. The Federal, State, and local governments, in need of revenue, have placed fantastic taxes on this fuel.

As the Senator knows, gasoline carries a heavier excise tax in dollar value to support the Government than anything else in the entire economy, both for the Federal and State government. It is a tremendous revenue bearer for the support of the State and local government. That is the reason that people get the impression that they pay more for oil than they did before. The price has actually been kept down, but we do not get credit for it. Every time the price goes down, someone else puts an extra tax on it.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator is correct. He made the statement that the number of consumers has multiplied many times and the methods have been improved. We have more automobiles, and higher standards have been set. Yet, the price is still being held at the same level as when it started. I think it is a real tribute to the industry.

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

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is well aware of the fact that in addition to discovering new wells—very few of which have been found during this period of high imports—there is also the danger of the premature closing of wells. I am sure the Senator finds that existing in his own State, does he not?

Mr. McGEE. The Senator is correct. That is another factor depressing the industry.

Mr. MONRONEY. Once these stripper wells—small producers—that cannot economically produce against the threats

of foreign oil—are closed and shut down, millions, if not hundreds of millions, of valuable natural resources will be lost forever, because once they are closed down, water takes over and the wells lose the ability of ever being able to produce oil again from the same wells. Therefore we get a double impact from loss of future production that we may have as well as loss of current production which is denied to us.

Mr. McGEE. What the Senator has said is very true. His statement further emphasizes that we dare not depend upon outside sources to make up the differences or to supply our needs. The moment we permit our domestic exploration to sag, we bring into jeopardy the whole national need.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the Senator completely. We cannot merely turn on a spigot and suddenly find a supply of oil.

Mr. McGEE. Not even with an edict from the Congress.

Mr. MONRONEY. That cannot be done in the control of oil. It requires year-by-year progressive drilling, exploration, and wildcatting in order to develop the reserves that are necessary. It has always been a rule of thumb that we must discover more new sources of oil each year than we have produced in that year or we will be in a dangerous position. During almost all the years in our great history of production of oil we have been able to do that. Now with the threat of imports we find that the number of exploratory wells is decreasing and we are not discovering new sources to replace the oil presently produced.

Mr. McGEE. As I indicated in the closing part of my remarks, in the past 2 years in particular, our oil discoveries have fallen short of our production. Thus we are already lagging behind in meeting the standard of our historic formula.

Mr. MONRONEY. On the other hand, world competition is becoming stiffer. We may find ourselves with a dollar outflow to buy foreign oil because we have failed to develop sources at home, and in the dollar exposure for the fuel to keep America's economy on wheels, we can very well run into a most serious financial condition in relation to the imbalance of our dollar earnings. Is that not a correct statement?

Mr. McGEE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator for his taking the time in making the effort which he has made in relation to this most important subject.

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

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield to my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have been privileged to hear a part of the address of the able Senator from Wyoming, and I assure him that I will read it and the remarks of the diligent senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] when printed in the RECORD. West Virginia has a vital interest in the subject so cogently discussed by our colleagues. Although our principal prominence in the field of fossil fuels production is associated with the mining of bituminous

coal, we also have a long history of oil and natural gas exploration, production, finishing, and marketing.

So, Mr. President, I associate myself in general with the informative and well-reasoned remarks of Senators MCGEE and MONRONEY. And I believe it is appropriate, too, that I broaden the discussion to include the problem posed by ever-increasing quotas being established for the importation of foreign residual fuel oil as a direct competitor of our domestic fossil fuels, especially coal.

I have consistently advocated and supported a program to control imports of residual fuel oil. This is because I am convinced that excessive imports of this waste product from foreign refining operations are detrimental to the domestic fuels industries and to the national security. Colleagues from the Atlantic seaboard disagree.

The implications of the oil import control program are so important to the domestic economy and the national security that the subject must be debated with candor at appropriate times.

Mr. President, there has been injected into the debate the argument that, by maintaining controls on residual fuel oil imports, there is an impairing of our Nation's relations with one of our friendly South American neighbors, Venezuela. It is even claimed that residual import controls tend to undermine the economic and political stability of Venezuela.

As I said in addressing this subject here last February 19, no one holds the democratic regime of Venezuela in higher regard than does the Senator now speaking. I would not advocate any program or any legislation which would seriously affect Venezuela in an adverse way. The oil import control program for both crude and residual has not had and will not have such an effect.

The period since 1959, when import controls on crude and residual were invoked by Executive proclamation, has been one of sustained and heartening economic growth for that South American country. I shall repeat for the RECORD some facts I brought to the attention of the Senate on February 19:

Venezuela has continued, during the life of the program, to increase its sales of residual oil to the United States for much needed American dollars. In 1959, total export of this product to the United States, including residual processed in the Netherlands West Indies from Venezuelan crude, amounted to 91.4 million barrels. By 1962, the latest year for which statistics are available, these exports had increased to 162.1 million barrels, an increase of 77.3 percent.

Here are some other pertinent economic facts about Venezuela, 5 years after oil import controls became effective: Its gross national product in 1962 was exceeded in Latin America only by Mexico and Brazil. In 1963, according to the Venezuelan Central Bank, there was a 20-percent increase in per capita income, unsurpassed in Latin America. The bank also stated that international reserves stood at \$750 million in 1963—highest since 1956-57—and that there existed a \$150 million surplus in international balance of payments.

Venezuela ranks first among its Latin American neighbors in total foreign trade. In 1962, its exports totaled \$2.6 billion, and it had imports aggregating \$1.1 billion.

This foreign trade, incidentally, both export and import, is and has been predominantly with our country. In 1962, the United States accounted for 52.6 percent of total Venezuelan imports and purchased about 34 percent of total Venezuelan exports, excluding Venezuelan exports of petroleum to the Dutch West Indies which are refined and largely exported to the United States.

Petroleum constitutes the bulk of Venezuelan sales to the United States. Of its exports to this country in 1962, which totaled \$882 million, nearly 95 percent—\$839,667,585—was for petroleum and petroleum products, according to the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

As might be expected, Venezuela enjoys a favorable balance of trade with the United States, due almost entirely to the huge amount of oil it exports to us. In fact, in every year but one since 1955, Venezuela has enjoyed a favorable balance of trade with the United States. In 1962, the balance in its favor was \$305,500,000.

I am sure that all of us are pleased to know of the significant economic gains accomplished by Venezuela during the past 5 years under a free and democratic government. Also, it is pleasing that trade with the United States has constituted an essential element in the expanding Venezuelan economy.

In view of the sustained economic growth of Venezuela, I do not see how anyone can seriously contend that the oil import control program—including the residual quota system—has served to weaken Venezuela economically, or to threaten its future. Today, it has a sturdy economy which has contributed significantly to political stability. Surely, this condition of economic and political strength could not prevail today if, over the course of the last 5 years, the residual oil import control program has been operating to the detriment of Venezuela, as some persons allege.

Under the oil import control program instituted by Presidential proclamation in March 1959, imports were permitted by the Department of the Interior to increase from a rate of 343,000 barrels per day at the beginning of the program to 575,000 barrels per day last year and then to jump even higher to 636,000 barrels daily in this quota year. Almost all of this too-accelerated increase has been filled by residual oil produced in Venezuela or from Venezuelan crude oil refined in the Netherlands West Indies.

Mr. President, oil is vital to the economy and the security of this Nation. So is coal. In times of emergency, the country must have domestic sources of fuels capable of meeting any contingency. Continuation of the building up of allowable imports of both crude and residual will destroy the capacity of both domestic petroleum and domestic coal to meet this emergency requirement.

Earlier this year, the Secretary of the Interior was quoted as having stated:

When the national security contribution of the residual oil program is measured in the broader terms of the overall petroleum import control system, it is apparent that in order to maintain the integrity of the control program it is necessary to retain controls on all of the principal derivatives of crude oil, including residual fuel oil.

That policy enunciated by the Secretary of the Interior is a sound one for the Nation in the light of the urgent necessity for maintaining strong and expanding domestic fuels industries capable under all circumstances of meeting our country's energy requirements. Certainly

this is a prerequisite of a sound national security status.

It is imperative that there be a holding of the line against increases in crude and residual oil import quotas. An element of stability must be added to the control system. I have introduced, with 29 colleagues cosponsoring, a measure (S. 2185) to give legislative sanction to the oil import control program in such a way as not to work to the detriment of Venezuela. At the same time, it would induce more stability into the program for domestic interests. In effect, this legislation would create a condition in which domestic fuels—coal and domestically produced residual oil—would have a fair opportunity to compete for a share of the growth market for industrial fuels along the Atlantic seaboard. We seek to strike a balance between imports important to friendly nations such as Venezuela and to domestic fuels industries.

A residual oil import control program continued on this basis would not damage Venezuela. It could continue to sell petroleum and petroleum products to this country in volumes and at values far in excess of commodities purchased from us. It would enable Venezuela to continue its heartening economic growth and political stability.

Likewise, it also would assure the domestic fuels industries of conditions under which they could plan for further growth and development while competing for a fair share of the growth market for industrial fuels in the eastern coastal area. The present oil import control system needs more built-in stabilizers. I agree with the Independent Petroleum Association of America that the situation growing out of the unstable oil import control system can only worsen in the absence of Government action to strengthen it. I believe that this program needs a better legislative foundation and realistic formulas to measure allowable imports. I recommend that there be action on S. 2185 and companion measures currently in the House Ways and Means Committee.

We believe that there is an inequity which continues to exist. I bring it to the attention of the Senate in connection with the very comprehensive discussion by the Senator from Wyoming on the subject of the importation of oil.

Mr. MCGEE. The senior Senator from Wyoming is very mindful of the impact of imports of residual oil on the domestic coal industry. West Virginia is one of our great giants in the coal industry. My State of Wyoming, I believe, has the largest known reserves of coal left in this part of the world. Many of our mines are closed at the present time. Few of them are in full operation. We feel very keenly in respect to that aspect of the problem. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his comments.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I extend my congratulations to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], who I believe has performed a service in laying before the Senate the difficulties which confront the independent domestic oil industry. I have been in contact with both the President and

Secretary Udall on the subject of imports. I hope that the discussions entered into by the two Senators from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE and Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and others who have participated will be read with great interest downtown. I thank the Senator.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] will proceed very shortly under a unanimous-consent order. I hope that when he is through it will be possible for the Senate to observe the Pastore rule of germaneness and get down to the business at hand, which is quite important.

COUNCIL FOR A LIVABLE WORLD

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate on a subject which is not pertinent to the pending business.

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

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. I should like to propose an inquiry to the majority leader. I understand that the Senator from Colorado intends to make some mention of me in the course of his remarks. I would hope that the unanimous-consent agreement would cover my right, if I so desire, to make a brief reply.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course.

Mr. DOMINICK. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, taking the time of the Senate for this purpose is not what I would consider the most pleasant prospect that I have ever had, but I think I shall be speaking on a subject which I believe is of some importance. I have alerted the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] of my intention to talk on this subject, and my staff has notified the staff of all other Senators who may be involved in the particular situation that I am about to discuss.

Approximately 3 weeks ago, on June 8, a statement was made on the floor of the Senate which caused me some concern and to which I feel obliged to take exception. The statement to which I refer was made by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] and it had the net effect, intentional or otherwise, of casting doubt upon the motives and intelligence of a friend of mine and a distinguished Member of the other body, Mr. E. Y. BERRY, of South Dakota, and a widely read and highly respected syndicated columnist, Mr. Holmes Alexander.

I should like to take a moment again to repeat that I am glad that the junior Senator from South Dakota is on the floor of the Senate, and I hope that other Senators who may become involved will also be able to get here.

The attack upon these two men was particularly strong, I believe, and was apparently brought about by a series of

articles written by Holmes Alexander and placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on successive days by Representative BERRY. The articles, which I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD during the course of my remarks, deal with a relatively new lobbying organization called the "Council for a Livable World," which concerns itself primarily with the issue of disarmament. An integral part of the council's operational program is providing substantial financial support toward the election campaigns of those Senators or senatorial candidates whose philosophies are or seem to be sympathetic to those put forward by the council. For example, members of the council contributed \$20,091.55 to the campaign of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] in 1962. The council itself contributed another \$2,000 from its general fund in the closing days of that campaign.

The council, in its Washington Bulletin dated January-February 1963, claimed that these contributions "represented a substantial fraction of the total campaign expenditures and were a critical factor in the election," which, of course, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] won by less than 600 votes.

Such financial assistance is most helpful in any political campaign. The purpose of my relating the figures which the Senator from South Dakota has already released is merely to indicate the measure of support that the council gives to those whom it favors. I have no intention of criticizing the right of any organization or group to work for and to provide financial support for the campaigns of candidates whose beliefs parallel their own in some areas, provided, of course, that they do it within the terms of the law; nor do I find fault in any way with Senator McGOVERN's connection or association with the council. My criticism is directed at what I consider to be an unwarranted and unfair attack upon Representative BERRY and Mr. Holmes Alexander. I might also add that I have contacted both these gentlemen regarding this attack and have secured their permission and approval to make a statement on their behalf.

With regard to Representative BERRY, Senator McGOVERN said:

It is not necessary for me to ask that [Holmes] Alexander's many articles attacking the council and numerous Members of the Senate be printed in the RECORD, because Mr. E. Y. BERRY, of the other body has already taken care of that. It is appropriate that Mr. BERRY, like Robert Welch of the Birch Society, should sponsor Mr. Alexander's articles, because Mr. BERRY was one of only two Members of Congress who accepted an invitation to attend a Birchite organizational meeting in Washington some months ago.

I am not exactly sure what my colleague is attempting to prove in this connection, but I believe he is the victim of some false information and to the extent it implies guilt by association, which the liberals so deplored in other days, it should be challenged. Representative BERRY, whose integrity is beyond repute, just as is the integrity of the junior Sen-

ator from South Dakota, has authorized me to place in the RECORD the following concise statement of rebuttal:

There isn't a scintilla of truth in this statement that I attended a Birchite or any other organizational meeting or have ever attended a John Birch Society meeting anywhere or at any time.

It would appear in the face of such a categorical denial by Representative BERRY that the relationship implied by my colleague between Mr. BERRY and Mr. Welch of the John Birch Society not only does not exist now, but has, in fact, never existed. Mr. BERRY has effectively demolished any possible misunderstanding on that account.

The attack against Holmes Alexander was no less baseless than that launched against Representative BERRY, but it was longer and much more emotional. After stating the general areas of disagreement between Mr. Alexander and himself, Senator McGOVERN launched into the following tirade of unsubstantiated and misleading information:

But what of Holmes Alexander's connections? For whom does he speak? Why his strenuous effort to discredit the conscientious patriotic citizens who comprise the Council for a Livable World?

I think the clue is that Holmes Alexander is married to the John Birch Society and is spouting the Birch line.

Beginning in March 1958, Alexander wrote a long series of 12 articles for the magazine American Opinion, edited by Robert Welch, head of the John Birch Society. In 1961, Welch copyrighted and published these articles as a book entitled "How To Read the Federalist" by Holmes Alexander.

Robert Welch, Mr. Alexander's publisher, who doubtless paid him handsomely for his articles and his book, is the same man who called the late Republican Secretary of State John Foster Dulles "a Communist agent." He is the same man who said President Eisenhower was a "dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy whose whole purpose was treason."

Senator McGOVERN then goes on to quote some of these statements by Mr. Welch at some length after referring again to him as "Mr. Alexander's publisher."

Finally, he concludes his attack on Mr. Alexander as follows:

Mr. President, I consider myself to have made the honor roll when I am attacked by men who "reason" in the way Robert Welch and Holmes Alexander do. Their muddleheaded nonsense does not worry me, as far as my personal peace of mind is concerned; but I do resent their attacks on the Council for a Livable World, because we need to encourage, rather than discourage, the political participation of good citizens who love their country and the world enough to invest in the cause of peace.

The implications here, just as in the case of Representative BERRY, that Holmes Alexander should be associated with the statements of Robert Welch, or that Robert Welch is "his publisher" to the exclusion of all others, or that Mr. Alexander is guilty of promulgating "muddleheaded nonsense" and is not a "good citizen" who loves his country because he strongly disagrees with what he believes the Council for a Livable World represents, are absolutely preposterous. I am amazed at this obvious attempt to discredit a respected journalist on such

meager, meaningless, and unrelated trivia that falls apart with even the most cursory examination.

Mr. Alexander is a journalist, and as such, sells his writings to those who publish. Mr. Welch edits *American Opinion* which did in fact carry a series of articles by Holmes Alexander, and there the story ends. Mr. Alexander has no personal relationship with Mr. Welch nor any involvement with the John Birch Society. He has, in fact, never even seen Mr. Welch in person. What Senator McGOVERN neglected to say was that Mr. Alexander has also had his writings published in some 30 magazines including the *Saturday Evening Post*, *Collier's*, *Harper's*, *Scribners*, the *Saturday Review of Literature*, *Esquire*, *Country Life*, *Country Gentleman*, and *Town and Country*, to mention only a few. In addition, he writes a column for the *McNaught Syndicate* which is published in 150 newspapers across the country 5 days a week. He has written five books published by Harper's, one published by Rinehart, one published by Regnery, and another by Fleet. He is the author of "The Famous Five," a book about Senators Clay, Webster, Calhoun, La Follette, and Taft, whose portraits decorate the walls of the Senate reception room. The introduction to this book was written by then Senator John F. Kennedy, who subsequently became friendly enough to correspond with Mr. Alexander on a first-name basis. During the 1959 unveiling ceremony of the pictures in the Senate reception room, Mr. Alexander was praised for his literary contribution by Lyndon B. Johnson, who was at that time the Senate majority leader. He also received congratulations on his work from then President Eisenhower. All of this, it should be noted, took place a year after his articles appeared in Mr. Welch's periodical.

I venture to say that Mr. Alexander has the respect of a great many Members of this body, from both sides of the aisle. Proof of this fact is evident in the number of distinguished personages who have filled in as guest writers when Mr. Alexander goes on vacation. Among these are Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY; the minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN; Attorney General Robert Kennedy; Secretary of Labor Wirtz; and others. A typical example of this can be seen in the column dated September 11, 1961, which was written by then Congressman and now Senator DANIEL BREWSTER. As an example of the high esteem to which Mr. Alexander was held by the man whom President Johnson chose to stand in for him in the 1964 Maryland primary, I request unanimous consent that the column by Mr. BREWSTER be included at this point in my remarks.

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

(NOTE.—Holmes Alexander has left on a brief European vacation. During his absence a number of prominent and interesting guests will contribute columns. By Congressman DANIEL BREWSTER, Democrat, of Maryland, second district, now U.S. Senator)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A distinguished columnist runs a great risk when he turns this

space over to an old friend. Let me tell you about this learned man of letters. I know him well.

Holmes Alexander is a man with many and diverse interests. "Who's Who in America" lists his books—three biographies, four novels and the highly praised work on American air power, "Tomorrow's Air Age"—but this is only part of the man. His quest for excitement has known few limits.

Among other hazardous undertakings, Holmes was once an amateur steeplechase rider. I remember one dark night in May 1930 when Holmes won the moonlight steeplechase on a horse named Red Dragon. Just imagine racing in the middle of the night, hoping your horse would see the white-painted fence in time to jump. Holmes won other races—I know, as I rode against him—but there were many times when he ended up in a crashing, splintering fall, with horse, fence, and Holmes all in a heap.

Holmes also turned his hand to politics. At the age of 24, he was elected to the General Assembly of Maryland. In days of bossism and recognized political machines, independence was his motto. In fact, one back-row countryman said the last time he saw such an independent operation was when his boar hog got loose on the frozen mill pond. Holmes was not a "go along" man.

I later succeeded to the legislative seat when held by Holmes and heard many legends about him. After one particular political machination, in which one of our most distinguished columnist's colleagues led to him, Holmes swore he would try to kill him, and set about to do it. The story I heard from Annapolis was that Holmes quickly took the startled professional politician by the throat and undoubtedly would have proceeded with the work at hand had he not been pulled off by his friends. These men later commented that they would not have missed the man who broke his word, but it would have been a shame for Holmes to go to jail—he would have been missed. Holmes has never been afraid to fight.

At the end of his tour of duty in office, Holmes reported to Marylanders in an article entitled, "I Hold Office," which was published in Harper's magazine in 1933. Sacred cows were butchered, windbags deflated, and spades called spades. The big country boss was dubbed "Old Rolling Thunder." When the boss read this, he thundered even louder. Holmes did not run for reelection.

In World War II, Holmes went in as an Air Force ground officer, but he flew as an aerial photographer on the very first mission of the 392d Bomber Group (H) and decided to be a flyer. Although overage for such things, he went to gunnery school and earned his air crew member's wings. He flew over Germany and France as a gunner-photographer, and over the North Sea as air-sea rescue officer of the 2d Air Division. He wrote about it all. The *Baltimore Evening Sun* carried his "History of a Bomb Squadron," and the *Saturday Evening Post* ran his "Fishers of Men." He came home with a major's commission, with the Air Medal, four battle stars and the Distinguished Unit Award.

I will always remember one of Holmes' letters to his children from overseas. It was published in the *Saturday Evening Post* under the title, "Dispatch From Dad"—it might have been called, "My Children, This Is Why We Are Fighting."

This son of a distinguished, successful family forsook a goldplated seat in the Alexander business firm for a reporter's pencil. His pencil has been golden in a different sense. We can see in his books, stories and columns the result of the physical violence and smashing falls of racing days, the tension of the bomber crew, the understanding and sentimentality of a son and father, and the scholarship of a historian. All this comes through in our favorite reporter's writings.

On my return from duty in the South Pacific with the Marine Corps, I went to see Holmes Alexander, my friend and neighbor. Mission—advice on politics. I will always remember the wise counsel he gave me. It summed up to this: "Be independent." This good advice has taken me through 8 years in the General Assembly of Maryland and into my second term in the Congress of the United States.

Long ago, at the Gilman School, Holmes wrote something for the school magazine which I still remember. It has served as his motto down the years:

"It's true in life and race and hunt
The place to die is out in front."

Well, Holmes, here is to the old days, but also here is to tomorrow. We all hope there will be better days—but if we die, let us do so "out in front."

Mr. DOMINICK. I have a couple of comments to make on this column that may be entertaining and of interest to Members of the Senate. It is under the byline of Representative BREWSTER, and starts:

A distinguished columnist runs a risk when he turns this space over to an old friend. Let me tell you about this learned man of letters. I know him well.

He then goes into remarks about Holmes Alexander. I recommend this as reading material for anyone who has enjoyed some of the writings of Holmes Alexander, as have I.

As one more item concerning the ridiculous charges leveled at Mr. Alexander by the junior Senator from South Dakota, I have an Alexander article written for release on April 3, 1961, entitled "Their Eyes Have Seen the Glory." In this article Mr. Alexander points out how he ended up on Mr. Welch's blacklist because, as he states it: "A column of mine spoke well of President Eisenhower." I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the *RECORD* at this point in my remarks.

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

THEIR EYES HAVE SEEN THE GLORY
(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Whether from independence of viewpoint, or inferiority of talent, I have never been invited into the conservative establishment—an ostracism which has its advantages when I write about the conservative movement.

To make myself clear—you do not find this column on the rightwing "must" lists, or my name on the speakers' roster of the rightist rallies, or among those given awards and testimonials as guardsmen of the old order. This, I repeat, could be because I have no party line on the "gut issues" such as McCarthyism and the John Birch Society, or it could be because almost everybody is brighter than I am.

Either way, I am not suspect of buttering up my own lodge brothers in trying to applaud what is manifestly a rolling wave of conservatism in our time.

Much in the news today is Robert Welch, founder of the John Birch Society. I never met Welch, but I used to write for his magazine, *American Opinion*, until one day a column of mine spoke well of President Eisenhower—and there I was, with a good many others, on Welch's blacklist.

This gives me a grudge, but I don't intend to indulge it by joining the mixed-up mob that is howling around Welch and his society. Like Joe McCarthy, Welch alienates

his natural friends and serves as a supply sergeant for his enemies' artillery. Fine newspapers and dedicated patriots, believing in constitutional action, are driven off when Welch seems to propose a coup d'etat against communism. Preposterous hypocrites of the left are afforded the chance to open their veins and bleed at Welch's "smear tactics" of calling Dwight and Milton Eisenhower Communists.

What Welch means, of course, is that everybody who is less than a 24-hour, all-fair-in-war Red-hater is a cold war slacker, hence, giving comfort to the enemy. Welch is a wild talker, an untrammelled thinker, but in America we don't ordinarily punish people for what they say and think. Until Welch is caught giving military secrets to the enemy, or conspiring our overthrow, he's going to get my hurrah as a good American.

Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker writes me to recommend the organization Young Americans for Freedom, representing conservatives in 115 colleges and universities, covering most of the States. I already know two of its prime movers, David Franke and Lee Edwards, and I hope the country knows of young Americans' brilliant sortie last January when they out picketed a Red demonstration against the Un-American Activities Committee.

Another youth movement shows up in the periodical called *Advance*, published out of Cambridge, Mass., by Bruce Chapman. Although oriented toward the Republican Party, its line appears to be "progressive" and is certainly nebulous. My observation about this kind of Republicanism is similar to Dr. Johnson's comment about a dog walking on its hind legs or a woman preaching a sermon—remarkable as the feat may be, it is not well performed.

For example, a modern Republican Senator whose "liberalism" has *Advance's* endorsement, once used the influence of his office to kill an article in a national weekly magazine because he was afraid of what the author might say of him. This is how bleeding hearts too often practice freedom of speech which they rhetorically uphold—and how they guard the equality of opportunity which they put to such useful purposes in their oratory. It's going to take a lot of savvy by *Advance* to learn that all who cry "liberalism, progressivism" aren't going to heaven with Theodore Roosevelt and Robert La Follette.

William F. Buckley, Jr.'s latest book, "Up From Liberalism," has recently been promoted to the broader popularity of a paperback edition. Bill Buckley joins Senator BARRY GOLDWATER in showing that the curtain called (by John Chamberlain, I think) the averted gaze can be smashed by talented and determined conservatives.

We can be sure that the leftist literati did their best to prevent Buckley and GOLDWATER from being noticed and heard. And, although each of these eloquent and tony fellows sometimes pulls a boner or strikes a stained-glass attitude, I wouldn't know how to name two Americans in the postwar period who better deserve their country's thanks.

These are not all the dynamic conservatives of the day, and I don't mean to exclude anybody by omission. The cause has many defenders, the mute and inglorious, as well as these above.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I do not argue in this particular instance in favor of any specific statements made by either Representative BERRY or Mr. Alexander, although I also share their concern with the activities and direction of the Council for a Livable World. I do, however, feel compelled to speak out against charges garbled on the winds of innuendo rather than enunciated by the "sweet voice of reason" the Council

refers to in its literature. I believe I have already shown that the charges are unwarranted, arbitrary, lacking in substance, and insulting to both Representative BERRY and Holmes Alexander. I welcome the opportunity to express my concern with a situation wherein unsubstantiated criticism is heaped first upon a respected Member of the other body and then upon one not accorded the privilege of a personal rebuttal in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In order that the articles causing such harsh criticism may be read in context, I request unanimous consent that the seven referenced articles by Holmes Alexander, as introduced by Representative BERRY, as well as an eighth Holmes Alexander article entitled "Business-Bossing Bureaucracy Farce" and a June 12 editorial from the *Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post* on this subject be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

[FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 28, 1964]

JACKSON PROBES BOMBER LAG

(Extension of remarks of Hon. E. Y. BERRY, of South Dakota, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, May 28, 1964)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the noted syndicated columnist, Holmes Alexander, recently carried a series of articles dealing with the organization known as the Council for a Livable World, one of the groups espousing unilateral disarmament which has contributed generously to the campaign coffers of candidates it has endorsed. Mr. Alexander brings out astounding facts regarding the objectives and activities of this group which I think will be of general interest.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Alexander's syndicated column for March 3, 1964:

"[FROM THE WHEELING (W. Va.) INTELLIGENCER, Mar. 3, 1964]

"JACKSON PROBES BOMBER LAG

"(By Holmes Alexander)

"WASHINGTON.—Senator HENRY (SCOOP) JACKSON, a skeptical supporter of the test ban treaty, has been visiting our nuclear laboratories to check up on our nuclear vigilance in the wake of the treaty which the Senate ratified last autumn.

"JACKSON is asking the Preparedness Subcommittee, of which he is a member, to follow up his check with a full-scale investigation of the four safeguards which the Kennedy-Johnson administration is pledged to observe. In convenient shorthand, the safeguards are:

"1. Stepped-up underground testing to compensate for the ban against atmospheric testing.

"2. Maintenance of high efficiency and morale among scientists entrusted with our nuclear armament.

"3. Readiness to resume atmospheric testing if the national interest requires it.

"4. Improved detection to insure against Soviet cheating on the treaty.

"JACKSON, a member of both the Armed Services and Atomic Energy Committee, has 'majored' in atomic legislation since coming to the House of Representatives in 1940, with time out for wartime Army service. His skepticism is that of an informed and concerned patriot who believes that the United States should keep a definite superiority, not a parity, in nuclear arms. Here are some of the factors that are wrinkling his studious brow:

"Coming from Washington State, where much of the employment depends upon the

defense industries, JACKSON is up for reelection with no strong opposition, except from the various peacemongering organizations which like to tag him as a minion of the munitions lobby.

"In 1962, one of these unilateral disarmament groups, the Council for a Livable World, endorsed and financially supported the election of two Democratic Senators, MCGEE, of South Dakota, and CLARK, of Pennsylvania. The Livable (with communism) Worlders, I am told by their executive director, Col. Henry Aston Crosby, have endorsed four other Democrats for reelection this year: MCGEE, of Wyoming; BURDICK, of North Dakota; MOSS, of Utah; and MCCARTHY, of Minnesota. The Livable Worlders have also supported the liberal Republicans, JAVITS, of New York, and KUCHEL, of California. Thus there is in the Senate a perceptible and respectable nucleus of men who are beholden to a group that favors disarmament in the face of the enemy.

"Specifically, Dr. Leo Szilard, chairman of the Livable Worlders and a noted pacifist-physicist, has testified on Capitol Hill against making the safeguards too safe. He told the Foreign Relations Committee that 'an extensive program of underground bomb testing' (safeguard No. 1) would not be 'furthering the cause of peace' but that it would 'be likely to do just the opposite.'

"Again, as part of the background for JACKSON's skepticism, are charges by Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, that the Defense Department is spending only 'peanuts' in keeping up the safeguard. HOSMER has peppered both J.F.K. and L.B.J. with demands for hard information, but up till now is not satisfied either with the general or detailed material that has been sent him.

"HOSMER has a set of figures which show that the four safeguards require a round figure investment of \$1 billion, plus annual operating outlays of about \$250 million. Secretary McNamara has asked for a total safeguard investment of only \$279.2 million for the coming fiscal year—far below HOSMER's calculation of what is required.

"At the moment the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee is going into Senator GOLDWATER's charges that our long-range missiles are unreliable. After that, says JACKSON, the safeguards."

[FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 2, 1964]

COLD WAR COMES INTO WYOMING

(Extension of remarks of Hon. E. Y. BERRY, of South Dakota, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, June 2, 1964)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD another in the series of articles by Holmes Alexander on the Council for a Livable World.

Mr. Alexander's article is as follows:

"[FROM THE BOSTON HERALD, Mar. 9, 1964]

"COLD WAR COMES INTO WYOMING

"(By Holmes Alexander)

"WASHINGTON, D.C.—Wyoming is only one of 35 States to elect a Senator in 1964, but a case can be made to call it a microcosm, an America-in-miniature.

"This is true because the incumbent, Senator GALE MCGEE, Democrat, has run up distress signals, claiming himself under attack by the John Birch Society. He has gotten some mileage out of this claim—it has attracted the sympathetic attention of liberal columnists and of the antiextremists.

"That in itself could not make the Wyoming election a national incident, but MCGEE's candidacy is now being backed with his avowed approval by an extremist outfit on the opposite end of the ideological spectrum, the Council for a Livable World.

"For perfect laboratory conditions of the test case, it would help if MCGEE, who's a

professional rather than political type, were further identified. For example, at President Johnson's first 'live' television press conference, the question arose as to whether reporters should give their names before asking questions.

"GOOD GUY OR BAD GUY"

"It was jocularly proposed among us that the questioner, instead of bothering with his name, should merely say whether he was a good guy or a bad guy. So, as a true word, though spoken in jest, let us say at the outset that MCGEE is a good guy, whose worthiness is strictly a local issue. But the head-on clash in Wyoming between the Birch Society and the Livable World Council should bear some wider examination.

"The society is headed by Robert Welch, whose ideas are too well known to need expatiation here. The council is headed by Dr. Leo Szilard, actually its cochairman, who is not less outspoken than Welch, but who has yet to become a household word for polemic politics. Yet a candidate who accepts Welch's backing should not, I think, be held more responsible for the company he keeps than one who accepts Szilard's backing.

"Leo Szilard, Hungarian born, is one of many intellectuals who were refugees from Hitler. Like others of his bent, Szilard participated in making the A-bomb to incinerate Fascists, but he doesn't feel the same way about incinerating Communists. While the Axis was intolerable to Dr. Szilard and to others holding his views they are willing to tolerate a worse evil in communism. They aim to make the world not free, but 'livable.' They are among the first to condemn anti-Communists for asserting that any 'means' are justified if they achieve the 'end' of exposing and defeating the Red menace. But some of the 'means' by which Dr. Szilard would make the world 'livable' with communism will leave Americans aghast.

"Specifically, there is the disarmament plan that Dr. Szilard put before the so-called 'Pugwash Conference of Free World and Communist Scientists' which met in September 1961 at Stowe, Vt. Among his ideas for policing a nuclear peace are these:

"1. An informer system among Americans: The President would post a \$1 million tax-free award to any American who reported nuclear treaty violations to a U.N. Control Commission. To enable the squealer to become happily adjusted, Szilard adds that 'the recipient of such an award who wishes to enjoy * * * a life of leisure and luxury abroad * * * would not be hampered by currency restrictions.'

"2. A head-hunt system: A U.N. Peace Court, following a barbaric precedent of the Middle Ages, would pass the death sentence upon any American citizen or Government official deemed guilty of violating 'peace' in almost incredible savagery Szilard told this international group, which included some vicious enemies of America, that:

"The court could deputize any and all Americans to try and execute the sentence. An American citizen killing an 'outlaw' could not be legally tried for murder in an American court, inasmuch as the treaty * * * would be law of the land.'

"SITUATION CAN BE REMEDIED"

"Whether this sort of gabble comes from an unbalanced mind, or from a kindly scientist talking of matters out of his field, or from a genuine 'hater' of the American Constitution and people, or from a gargantuan hoaxster, it is about to be injected into the Wyoming campaign.

"The situation could be remedied if MCGEE would repudiate the support of Dr. Szilard and the Council, just as many candidates have repudiated the support of the Society and Robert Welch. This MCGEE has declined to do in an interview with me. Or, if the

Council members could publicly dissociate themselves from Dr. Szilard, just as many Birch members have done in regard to Mr. Welch.

"But in the absence of such repudiation and dissociation, Wyoming will show what could happen (and, under the surface, may be happening) in many States where the desperate conflict of the cold war has come home to America."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 3, 1964]

DISARMAMENT PROPAGANDA AT A PRICE

(Extension of remarks of Hon. E. Y. BERRY, of South Dakota, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, June 3, 1964)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD another in the series of articles by Holmes Alexander on the Council for a Livable World.

Mr. Alexander's article is as follows:

"DISARMAMENT PROPAGANDA AT A PRICE

"(By Holmes Alexander)

"WASHINGTON, D.C.—Dr. Leonard S. Rodberg, a physicist, is employed by the State Department's Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—and thereby hangs a detective story.

"As a suspicious reporter, I have worked up some curiosity about an outfit in Washington known as the Council for a Livable World. The council began life under the name of the Council To Abolish War. Its founder and cochairman is Dr. Leo Szilard, a noted Hungarian-born physicist. He made a splash at the Pugwash Conference of 1961 by proposing his personal nuclear peace treaty. Under its terms, any American who violated the treaty would be declared an 'outlaw' to be shot on sight, and any American who informed on an 'outlaw' would be given a \$1 million tax-free award.

"After this extravagant keynote, the council in 1962 set about to pour money into the campaigns of Senators who would support its program, among other things, to reduce Defense spending and 'to work toward bringing (Red) China into the family of nations.' The amount of \$22,000 was given by council members to finance the South Dakota campaign of GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, who had lost the 1960 Senate race to Senator KARL MUNDT. This time MCGOVERN, with the council supplying 20 percent of his funds, won by 600-odd votes, and he soon began introducing unilateral disarmament legislation.

"I recently discovered that the council membership in 1963-64 had donated \$14,351.84 (thus far) to the campaign of another little-known western Senator—QUENTIN BURDICK, Democrat, of North Dakota, and that BURDICK was expected by the council to make a speech to its Syracuse chapter on May 5.

"BURDICK tells that he did not actually accept the Syracuse engagement, but that the council sent him around a speech manuscript on approval. I managed to acquire a draft of the manuscript. Since it read like a disarmament tract, I surmised that it had been prepared by the State Department, or its Disarmament Agency.

"When I called the Disarmament Agency to ask if somebody there had prepared a speech entitled, 'Prospects for Controlling the Arms Race,' I received a flat denial. But after some sleuthing, I called again and, with some choice remarks on 'managed news,' I disclosed my information that the speech had indeed been prepared by the man whose name leads this column—Dr. Leonard Rodberg. This time, the State Department's Disarmament Agency followed through and asked Dr. Rodberg. He admitted he'd written the speech at home in his private capacity, at the request of the council.

"There is my detective story, or part of it. When Senator BURDICK declined to make the speech, although under a campaign fund obligation of better than \$14,000, Senator MCGOVERN (a \$22,000 beneficiary) contacted Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, to whose reelection campaign the council members have thus far given \$372.30. MUSKIE's name was substituted on the speech draft, but he declined to use it—and ended up making a speech of his own at the Syracuse meeting.

"Well, what goes on here? A disarmament lobby is getting Senators on the financial hook. It is offering them prepared propaganda that is written by a State Department employee who is 'moonlighting' for the council. Do the Senators who take this campaign money know their sponsors?

"I hereby dissociate myself from Dr. Szilard,' BURDICK told me after thinking it over. And I am making inquiries which may lead to renouncing the council's support. I don't want to be unfair. I want to give the council a chance to reply to my questions."

"This seems a good note on which to end a chapter of the strange story on the council, which wants us to inhabit a 'livable' world with communism."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 4, 1964]

DISARMAMENT PROPAGANDA AT A PRICE—II

(Extension of remarks of Hon. E. Y. BERRY, of South Dakota, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, June 4, 1964)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD another in the series of articles by Holmes Alexander on the Council for a Livable World.

Mr. Alexander's article is as follows:

"DISARMAMENT PROPAGANDA AT A PRICE—PART 2
(By Holmes Alexander)

"WASHINGTON, D.C.—Propaganda shops are all over Washington, and most of them are self-supporting—but not so the State Department's Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which is tax supported.

"In a previous installment of this column series, I reported on a speech entitled, 'Prospects for Controlling the Arms Race.' It took some gumshoeing for me to discover that its author was Dr. Leonard Sidney Rodberg, who works in the Science and Technology Division of this State Department Agency. The speech was offered first to Senator BURDICK, Democrat, of North Dakota, and later to Senator MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, for delivery before a Syracuse (N.Y.) chapter of the Council for a Livable World, which is a ban-the-bomb outfit.

"Dr. Rodberg assures me that he wrote the speech on his own time. Senators BURDICK and MUSKIE both, to their credit, declined to use the tailored document, which is full of the hair-raising horrors of nuclear war and calculated to scare Americans into pacifism.

"I will take Dr. Rodberg's word that he moonlighted the ghostwritten speech, but I hope to find out whether other speeches for other campaigning politicians (both BURDICK and MUSKIE are up for reelection) have been written in the Disarmament Agency at the taxpayer's expense. Meanwhile, there is plenty of hard evidence that this State Department Agency is using public money to peddle special pleading that could very well serve the purposes of those who would like to see America stand naked to her enemies.

"Congressman GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, Republican, of California, in a House speech, pinpointed 127 speaking trips made by Disarmament Agency personnel between July 1962 and January 1964. Of these, 23 were on an expense account basis for which the taxpayer coughed up \$3,138.71. Another 84

trips were not charged to the taxpayer, but the personnel were away from their desks while on Government salaries.

"One of the ways in which propaganda shops operate is by flinging parties at which the guests, often influential writers or politicians, are softened up on charm and entertainment. This State Department Agency which is supposed to explore the practicalities of international control of weapons and of disarmament, has requested—although denied—\$4,000 for 'official reception and representation expenses.' When questioned on these aspects of his job, the Agency Director, William C. Foster, said:

"Mr. Chairman, this is consistent with one of the four functions with which our Agency is charged; namely, of disseminating information about arms control."

"In its budget request for 1965, the Agency asked for \$11 million, an increase of 46 percent over its last year's stipend, but the amount requested does not deflect additional sums for arms control and disarmament that are 'hidden' in other departmental budgets such as Defense, Atomic Energy, Space, and the U.S. Information Agency, the last-named having recently gone in for subsidizing propaganda books issued by commercial publishers.

"LIPSCOMB gets a figure of \$150 million of hidden money that is going into various projects for controlling and reducing American armament. How much of all this is a wise and responsible effort? An unnamed spokesman for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, speaking before the House Appropriations Committee in a recorded statement, said this about proposals made by the Disarmament Agency:

"As a matter of fact * * * quite a sizable portion of the proposals they have sent over have not been looked on with much favor by the Joint Chiefs."

"Taken together, the doings of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, plus those of the Council for a Livable World, seems to add up to a pacifist lobby. Some of it is supported by the taxpayer, some of it is being huckstered around the country by reelection-seeking politicians who know not what they do.

"At the risk of being disrespectful, I note that the majority of Senators and Representatives who take campaign money from the Livable World outfit are men who have not 'majored' in the complexities and dangers of cold war disarmament. I would be surprised if anyone recognized Senators BURDICK, MUSKIE, HART, of Michigan, MCGEE, of Wyoming, and MOSS, of Utah, or Representatives MONTOYA, of New Mexico, and HARDING, of Idaho, as knowledgeable persons in this field, although competent in other fields.

"Why have these men been politically subsidized by the pacifist lobby? Their colleagues in the Congress, and their constituents back home, ought to ask these men if they know what the score is."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 8, 1964]

DISARMAMENT PROPAGANDA AT A PRICE—III

(Extension of remarks of Hon. E. Y. BERRY of South Dakota, in the House of Representatives, Monday, June 8, 1964)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD another in the series of articles by Holmes Alexander on the Council for a Livable World.

Mr. Alexander's article is as follows:

"DISARMAMENT PROPAGANDA AT A PRICE—PART 3

"(By Holmes Alexander)

"WASHINGTON, D.C.—On February 27, 1964, Senator MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, who took \$22,000 in campaign funds from a ban-the-bomb group called Council

for a Livable World, introduced an amendment to cut \$17 million out of Defense Department funds for aircraft, missiles, research, tests, and evaluation of military weaponry.

"Without going into the usefulness of the items which the McGovern amendment would abolish (a near impossibility for a layman), I note that 4 of the 20 Senators who supported the amendment are financially beholden for campaign funds donated by the membership of the Livable World Council. They are CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, BURDICK, Democrat, of North Dakota, MCGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming, and MCGOVERN himself.

"Of these four, not one is on either the Armed Services or Joint Atomic Energy Committees which study military affairs and the Nation's need for weapons. But among the 64 Senators who opposed and defeated the McGovern amendment are all the ones which most of us reporters use as checkpoints on these complex matters of military readiness: Senators RUSSELL, STENNIS, SYMINGTON, JACKSON, CANNON, the BYRDS of Virginia and West Virginia, and MARGARET CHASE SMITH.

"I am very slow to attach wrongful motives to men in responsible office, and I don't believe for a moment that any of these four Senators for the McGovern amendment would willfully cast a vote that he believed to be harmful. CLARK is cantankerous (his new book is sarcastically entitled, 'Congress: The Sapless Branch'), and he enjoys twitting the Senate Establishment with contrary votes. BURDICK, a country lawyer, admittedly has very little knowledge or experience in military matters. MCGEE, a former history professor, has a hungry, searching mind which loves to savor 'ideas,' and he has reached an intellectual and creditable conclusion about experimental disarmament. MCGOVERN, a World War II bomber pilot and a thoughtful idealist, deeply believes that the United States should take a chance, and take the lead, on world disarmament.

"But, giving them full credit for sincerity and singularity (in CLARK's case), I see these Senators and some others as the nucleus of a Peace Party in Congress, backed by a pacifist lobby, the Livable World. Other Democratic Senators whom the Livable World commends to its membership are MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, MOSS, of Utah, HART, of Michigan, and GORE, of Tennessee. The Republican PROUTY, of Vermont, seems to have been added as a gesture of bipartisanship. Two Representatives, both Democrats, are on the recommended list. They are HARDING, of Idaho, and MONTOYA, of New Mexico.

"Just to see how other analysts than myself would rate these men whom the Livable World appears to be collecting into a Peace Party, I have checked their ratings in the voting index compiled by Americans for Constitutional Action on the subject of 'national sovereignty.' The Americans for Constitutional Action says it is 'for strengthening our national sovereignty and against surrendering control of our foreign or domestic affairs or our national security to any other nation or to any international organization.' I don't regard these ratings as infallible, but they do provide an arbitrary either/or indication of overriding philosophy. They show, in aggregate, how much importance a Member of Congress puts on national sovereignty as against 'peace,' internationalism, and concern for the 'world' instead of for this country.

"Astonishingly, I think, MUSKIE, HART, MCCARTHY, BURDICK, MOSS, CLARK, and MCGEE get zero in this rating. GORE gets 6 percent, and PROUTY gets 50 percent. In the House, HARDING gets zero and MONTOYA gets 43 percent.

"As a footnote, I think it worth adding that the Livable World has sent out a memoran-

dum to its membership urging support of HARDING as 'the logical choice of the Democratic Party to run for the Senate against Senator JORDAN in 1966.' In striking contrast to HARDING's zero rating on national sovereignty, Americans for Constitutional Action rates JORDAN, Republican, of Idaho, at 100 percent.

"Unless I'm wrong, the pacifist lobby is trying to build up a Peace Party in the Senate, where foreign relations are decided. Respectability, of course, is an essential in an undertaking of this sort, and it's pertinent to note that the Livable World has as its executive director, in charge of the Washington office, a genuine war hero in Col. Ashton Crosby, U.S. Army, retired. His standard answer to criticisms of the Livable World is to write or say:

"I have 14 combat decorations, including 3 silver stars, a Croix de Guerre in lieu of a fourth silver star, and 4 Purple Hearts."

"This seems a bit of a non sequitur, but Colonel Crosby told me in a telephone interview that he was sticking with the Livable World chiefly to keep its membership from going off the deep end. Maybe he'll soon leave the Livable World and dedicate his patriotism to a concern for freedom rather than to cohabitation with our enemies."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 9, 1964]

THE LIVABLE WORLD AGAIN

(Extension of remarks of Hon. E. Y. BERRY, of South Dakota, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, June 9, 1964)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have inserted in the RECORD a series of articles by Holmes Alexander to bring to light the political activities of the Council for a Livable World. I am today inserting another in this series of articles.

I was real interested in the statement of Senator MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, appearing on pages 12972 and 12973 of the June 8 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which he defends the Council for a Livable World and defends a contribution made by the council to him in the amount of \$22,000.

As is usually the case, when anyone is being attacked for not following the radical left, Holmes Alexander was attacked as being a Birchite and having some connections with Robert Welch. Going a step further, the junior Senator from South Dakota says that it is appropriate that I should insert these articles in the RECORD because, he says:

"Mr. BERRY was one of only two Members of Congress who accepted an invitation to attend a Birchite organizational meeting in Washington, some months ago."

If the junior Senator's facts are all as deliberately distorted and unfactual as this statement, his many pages almost daily in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are an absolute waste of the taxpayer's money.

An additional article by Holmes Alexander follows:

"THE LIVABLE WORLD AGAIN

"(By Holmes Alexander)

"WASHINGTON, D.C.—Toward the end of 1963, the directors of the Council for a Livable World, a ban-the-bomb outfit, began preparing a document entitled, 'Draft of Program Action,' in which there occurred the interesting phrase 'old myths rather than current realities.'

"On April 25, 1964, Senator FULBRIGHT gave his memorable foreign policy speech in which there occurred exactly the same phrase—'old myths rather than current realities,' and there is internal evidence that the action report predates the Fulbright address. The full quotations are:

"Council for a Livable World: 'In too many cases we are handicapped by policies based on old myths rather than current realities.'

"Senator FULBRIGHT: 'This divergence has in certain respects been growing, rather than

narrowing; and we are handicapped, accordingly, by policies based on old myths, rather than current realities."

"Well, funny coincidences do occur. I would think nothing of this one except that the Livable World seems to go in for supplying Senators with speeches and ideas that promote disarmament. As reported here in a column series beginning May 12, the Livable World prepared and offered a flesh-creeping speech to Senator QUENTIN BURDICK, Democrat, of North Dakota, and later to Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, for delivery in Syracuse on May 5. The address, as I learned after considerable sleuthing, was written by an employee of the State Department's Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Dr. Leonard S. Rodberg, in his spare time, as he assures me.

"I have not established that the Fulbright speech was ghosted or inspired. I do not know the exact date of the Livable World's Action Report, except that Col. Ashton Crosby, the Council's Executive Director, tells me the inception was 'about 6 months ago,' and this is borne out by some internal evidence. I have asked Senator FULBRIGHT whether the funny coincidence of an exact repetition of phrase was collaboration or circumstance.

"It is circumstance," the Senator replied firmly.

"There is no doubt, however, that disarmament propaganda and campaign contributions have formed a liaison here. The Livable World had provided, by its own accounting, \$14,351.84 to the reelection chest of BURDICK and \$372.30 to that of MUSKIE. Back in 1962 the Livable World, while operating under the name of Council of Abolishing War, gave \$2,500 to the Fulbright campaign fund of that year.

"The Livable World was founded by Dr. Leo Szilard, a militant peacemaker whose fantastic speech before Cyrus Eaton's Pugwash Conference in 1961 has been previously digested in this place. The outfit's officers, headed by Dr. Bernard T. Feld of MIT, include biologists, physicists, psychiatrists, film directors, a do-gooder attorney, and a left-leaning labor leader. I have requested the entire membership list of the Livable World, but am not encouraged to believe it will become available.

"In a transgression of conservatism, I previously understated a disarmament vote in the Senate. I gave the proposed slash in defense procurement of weapons and research as \$17 million and neglected to include Senator FULBRIGHT as a slash supporter. Actually the key figure was \$52 million. At least five Senators, who accepted Livable World campaign money, voted for the cut. In addition to FULBRIGHT (\$2,500), there were MCGOVERN (\$22,000), BURDICK (\$14,000), MCGEE (\$8,000), CLARK (unknown).

"One ray of hope for the Livable World seems to be Colonel Crosby, its executive director. The early action program called for unilateral nondeployment of our antiballistic missiles and for bomber disarmament. Crosby was able to insert 'mutual' into the first category and 'by both sides' into the second. But these appear to be semantic concessions, much like changing the council's letterhead from Abolishing War to Livable World. The outfit's name was changed—but not its nature."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 10, 1964]

DISARMAMENT: RESPONSIBLE AND
IRRESPONSIBLE

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD another in the series of articles by Holmes Alexander.

The article is as follows:

"DISARMAMENT: RESPONSIBLE AND
IRRESPONSIBLE

"(By Holmes Alexander)

"WASHINGTON, D.C.—In the unfinished business which President Johnson took over from President Kennedy is action to prevent the national atomic energy enterprises from highballing down the same track that nearly wrecked the American railroad system.

"One of the Atomic Energy Commissioners who served under J.F.K. tells me that he discussed this matter with the late President in terms of the following analogy:

"Like the railroads, the Atomic Energy Commission has been on the point of getting itself committed to an open-ended supply of services: that is, doing research and providing materials at large costs to the Defense Department, NASA, and private industries.

"Like the railroads, the AEC is committed, through its contractors, to scores of labor contracts that reach far into the future, as well as to contracts with many universities and research corporations.

"Like the railroads, the AEC is a multi-billion-dollar institution and has accumulated manifold and complex fiscal obligations which are threatening to become an impediment to free and wise choice of action.

"Against this background of thinking, President Johnson, last January, announced a reduction in the production rate of plutonium and uranium. In part, this was a disarmament decision, for the military uses of nuclear power take a large hunk of the AEC's \$2.6 billion budget.

"The point I am creeping up on is that here is a careful, phased, responsible form of disarmament, the very opposite of the ignorant, meat-ax, irresponsible disarmament which is being attempted by ban-the-bomb scientists, do-gooders, and dubious characters, two of whom I shall name in this piece.

"The President, the Defense Department, the AEC, and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy all had a part in determining that the cutback in production of uranium-plutonium could be safely made. The Joint Committee, consisting of Senate and House Members of long experience in these fields, decreased last year's nuclear weapons program by \$11.1 million, and knocked another \$22.1 million off last year's figure for plant and capital equipment in the weapons program.

"In contrast to these reductions in nuclear arms production by men who know what they're doing, we get political scheming by an outfit that ought to be politically blacklisted—the Council for a Livable World. This pacifist group, with a secret membership, has invested sometimes over \$80,000 in the reelection funds of Senators who are nonmembers of the Atomic Energy and Armed Services Committees, but who vote for meat-ax disarmament. At least two members of the Scientists' Committee of the Livable World can be called suspect of not having the Nation's best interests at heart. They are:

"Dr. Halsted Reid Holman, born 1925, a California physician, a president and vice president of groups cited by the Un-American Activities Committee as Communist fronts, a campaign fund contributor as recently as 1962 to the Livable World. In testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, 1951-52, Dr. Holman pleaded the fifth amendment and declined to answer several questions, including:

"Are you a member of the Communist Party? In November 1946, you were a member of the Communist Party in Connecticut, were you not?"

"Dr. Herman J. Muller, born 1890, a Nobel Prize winner in medicine and physiology, au-

thor of an avowedly Marxist book, 'Out of the Night.' Dr. Muller testified in closed hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee, 1953. The committee records show him as a member of the advisory committee of the Book Union (1944) and member of the national committee of the Student Congress Against War (1944), both cited by the committee as being subversive organizations. In justice to Dr. Muller, he resigned his post (1933-39) as senior geneticist at the Soviet Academy of Sciences Institute of Genetics, and also his membership to the U.S.S.R.'s Academy of Sciences (1948) because of disagreements arising from the Stalinist dictatorship. He says he is not an 'orthodox Marxist' but believes Marx rates with Darwin as a man who gave the world 'revolutionary truths.'

"The Livable World, into whose affairs I am prying, is financially backing the reelections of Democratic Senators BURDICK, of North Dakota; MCGEE, of Wyoming; and MUSKIE, of Maine. In 1962, it backed Democratic Senators CLARK, of Pennsylvania; FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and MCGOVERN, of South Dakota. Four Republicans who have been either offered or given campaign backing—KUCHEL, JAVITS, PROUTY, and FONG—have backed off.

"Thus we have an organization, difficult to research because of its secrecy but showing at least two dubious official advisers, trying for a foothold of influence in the U.S. Senate."

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post, June 12, 1964]

COUNSEL FOR AN UNLIVABLE ONE

(Robert M. Hitt, Jr., editor; William P. Cheshire, associate editor)

Not that he requires any help from us. Still, we should like to offer a word or two in defense of Holmes Alexander, the conservative columnist. Mr. Alexander, it seems, is in hot water again with the ban-the-bomb crowd.

Hostilities erupted shortly after Mr. Alexander inspected the record of a group called the Council for a Livable World and reached the conclusion, subsequently expressed in his syndicated column (which appears in the News and Courier), that the world the council has in mind is not the sort of world in which Mr. Alexander particularly cares to live.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, an admitted beneficiary of the council's campaign purse, quickly took to the floor of the Senate to denounce Mr. Alexander as a "mad hatter" who is "married to the John Birch Society." (In point of fact, Mr. Alexander is neither mad nor a hatter and is married to the former Mary Barksdale, a charming Virginia lady as far removed from the JBS as Mr. Alexander is himself.)

"The council," said Senator MCGOVERN, "is none of the things Mr. Alexander said it was" (a pacifist group that seeks unilateral disarmament). "Rather," he said, "it is a group of distinguished scientists, teachers, and scholars led by a decorated war hero that encourages its members to act like responsible citizens"—the Senator by implication, being a notable example of the product.

"Alexander says that shortly after my election and support of the council," complained the Senator, "I began introducing unilateral disarmament legislation. This is pure poppycock. I have never introduced any such legislation." Thus spoke Senator MCGOVERN last week. But hearken to the words of the same Senator as spoken to the Senate on September 24 last year:

"The nuclear arms race is a dead-end street. Would Mr. Khrushchev respond to a systematic, step-by-step arms race in reverse? I think he might."

The first of these steps, Mr. McGOVERN suggested in the form of an amendment, should be to lop \$5 billion from the U.S. defense budget. Later, he added cautiously, more cuts could be made. In a colloquy with Senator DOUGLAS on the subject, Senator McGOVERN spoke of "the unilateral steps I proposed." So much for Senator McGOVERN.

What of the Council for a Livable World, which he supports? According to its own publications, the council: (1) makes "substantial contributions" to the campaigns of Congressmen willing to "press for improvements" in current defense policies and maintains in Washington a lobby to bombard Congress with what the council describes as the sweet voice of reason. This sweet reasonableness the council is so anxious to promote, is set forth in the council's immediate action program:

"The council proposes that the United States renounce, at the earliest possible date, any intention of achieving a strategic nuclear weapons capacity sufficient for substantially destroying in a single massive attack the Russian retaliatory forces."

However much Senator McGOVERN may protest, the council is honest enough to make no secret of its aims. It would have this country abandon its nuclear strike force as a demonstration of good faith, after which our diplomats presumably could draw up some sort of treaty with the Russians specifying that they would do the same.

If the council believes in such folly, then goodness knows it has every right to lobby to its heart's content and to enlist the aid of every like-minded Congressman it can find. But it is uncalled for, we submit, for Mr. Alexander to be vilified because he has bad dreams in which Mr. McGOVERN is casting a deciding vote on the defense budget.

The council's program is a program that invites disaster of the worst kind, both nuclear and political. And Mr. Alexander just happens to believe, as we do, that it is better to be free than slave—even in an unlivable world.

BUSINESS BOSSING BUREAUCRACY FARCE (By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Ordinarily when a politician puts in a bill to create a new Federal agency to do what three or more Federal agencies are already doing, you say to yourself: "There is a real empire builder."

But the case of Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, may be a little different. He has, indeed, offered such a bill (S. 2274). The McGOVERN measure would set up a ponderously named bureaucracy called the National Economic Conversion Commission which, among other things, would "require" defense industries "to plan their own conversion to civilian production." It is Federal enforcement legislation out of the same drawer that gave us the business bossing blueprints within the civil rights bill.

McGOVERN'S conversion commission for beating our national sword into a plowshare (peaceful competition with the Communists) is hardly necessary unless you think a new agency should be added either to supplement or replace several others in the same field. The other sword into plowshare bureaus are:

1. The Defense Department's Office of Economic Adjustment which is supposed to help communities recover from the loss of military installations and contracts.

2. The President's Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament. This group is one of L.B.J.'s own brain children. It sprang full born from his forehead last December when he first started cutting back military bases. It does its business through the very competent Council of Economic Advisers which reports directly to the President.

3. The State Department's Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Its Assistant Director has the assigned duty of researching the economic impact of military disarmament.

4. The Departments of Labor and Commerce, as well as the Atomic Energy Commission, also have small offices at work on conversion.

McGOVERN is an earnest, touched in the conscience World War II bomber pilot. He is also a \$22,000 taker of campaign funds from a secret membership ban-the-bomb outfit known as the Council for a Livable World. I have to confess to planting spies within the Livable World, and that is how I have learned why the peacemongers favor a parallel program of unilateral disarmament and unilateral conversion. The following is a brief paraphrase of their argument:

The Communist doctrine, and Communist leaders of today, hold that capitalism lives by the sword of conquest. Soviet economists believe that the United States would collapse were it not for its imperialistic programs. There are two ways in which we Americans can "take the lead for peace" and can prove ourselves peace lovers to the Russians.

One way is by unilateral disarmament, for which McGOVERN had made several Senate speeches and legislative proposals. The other is by unilateral conversion of arms into ice boxes, as envisioned in S. 2274. When the Russians see that we are really dismantling our weapons industry, they will (the peacemongers say) run as fast as they can to do likewise.

This summary I have given is roughly in the language of Prof. Seymour Melman of Columbia, who is one of McGOVERN'S authorities and a disarmament propagandist in his own right.

It may be asked how American peacemongers seem to know so well what the Russians would like us to do. I cannot speak for Professor Melman, but I have learned a good deal about the Livable World, which has been supplying campaign funds and/or campaign speeches to disarmament-voting Senators McGOVERN, \$22,000; McGEE, \$8,000; BURDICK, \$14,000; FULBRIGHT, \$2,500; MUSKIE, \$300; and CLARK, unknown; but perhaps as much as \$20,000.

The Livable World's founder, Dr. Leo Szilard, who died last week, conducted a correspondence with Khrushchev and may have known how the Russians think about us. Drs. Halstead R. Holman and Hermann J. Muller, both scientific advisers to the Livable World, are on record by congressional committees as having been members of Communist fronts. They, too, may know how the Communists think concerning American disarmament.

In any event, unilateral disarmament and unilateral conversion go together in the peacemongers' plans.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, anyone taking the time to read the Alexander articles must admit that they are written in straightforward, unequivocal language. Whether one agrees with the conclusions drawn therein or not, there can be no doubt that Mr. Alexander has indeed raised some interesting questions which should certainly not be shunted aside with irresponsible and meaningless charges. Whenever we have an organization that hopes to be able to spend \$20 million each year in campaign contributions or \$30 million over a 4-year period, we have a powerful force which is bound to be highly controversial. And when such an organization has as one of its general aims the removal of the main obstacles to disarmament, that controversy is bound to be heightened.

After having read the council's so-called action program as well as some of their very recent literature, I am sure we have just begun to scratch the surface of this controversy.

Those connected with the council deny its tendencies toward unilateral disarmament, but it is difficult to be sympathetic toward their protestations in view of the statements published by the council. While there is no flat statement of adherence to a policy of unilateral disarmament, there certainly are statements that leave room for doubt. For example, the council's action program states that:

Unilateral initiatives in arms control and in partial disarmament measures can help to create a more favorable atmosphere for fruitful disarmament negotiations, as, for example, if the United States were to adopt a strategic policy of using its nuclear weapons only for retaliation in kind, or if we were to dismantle vulnerable missile bases in Europe.

For the purpose of protecting both the council and myself from any misquoting or quoting out of context, I request unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the immediate action program of the Council for a Livable World.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if the statement to which the Senator has referred is reasonably brief, I wonder if he would mind reading it into the RECORD, so we can hear the program to which he has referred.

Mr. DOMINICK. I shall be glad to do so. It is a one-page document. It should not take me very long to read it. It reads:

The council will pursue these aims by identifying and pressing for specific objectives which appear to be currently attainable. The action program will be limited to measures for which it appears possible to generate support within the administration and Congress. The program may omit certain objectives considered by many individuals and groups to be eminently desirable and which, in the long run, may indeed be necessary. However, the council is restricting its action program to objectives it believes have reasonable prospects for realization in the near future and—to be effective—it must be selective even with respect to these.

THE IMMEDIATE ACTION PROGRAM

1. Toward removing obstacles to a disarmament agreement, the council proposes—

(a) To take the initiative in establishing a nongovernmental joint Russian-American staff study on the problem of maintaining and securing the peace in a disarmed world.

(b) To seek the cooperation of labor and industry in promoting the passage by Congress of legislation which would facilitate the orderly transition of our economy from high arms expenditures to low ones. Such legislation would include measures providing for Federal retraining of labor; for Federal housing for relocated workers; and for substantial compensation to industry for losses from such causes as canceled contracts, retooling and reconversion for non-military production during the period of transition.

2. Toward halting the arms race before it reaches the point of no return and promoting a first-stage arms reduction agreement, the council proposes that—

(a) The United States renounce, at the earliest possible date, any intention of

achieving a strategic nuclear weapons capacity sufficient for substantially destroying in a single massive attack the Russian retaliatory forces.

(b) U.S. Government agencies concerned with the disarmament negotiations concentrate on attaining a workable first-stage disarmament agreement with the Soviet Union aimed at the substantial reduction of nuclear weapons delivery capabilities.

3. Toward diminishing the risk of war and promoting cooperation between nations, the council proposes that—

(a) U.S. delegations to the United Nations and other international bodies shall treat each issue separately rather than as an element of cold war, and shall base their negotiations on the merits of each case rather than upon the desire to win essentially meaningless diplomatic victories, and that this policy shall be clarified to the American people.

(b) The United States lift all geographical restrictions on foreign travel by American citizens, and that the prohibition against travel in certain countries, currently printed in American passports, be replaced by a simple listing of countries where the United States does not have diplomatic facilities and where, accordingly, the passport is useful for identification purposes only.

(c) The United States seek, if possible, under the auspices of the United Nations, the establishment of a nuclear-free zone (with a prohibition against installation of offensive missile bases and offensive nuclear weapons delivery systems) in Latin America and in other regions of the world where nuclear weapons technology has not yet been independently developed, such as Africa and the Near East.

4. Toward reducing the likelihood of escalation in the event of a war, the council urges that—

(a) In order to be in a position at the earliest possible date to renounce the first use of tactical as well as strategic nuclear weapons, the United States shall take all possible steps to redress the current imbalance in conventional armed forces between the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries. The most desirable method of achieving this end would be to include in a first-stage disarmament agreement a provision for the reduction of conventional arms and forces in being. In the absence of such an agreement, the United States should make every effort to convince our NATO allies to increase their conventional forces to adequate levels, at the same time discouraging by all means possible, the development of an independent NATO nuclear capability.

(b) American nuclear warheads and bombs shall be withdrawn from advanced positions in West Germany, that they shall not be located, stockpiled, or distributed to troops in any area of confrontation with opposing forces or in zones of actual conflict and that, wherever located, they shall be retained in American hands under effective American control.

That is as much of the action program as I have available at the moment.

As I indicated earlier in my remarks, the Council for a Livable World has adopted a highly practical route toward achieving its goals. This route is a political one wherein the council provides financial support to those candidates it feels adhere to its policies, and an indication of the scope of their effort can be seen in the following excerpt from a letter to a council supporter from the executive director, H. Ashton Crosby. The letter, dated May 5, 1964, reads in part as follows:

The council further recommends that, unless you have specific desires relating to the support of some particular candidate, that

contributions now be given to the following priority candidates according to the following recommended alphabetical apportionment: MONTROYA, A—D; MCGEE, E—K; MUSKIE, L—P; MOSS, Q—S; HARDING, T—Z.

This means that if your last name begins with a letter A through D you are to make your contribution check out directly to Mr. MONTROYA.

Mr. MONTROYA is presently engaged in a campaign against Senator MECHEM.

If it begins with a letter E through K, the check should be made out to Mr. MCGEE, and so forth. I continue to read:

You will note that, with its recommendation of Congressman HARDING for support, the council is departing from the precedent of soliciting support only for candidates for the Senate. However, we feel that in this case, the reelection of Mr. HARDING is the first step toward our support of this outstanding young legislator for election to the Senate in 1966.

I presume that is when Senator JORDAN of Idaho will come up for reelection.

We have here, then, a new organization bringing to bear on Congress, and particularly the Senate, new pressures on matters of armament and defense policies. It is highly organized, apparently well financed, and obviously an articulate exponent of a particular philosophy which has every right to be heard. By the same token, when its pressures are being brought to bear in such an important sphere of our national security, it cannot expect to foreclose reasonable debate regarding the wisdom and efficacy of its programs and proposals. I am sure the Members of this body will hear more of the Council for a Livable World and I look forward to learning more about its goals, achievements, operational techniques and personnel as the weeks pass.

At present, the tendency on the part of those who advocate disarmament to underplay the aggressive intentions of the Communists and overemphasize the foibles and shortcomings of the free world nations has me deeply concerned. Try as we will to attribute reasonable, rational, and peaceful gestures to the Communists, the words of the House Committee on Un-American Activities come back to haunt us. In discussing the changes in the Communist Party line they state in House Document No. 398 of December 1, 1961, after this administration had taken office:

There has never been a change in one basic Communist purpose from 1918 to the present date, however—the eventual elimination of non-Communist governments and the establishment of world hegemony for the Soviet Union.

In August of 1959, Mr. Arthur Baker, for 22 years chief of the parliamentary staff of the Times of London, outlined current Communist strategy to divide Europe. I hope Senators will listen to this, because it is quite pertinent. He stated the following steps:

First, divide Britain from Germany, France, and the United States.

Second, promote Western trade with Russia and China to the detriment of trade with free nations.

Third, encourage steady organized breakdown of moral standards and so weaken Britain's moral fiber.

Fourth, advocate the abolition of nuclear weapons and promote a concept of peaceful coexistence that will mean death.

The obvious conclusion is that in spite of Soviet peace talk and apparent ideological difference between Russia and China, world communism has and is continuing to advance in the less developed areas of the world. We must not confuse words with action and talks of peace with peace itself.

While it is all very well to talk of elimination of first strike capability, cessation of development of any ballistic missile defense system and unilateral steps designed to show good faith, it is certainly not a pragmatic approach to the hard realities of the day. There is no doubt about America's intentions in the minds of the leaders of the Communist movement. It is in fact this knowledge that gives them the audacity to start brush fires in remote areas of the world. It is also this knowledge that makes them pull up short of a full scale showdown. It is the paradoxical nature of our time that it is this very thing which the disarmers would take away from us that has prevented world war. As Sir Winston Churchill pointed out, it has been the overwhelming nuclear superiority of the United States that has kept the peace.

I pray that we may never lose that superiority.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I compliment the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado upon his courageous and restrained remarks. The Senator from Colorado has made an important, articulate speech, and I wish to associate myself with each and every one of his statements, particularly those concerning my friend the eminent journalist and author, Holmes Alexander and Congressman BERRY—an able legislator and a man of unimpeachable integrity. Senator DOMINICK and I are of like mind on the merits of these two gentlemen. Holmes is a gentleman noted in the world of those who live by the pen as a man of unassailable probity, integrity, and character. I am confident that the attacks upon him by the Council for a Livable World and its spokesmen will produce no blot on his escutcheon for he is established as a man who has spent a lifetime in the pursuit and reporting of the truth.

As anyone who follows Holmes Alexander's columns can verify, he is what journalism regards as a "fact man." He does not deal in sensationalism or innuendo. His columns concerning the Council for a Livable World have reported factual names, dates, and places and incidents and brought to the public's attention the existence of an organization which has become a significant power in the process of congressional elections.

As Senator DOMINICK has pointed out, Holmes Alexander has a long and distinguished career in journalism. He is author of 8 books and he has a syndicated column which is carried in well over 150 newspapers throughout the United States. He is known as a shoelace journalist who gets his information by going out and asking questions. At the

ripe young age of 24, Holmes was elected on the Democratic ticket to the Maryland House of Delegates where he served until 1935 and in the words of our colleague, Senator BREWSTER, "In days of bossism and recognized political machines, independence was his motto."

So there will be no lingering doubt as to the qualifications of Holmes Alexander to comment on the issues of the day, I should like at this juncture in my remarks to have printed in the RECORD a portion of a biography on the columnist.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A nationally syndicated column with Holmes Alexander's comments on national and foreign affairs has been appearing 5 days a week since 1947 in about 100 newspapers—among them the Houston Chronicle, Los Angeles Times, New Orleans States, Salt Lake City Tribune, Boston Herald, and Philadelphia Bulletin. He is recognized as one of the most astute reporters of political activities in Washington, D.C.

Alexander's long and varied career in journalism began in 1932 when his articles were first published in national magazines. In 1946 he was senior editor of Kiplinger's magazine. He is the author of three novels published by Harper and two biographies (of Martin Van Buren and Aaron Burr), and "Tomorrow's Air Age: A Report on the Foreseeable Future" (Rinehart, 1953). On March 6, 1956, he was a guest on Lynn Poole's television program, "Tomorrow's Careers," during which he discussed his career as a newspaper columnist and author.

Holmes Moss Alexander was born on January 29, 1906, in Parkersburg, W. Va., one of four children of Charles B. and Margaret (Moss) Alexander. His father was in the insurance business. He was educated at the Gilman School in Baltimore and at Princeton University, where he majored in English and received his B.A. degree in 1928. He took postgraduate work in England at Trinity College, Cambridge University.

On returning to the United States after his study in England, Alexander took a post at the McDonogh School, in McDonogh, Md. There he taught English and coached wrestling and polo. In 1931 he gave up teaching to embark on a political career. At the age of 24 he was elected on the Democratic ticket to the Maryland House of Delegates, serving until 1935.

Politics proved to be a stimulating but essentially a disillusioning experience for the young legislator. In two magazine articles, "The Case for Skepticism," published in Scribner's magazine in December 1932, and "I Hold Office," published in Harper's in September 1933, Alexander described his brief political career. "I charged into the political lists wearing white plumes of idealism," he wrote in Scribner's. "I was able to accomplish election because I was drafted onto an organization ticket, and because I mustered the patience to play that part until the votes were cast. Once firmly seated in office, I took a short and altruistic fling at lonewolfing it, but soon I was back in the fold participating in one transaction after another which a brief while before I would have considered outrageous and beneath me."

Renouncing public life, Alexander turned to writing. Ever since childhood, he confessed in an article, "So You're Going To Be a Writer," in the Writer (October 1942), he had been addicted to "an overfondness for words," a habit acquired, he thinks, in his boyhood while listening to sermons in the Episcopal church.

From 1934 until 1941, Alexander wrote fiction and fact articles for Country Life, Collier's, and the Saturday Evening Post. A

publisher who had seen his two articles on his experiences in the State legislature invited him to submit a political novel. Alexander made several unsuccessful attempts at writing one. Ultimately, he produced not a novel but a political biography. He writes (in "The Wrong Ways To Write Biography," in A. S. Burack's *The Writer's Handbook*, 1949): "I became a biographer only because it was the next best thing to being a novelist. * * * In short, biography was for me a reprieve from the madhouse of literary frustration."

The biography was "The American Talleyrand: The Career and Contemporaries of Martin Van Buren, Eighth President," published in 1935. It was an unsympathetic portrait, presented, as Reviewer Avery Craven remarked in the New York Herald Tribune books (July 7, 1935), "in a crisp, dramatic way." The historian Allan Nevins commented in the Saturday Review of Literature (May 4, 1935): "The author is not interested in national policies, but in the tricks, the wiles, the disappointments, and the victories of a politician. It is not a high mark, but the book hits it."

A second biography, "Aaron Burr: The Proud Pretender," followed in 1937. Alexander interpreted the complex character of Burr in a way that was neither apology nor condemnation. He saw his subject as a man motivated by the Nietzschean philosophy of the superman. The result, Henry Steele Commager observed in Books (Feb. 7, 1937), was that "he has illuminated our understanding of Burr." Writing in the Saturday Review of Literature (Feb. 13, 1937), Allan Nevins commented: "On the whole, this is an accurate, comprehensive, and vividly written biography."

Three novels have been written by Alexander: "American Nabob" (Harper, 1939), "Dust in the Afternoon" (serialized in the Saturday Evening Post in August 1940 and published by Harper in the same year); and "Selina" (Harper, 1942). Of "American Nabob" the New Yorker reviewer wrote: "A carefully done American historical novel of the middle 1800's in Virginia and West Virginia. The hero is the strong, unscrupulous entrepreneur type." Of "Dust in the Afternoon," a story of a boy who wanted to be a professional ballplayer and a girl who wanted to be an actress, Books commented: "As a report of what goes on in the training camp and the ball park, it is vivid and highly entertaining. It is written with feeling and without flourish in a swift, slangy economy of style." Of "Selina," the New York Times observed: "The story (of one of the first families of Maryland and the descendants of a tugboat captain) is well written and entertaining with plenty of incident and an exciting horse race to give it zest." The Springfield Republican reviewer called Alexander's style "smooth and facile."

In 1942 Alexander enlisted in the Army Air Forces and received the rank of first lieutenant. He was discharged in 1945 with the rank of major and was awarded the Army Air Medal. He described his wartime experiences training Air Force men in lifesaving techniques and in the actual rescue of survivors of plane crashes at sea in an article in the Saturday Evening Post, January 13, 1945, called "Fishers of Men."

When he returned to civilian life after World War II, Alexander resumed his freelance writing and began concentrating in his articles on national and international affairs. He continued to contribute to the Saturday Evening Post and to Collier's. In addition, he wrote regularly during 1951 for Nation's Business, contributing articles on the Congressional elections of that year, on present-day American relations with small nations, on trends in management and labor. He also wrote book reviews and covered political news for the Baltimore Sun. In 1953

Rinehart published his book, "Tomorrow's Air Age: A Report on the Foreseeable Future." The New York Herald Tribune Book Review (Dec. 20, 1953) commented: "This is, not so much a study of aviation as it is the examination of man's potential adjustment to the frightening environment just ahead * * * a stimulating report."

Alexander came to newspaper writing via a position which he took in 1946 as senior editor of Kiplinger's magazine in Washington, D.C. At about the same time he began contributing a weekly newsletter on Washington affairs to a small Maryland weekly. These letters came to the attention of the McNaught Syndicate, and in June 1947, his column began appearing in newspapers throughout the country. He calls himself a "shoeleather" type of columnist who gets his information by going out and asking questions.

Holmes Alexander and Mary Barksdale, a schoolteacher, were married on June 24, 1933. They have three children—Hunter Holmes, Peter Barksdale, and Mary Madge. For 15 years the Alexanders lived on a farm in McDonogh, Md., which they had bought as a small-scale operation, intending only to raise enough to meet their family needs. As Alexander described it in an article, "I Sold My Farm—Hooray" in the American Mercury (Mar. 1955), they found farming a costly and profitless operation. They now live in Washington. The columnist is 5 feet 8 inches tall, weighs 175 pounds, and has reddish hair and gray eyes. His favorite recreations used to be steeplechase, polo, and fox-hunting, but at present he describes himself as a "sedentary baseball fan." He also enjoys reading in American history.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, no American journalist is less deserving than Holmes Alexander of the villification and abuse from an organization, the stripe of the Council for a Livable World. I have had occasion to read his columns on that lobby group and I can attest to the dispassionance of his writing and his obvious attempts to be objective and factual in every respect.

Mr. President, from what I know of the Council for a Livable World I would say that it is very much the image of the John Birch Society. Both of them have secret membership lists, each of them is headed or was headed by an extremist. The council's founder, the late Dr. Leo Szilard, had proposed before Cyrus Eaton's Pugwash Conference, the destruction of American civil liberties before the law. This is at least on all fours with Welch's attacks upon the Supreme Court. The Council for a Livable World supported the political campaigns of men who openly support unilateral disarmament.

I am advised that Holmes Alexander has, in his possession, a draft of "program action" papers in which the council proposes nuclear disarmament and unilateral destruction of part of our bomber fleet. I understand that this part was reedited after Alexander's first articles appeared but the changes appeared to be of a semantical rather than substantive nature. The council has a speech factory which leans on the moonlighting predilections of arms control and disarmament functionaries to grind out reams of disarmament material. It is a tribute to various Senators who have been approached to espouse these writings that very few of them have chosen to do so.

The Council for a Livable World and its chief protagonist, its executive director, Col. H. Ashton Crosby, hesitate not for a moment to discredit their critics by trying to tie them to the coattails of the John Birch Society. In a letter which appeared recently in a Wyoming newspaper, Colonel Crosby sought to justify his smear attack on Holmes Alexander on the grounds that "I have 14 combat decorations." The council takes great delight in employing the same tactics that were called "McCarthyism" a decade ago.

I reiterate, Mr. President, that the Senator from Colorado has made a very important speech, a speech which should be read by Members of both sides of the aisle and by the public, for the Council for a Livable World, whatever its true intent and identity may be, is advocating the "unloaded rifle" and the "sheathed sword" in the face of an armed and aggressive opponent. I hope that this discussion on the Senate floor will prove the spark for a thoroughgoing and very comprehensive investigation into the activities of the Council for a Livable World.

I congratulate the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the colloquy and the comments which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. ALLOTT. I compliment my colleague for what he has said today. It seems to me that there is nothing more important in this day and age than that we try to preserve persons of integrity who do have integrity. No one can attack the integrity of either Representative BERRY, of South Dakota, or Mr. Alexander.

Second, I believe that the Senator has pointed out there are influences at work which most Senators believe to be contrary to the interests of the country. I can imagine nothing more than starting upon a course of unilateral action on disarmament. Of course, this is what is advocated in the statements of principle.

I congratulate my colleague. He has rendered a very great service, not only in coming to the defense of those who have been so bitterly and so unjustly attacked, but also in pointing out the real purposes of this organization, and the depths to which it reaches into our Government.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the comments of my distinguished colleague. The first time I ever heard of the Council for a Livable World was when it wrote to me asking for my comments on two questions. The questions related to the best method of preserving peace. Both questions assumed that disarmament would promote and preserve peace. I wrote back that the questions were misdirected. Not knowing anything about the organization, I suggested that what they should think about was the best way to preserve peace from its historic standpoint. From then on, I started hearing from them. It was rather interesting.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the names of the men who were being included for political contributions by the Council for a Livable World in this coming election. I am shocked to realize that four of the five come from the Mountain States, the theory being, I suppose, that either the people of the Mountain States are more gullible and more willing to buy this false doctrine of peace by weakness, or else the Mountain States are poor and sparsely populated States and it is possible to elect a Senator from a State of that kind with a smaller investment of the council's funds.

The list includes Representative MONTROYA who is running against the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], and my own colleague, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], who is running for reelection in Utah, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], who is running in Wyoming. I was very much interested in the pious hope of the council that Representative HARDING from Idaho—also a Mountain State—would be able to defeat the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] in 1966.

I wonder how the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] got on this list, because Maine and South Dakota are not Mountain States. I assume, however, that since they are small States and that the principle thus still applies, that the council could probably try to "buy" a Senate seat from a small State more cheaply than from one of the larger States.

I suppose if both Senators from Colorado were running this year, there would be an entry in that race from Colorado.

The same type of group contributed generously to the campaign of my opponent in 1962, David S. King.

I should like to warn the members of the Council for a Livable World that we in the Mountain States are not that kind of people. We believe in maintaining the strength of the United States. We believe in electing Members of Congress who believe in a strong America and I am afraid they are doing my colleague and these other candidates a real disservice in alining them and identifying them as men who accept the support of an organization of this kind.

Mr. DOMINICK. I very much appreciate the comments made by the Senator from Utah.

Senators might be interested in knowing that in one of Holmes Alexander's articles which will appear in the RECORD of my whole speech, which I introduced by unanimous consent, there appears a list of the amount of money that was contributed in the last election—the 1962 elections on the various candidates. There may be more of it, as I recall—either the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] or the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], or the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] came out with \$342.50. I do not know what happened to the Senator from Maine

[Mr. MUSKIE], but he certainly did not receive the support of the rest of them.

Mr. BENNETT. Then I have misunderstood the Senator's comments. The Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] have been supported. Theirs is a past story. But Representative MONTROYA, from New Mexico, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] and Representative HARDING will be supported in this present election, or the elections to come.

Mr. DOMINICK. It is my understanding that this is correct, and also that the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] is being supported in the election to come.

Each of these articles written by Mr. Alexander, as I understand, referred back to the previous election.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I congratulate with all the vigor and sincerity that I possess the junior Senator from Colorado on the speech which he has just made.

Those of us who know Holmes Alexander and know something about his background and follow his writings, know that he is one of the most honest, objective, and vigorous members of the fourth estate—and he has been that for many years. He writes facts. He does not speculate or philosophize based upon strange theories which he may desire to pontificate upon. He writes facts. He is objective. He supports those facts with the evidence whenever it is necessary. He is one of the great, objective journalists contemporary with our times.

Mr. President (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair), the Senator's exposition of the activities of this interesting and, I believe in the main, confused and muddled organization called the Council for the Livable World—I say in the main confused and muddled, because I believe that the directors or the organization and those responsible for its format and its advancement are not confused and know exactly where they are going—are going down the line to collectivism under the banner of peace. They have solicited many muddled people to join the organization under a false impression that they really stand for an honorable and a reliable peace, which in my judgment is not the case.

It is a strange thing that over the years there has been one red flag which has always called attention to organizations and has laid the basis or the reason for inquiry as to just what is the genesis of this particular organization or that—that is, when it includes in its title the word "peace."

It has been a standard format for Communist infiltration into organizations in this country. The word "peace" has been used to intrigue many well-meaning people who wish peace; but one will find that so many of those organizations are Communist-front organizations in which perhaps the majority of the membership are not aware of it,

but where the insidious management of that organization through its executive secretariat or its publicity directors, or something else, weave their way into the control propaganda mechanism of those organizations.

Not every organization which has the word "peace" in its title, of course, is Communist oriented or fellow-traveler oriented. However, it is interesting to note that as we go down the list of the organizations cited by the various official bodies in this country as being fellow-traveler organizations, it is interesting and fascinating to note in many of them the use of this word "peace" as an attractive element to gain adherence from people who really earnestly and zealously desire peace.

If we follow the philosophy of this organization in saying that it is for a livable world; if we follow its philosophy on the disarmament of the country, we might as well follow the philosophy of "peace to the grave." The grave is peace. There is no question about that. Their philosophy would lead us down the road to not only material, but spiritual and political destruction in this country.

The Senator should be commended. I commend him for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate, and for canvassing the situation as it exists, stimulated as it was by the unjustifiable criticism of Holmes Alexander, who should be praised by every freedom-loving American, rather than condemned.

Mr. DOMINICK. I agree with the Senator. Holmes Alexander has done a great deal of investigation of this subject. In one of his articles, which I have included in the RECORD for the information of my distinguished colleagues, we were told that there are two members of the Scientists Advisory Committee to this council who have been cited for being members of pro-Communist or fellow-traveler organizations, which have been listed on the Attorney General's list.

So, there are two people at least on the Scientists Advisory Committee, according to the article, who have been influential in part on this group. How many more there are, of course, we cannot tell. But this is a good organization. It is a part of the problem that we face.

As I was concluding, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] came by and informed me, which I am sure is correct—and I have no reason to doubt it—that Senator BURDICK returned the contribution he received from the Council for a Livable World. I do not know whether that is true or not. But I wanted to state it for the RECORD.

I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, and I want to thank him for performing a service this afternoon in bringing to the attention of the Senate and the general public how one of these organizations is operated, and also for having printed in the RECORD information in perspective regarding the very able and distinguished Representative from South Dakota, Mr. BERRY, and the distinguished, hard-working, and thorough Columnist Holmes Alexander. It has been my observation in reading

the writings of Holmes Alexander that he is factual and objective. I have observed that he does much independent digging for himself in the true tradition of the school of journalism. He is loath to swallow handouts. He would much prefer to dig out the facts for himself. As a result, those who read him have derived considerable benefit in getting the facts which we need to have an informed general public. Had it not been for Holmes Alexander, I believe there are a great many people who would not have known anything about the Council for a Livable World. Had it not been for the Senator from Colorado bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate, there are a great many others who would not have become acquainted with this organization.

I think that the point that should be drawn from this colloquy this afternoon and the excellent speech of my colleague is that the American people should appreciate the importance of having a fair and objective, factual-reporting press. Unless the American people receive the facts from reporters such as Holmes Alexander we cannot possibly have an enlightened and informed public opinion. Unless they know about the existence of certain organizations, unless they know how these organizations operate, how can they possibly evaluate the activities of some members of our legislative bodies?

I can think of no more effective way of doing away with the American way of life—as I am afraid some would like to do—than to have it legislated away. This would not be done in the name of doing away with the American way of life. It would be done in the name of preserving and enhancing the American way of life. But I am not talking about the label. I am talking about what would actually result from some of the legislation which would occur. I venture to say that there are some organizations—and I am not saying that the council, to which the Senator from Colorado alluded, would be among these—which would like to see the U.S. Congress not appropriate any money at all for national defense.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am positive of that.

Mr. MILLER. How better to get the job done than to exercise influence through campaign contributions and otherwise to elect people to Congress who are friendly to this idea? This is the insidiousness of this type of approach. It is difficult to draw a line. Members of many organizations are there because of conscientiously held beliefs—under the direction, however, of people who are deliberately and calculatingly going in a devious direction.

We all know that many members of organizations which are labeled "subversive" are well meaning—but they are well meaning dupes. I think that what my colleague, Senator HICKENLOOPER, had to say about the directors of some of these organizations was very well put.

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes. There seems to be little or no question that Mr. Crosby, who was an executive director of the Council for a Livable World, was an

extraordinarily heroic American citizen in World War II on behalf of our own forces.

It is my understanding that he received three Silver Stars, a Croix de Guerre, and a variety of other medals. I do not think there is any doubt that he was a real fighter in World War II. There is also little or no doubt that in some instances, he has tried to use his influence to attempt to change some of the wording and tenor of the policy of the council. It would not seem, in view of the program which the Senator from South Dakota actually read into the RECORD, that he is being very successful in the overall objective of being sure that any disarmament that may come about is consistent only with our ability to repel attack from our enemy.

Mr. MILLER. I think it is very fair for the Senator from Colorado to bring that point out. This, of course, raises another interesting question. How can it be that some of the heroes who received many decorations and performed outstanding service for our country during wartime end by being linked with organizations which are questionable in their objectives? No one knows. But we know that there are examples of such people who have changed. People's philosophies can change from that of being dedicated to the service of the American way of life to being dedicated to the service of communism, and vice versa. But the mere fact that one has had an outstanding war record does not mark him forevermore as one who should never be questioned.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct. I wanted to see that it was printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER. There is much unrealistic thinking on the question of dealing with Communist aggression. The Senator from Colorado has joined me in criticizing the accommodation policy of dealing with Communist aggression, which I regret to say is what we have been generally operating under for the last 3½ years. The line between that and something worse is very difficult to draw.

A service has been rendered on the floor of the Senate this afternoon by bringing these points to the attention of the Senate, not with any axes to grind—not that approach at all—but objectively, thoughtfully setting forth facts from which the people can draw their own conclusions. That is the type of service that should be rendered not only by Members of the Senate, but also by members of the press. Let the people have the facts, and then let them draw their own conclusions, and I think our country will get along very well.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the comments and the colloquy of my distinguished friend. One of the things that impelled me to speak on the subject was my own personal friendship for Mr. E. Y. BERRY, with whom I served for a term in Congress. I not only served in Congress with him but also I served on committees with him. So I know his ability and his reputation. I know his conscientious performance of his duties.

I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Colorado on his very timely and appropriate remarks in connection with Mr. Holmes Alexander and his series of articles on the Council for a Livable World. I have followed Mr. Alexander's writings in newspapers, magazines, and books for some years and have learned to respect both his judgment and objectivity.

From what I have learned of the Council for a Livable World, Mr. Alexander's columns on this organization were accurate and objective, but restrained. He did a real service to his country by pointing out the growing influence of so-called pacifist organizations which are advocating unilateral disarmament by the United States. As the Senator from Colorado has so ably pointed out, the Council for a Livable World despite its evasive denials has unquestionably advocated and urged what it calls "unilateral initiatives in arms control and in partial disarmament measures." Such organizations by their misleading propaganda could jeopardize the security of the United States and Mr. Alexander, by calling attention to this organization and its purposes in his series of articles, has performed a significant service to his country and, I hope, contributed to the national security of the Nation by exposing the council's program for unilateral disarmament.

Mr. President, I can imagine nothing more detrimental to this country than unilateral disarmament. That is exactly what Mr. Khrushchev and the Communists would like to see us do. Can we be so naive as to feel that we can disarm, hoping that the Communists are evolving and changing into a nonaggressive society which can be trusted? Lenin laid down the goal of the Communists in 1917, when he took over Russia, and at that time said:

The aim of the Soviets is to be the grave-diggers, the heirs, and the successors to the governments of the world.

That goal has never changed. It is their goal today. The goal of the Communists today is to take over the world. The only country that stands in their way is the United States. If we disarm unilaterally, the Communists will take over us and the rest of the world. If we unilaterally disarm, they will then be in a position to say, "Do you now wish to surrender, or do you wish to be destroyed?" It will be one or the other. If we disarm, we shall be forced to surrender or be destroyed.

Mr. President, the most asinine course that our country could follow would be to disarm. Yet prominent people in Government and in private life are today advocating disarmament, even without requiring inspections. There are organizations in this country advocating disarmament, and the Council for a Livable World is one of those organizations. I am proud that Holmes Alexander had the foresight, the wisdom, and the courage to expose this Council for a Livable World for the dangerous organization it is. Again, I compliment the able Senator from Colorado for the timely and perti-

nent remarks he made on this subject today.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from South Carolina. I fully agree with his analysis of the need for continued defense on our part to prevent the takeover of the world by the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, first, I thank the Senator from Colorado for his courtesy in notifying me yesterday, and again today, of his intention to discuss the subject that he has taken up in considerable detail this afternoon. I have no quarrel whatsoever with the Senator from Colorado. He and I have served together on the same committee—the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—and when he was recently attacked in a most unfair and, I thought, unethical manner, I was among those who joined in protesting the attack that was made on the junior Senator from Colorado.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I very much appreciated the Senator's support at that time. As I said earlier in my speech, I am not in any way impugning the integrity, the patriotism, the reliability, or anything else of the junior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I appreciate that.

The Senator has taken issue with me this afternoon because of the brief statement which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I made on the floor of the Senate on June 8. In that statement I attempted to defend myself and other distinguished Members of the Senate, and the Council for a Livable World against what I am convinced today, as I was then, were unjustified attacks by a Washington journalist. Those attacks in turn were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the senior Representative from South Dakota in the House of Representatives, and I felt constrained to make some explanation of his connection with this attack.

I wish to stress that I did not initiate the exchange that was responsible for the controversy that has developed this afternoon. I did not reply to Mr. Holmes Alexander until he had printed a series of articles casting doubts on my judgment, casting doubt on an organization and a group of fine people who supported my candidacy, and casting doubt on the judgment and the integrity of other Senators. Only after a series of such articles appeared in the press of the Nation did I see fit to take the floor of the Senate and offer a brief reply.

The Senator from Colorado has said that he felt constrained to take the floor this afternoon to speak out against what he called charges garbled on the winds of innuendo rather than enunciated by the sweet voice of reason.

It was for exactly that same reason that I took the floor to try to set the record straight with regard to the charges that had been leveled against me, the Council for a Livable World, and other Senators. We have heard numerous statements made by distinguished

Republican Members of the Senate as to the accuracy and the reliability of Mr. Alexander's charges, and the care with which he approaches the subjects that go into his syndicated column. I should like to take a very few minutes to comment on a few of the factual errors as well as gross distortions that have gone into the columns of this distinguished journalist. In his column of April 9, he said that—

Senator McGOVERN won his election by 200 votes.

I especially take exception to that statement, because I had such a hard time winning that election that I wish to get credit for every last vote that I compiled in my margin. It should have been 597. This may not seem very consequential to Members of the Senate, but to me the 397 votes Mr. Alexander overlooked amount to 197 percent error—which is a pretty big margin of error and not very factual, carefully checked reporting. I wish to set that one factual error straight today.

Mr. Alexander also said, in this first column in criticism of me, that the council contributed \$12,000 to my campaign. I want to correct that error, because I had at least as much trouble getting financial support for my campaign as I had getting a majority of votes. I want to be sure I get credit for the financial support that was given. Actually, the amount stated should have been \$22,000, not \$12,000. Actually, the bulk of the money was not from the council but from individuals acting on the council's recommendation. I am eternally grateful to the people who contributed that \$22,000. Most of that amount came in the form of contributions of \$25, \$15, \$10, some up to \$100, from teachers, professors, scientists, engineers, people from all over the country who believe in some of the things in which I believe. So I want to correct this misimpression. The error in amount is not so serious, because Mr. Alexander straightened it out in a subsequent article.

But now to come to a more serious error, he refers to the council as a pacifist lobby and as a unilateral disarmament group. Members of the Senate here today have repeated these charges, relying on his statement. Those charges are totally false. They are 100 percent in error. Distinguished Senators on the Republican side of the aisle who have talked about the aims and objectives of the council in terms of unilateral disarmament do not know what they are talking about. They do not know the objectives of the council. They have accepted Mr. Holmes' inaccuracies and they consequently are completely wrong in their interpretation of what the council stands for.

There is basically no difference in the aims and objectives of the Council for a Livable World and the aims and objectives of the Eisenhower administration, the Kennedy administration, and the Johnson administration.

All those administrations have been dedicated to a reduction of tensions in the world, to a reduction of unnecessary armaments, and to trying to arrive at some kind of agreement with our com-

petitors and with our potential enemies to reduce the overall level of the armament buildup, not only in our country, but in the enemy camp. There is no basis for the statement that the Council for a Livable World, as has been suggested, is for pacifism or for unilateral disarmament.

I shall take the time to read into the RECORD a very brief letter from the director of the council, in order to set forth the objectives, the philosophy, and the aims of this organization, which has contributed to Senators on both sides of the aisle in their election campaigns.

The letter to which I am referring was sent to Members of the Senate on May 13. At least, I received a copy, and I know a number of other Members of the Senate did, too. The letter is over the signature of H. Ashton Crosby, executive director of the council.

Before I read the letter, I want to say that Mr. Crosby is a strange pacifist, indeed, when we consider that he has spent a lifetime in military service. He is a retired Army colonel. He stepped out of uniform a few months ago. He won the Silver Star, the Purple Heart, and numerous other decorations for bravery. I would put his patriotism and judgment in matters of peace and war up against those of any Member of the Senate. The letter reads:

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: I have been asked by a number of Senators within the past few months as to what precisely the council stands for and what it is trying to do. Essentially the council is striving to further the development of interest between the scientific and political communities in the area of foreign affairs and, by recommending financial support to intelligent and thoughtful persons running for the Senate, contribute in some measure to constructive U.S. foreign and defense policies.

The council is an organization devoted to developing realistic and practical programs in the fields of arms control and the easing of international tensions, taking into consideration the national and international political climate. The council stresses the concept of responsibility and is well aware of the practicalities and limitations inherent in disarmament negotiations and the necessities of safeguarding our national security. Our programs are advanced within this context.

During the past few months the council has been under attack by columnist Holmes Alexander. His remarks have included the following statements:

That the council is an extremist group favoring unilateral disarmament.

That the council favors disarmament in the face of the enemy.

That the council backed Stuart Hughes in the 1962 Massachusetts Senate election.

Then, coming back to Mr. Crosby's statement:

The council never, at any time, recommended or solicited support for Mr. Hughes. The council has never at any time advocated unilateral disarmament or disarming in the face of the enemy.

The council is not a pacifist organization. Neither the directors nor I as a retired regular officer with the well-being and security of our country foremost in mind, would ever advocate pacifism or unilateral disarmament.

As the council becomes more effective in its operations, it will come under attack increasingly from those groups or individuals who for one reason or another are opposed to all measures leading to the easing of in-

ternational tensions and arms limitations. The council recognizes this as a measure of its success.

Without in any way going into the motives of those who are attacking the objectives of the Council for a Livable World here today, I take note of the fact that this is an election year. We are approaching the 4th of July—the fireworks, and all that sort of thing. We are getting ready to go home and reaffirm our patriotism, which is fine. We are limbering up on issues that may be of value to us in the coming campaign. Perhaps that sheds some light on the enthusiasm with which numerous Members of the Senate have participated in the attack on the council this afternoon. Perhaps we are getting a preview of things to come.

I do not believe that the American people can be convinced that peace is a dirty word, or that efforts to bring about a worldwide reduction in armaments and arms expenditures, as Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson have all tried to do—to reduce danger and save money—are unpatriotic.

For my own part, I welcome the participation of distinguished scientists, engineers, technicians, teachers, professors, students, and others who are participating in the Council for a Livable World.

One of the men who was instrumental in establishing the council was the late Dr. Leo Szilard. There have been some innuendoes about Dr. Szilard, the great scientist, who died a few weeks ago. He was one of the men who were instrumental in persuading Dr. Albert Einstein to talk with President Roosevelt about the possibility of building the atomic bomb, and the danger of our enemy building it. Had it not been for the intervention of Dr. Szilard and Dr. Einstein, it is quite possible that the atomic bomb would have been built by our enemies rather than ourselves, and that the outcome of World War II would have been vastly different. These men foresaw and forewarned our Nation of its greatest peril in history.

Leo Szilard and the scientists and scholars who worked with him are men who know and understand most clearly the awful dangers of nuclear war. I think it is to their credit that they are demonstrating some degree of political responsibility, having brought this terrifying weapon into being. They have demonstrated their love for country and they are demonstrating their love for mankind when they participate in the democratic political processes, in free elections, to endorse candidates of their choice.

With regard to the charges that I have made against Mr. Alexander, what I have tried to do in my earlier remarks is to set the record straight with regard to the council's purpose and with regard to my own integrity as a Senator. I have not at any time introduced unilateral disarmament legislation, as charged by Mr. Alexander. I did not introduce any legislation at the request of the Council for a Livable World. What I try to do as a Member of the Senate—and I believe this is true of other Members of the body as well—is done out of

my own conviction and because of my judgment that it is in the national interest.

With regard to what the Senator from Colorado has called unfair innuendoes about Mr. Alexander, I have drawn attention to his close affiliation with prominent members of the John Birch Society.

I have before me a book entitled "How To Read the Federalist," authored by Mr. Alexander. It was copyrighted in 1961 by Robert Welch, Inc. Everyone knows that Robert Welch is the prime mover, founder, president, chairman of the board, and everything else of the John Birch Society. There must have been some kind of conversation, some kind of negotiation, for Mr. Alexander's book to be copyrighted by the head of the John Birch Society.

If we consult back issues of the American Opinion magazine, which is the journal of the John Birch Society, edited by Mr. Robert Welch, we find in the issues for 1958 and 1959 a series of articles by Mr. Alexander, which later comprised the book to which Robert Welch, Inc., owns the copyright.

I have not suggested that Mr. Alexander is a member of the society. But I think it is a fair supposition, when his views, as expressed in his columns, so closely parallel many of the things advocated by the John Birch Society, that his articles are published in the journal and published as a book. That there is at least some degree of a meeting of the minds, some collaboration.

I think, too, that it is perfectly legitimate for me to draw attention to the fact that Representative BERRY, who inserted the articles in the Appendix of the RECORD, was one of two Representatives who attended a meeting in Washington on March 20, 1962, called by Billy James Hargis who, if he is not a Bircher, is cheating somebody out of dues, a man who has referred to the National Council of Churches as a Communist-front, who has referred to the brotherhood of man as "hogwash," and who has made various other statements that seem to put him in very close identification with extreme rightwing, Birch-type organizations.

Let me stress again the fact that I did not initiate this quarrel with Mr. Alexander or with Mr. BERRY. I replied to what I thought were unfair, untruthful, and distorted attacks on me and other Members of the Senate.

I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, first of all, let me say that when I came here this afternoon I had not intended to get into a fight, or even into an argument. But, as I sat here and listened to the statements, made largely on the other side of the aisle, about the Council for a Livable World, it became clear that I would remiss in my duty to my own conscience if I did not speak my mind.

It is unfortunate that we have come to the point in this country where one cannot speak up for peace without first reciting his credentials for patriotism.

Yet that is, in fact, the case, as so much of the discussion on the floor of the Senate today makes evident.

So, if a litany of loyalty is required, let me commence by saying that I am

not a pacifist. I fought as an enlisted man and as an officer in the Second World War, in India, Burma, and China. I am not an advocate of unilateral disarmament. My voting record in the Senate ought to make it clear, beyond any doubt, that I have supported enormous appropriations of money each year for the maintenance of our military forces, and that I would be the last to say that we should disarm in any manner which would endanger the security of this country, or which would enfeeble us in our commitment to support our allies in the world at large.

I am also as much opposed to communism as anyone who has spoken on this floor this afternoon. But I recognize that no final settlement will be reached in our struggle with communism, that no durable victory will be won, under a mushroom cloud.

The awful aftermath of thermonuclear war will not stifle tyranny; it will spread it. Those who have been closest to these weapons have been the first to tell us that nuclear war is an insanity which cannot possibly further the rational interest of this country or any other country that becomes involved in it.

I think we are alert enough to know the delicate balance upon which the peace of the world now rests—what Churchill called the balance of terror. I think we are all conscious of the fact that this balance could be tipped at any time, and that if the missiles ever go off, there will not be a livable world for any council to function in; that the cause of freedom will not be served, nor even the cause of human survival.

So, Mr. President, I find it difficult to become alarmed at the fact that there are citizens in this country, including some of our prominent physicists and nuclear scientists, men more conscious, perhaps, of the witchcraft of these awesome weapons than any of the rest of us, who are doing what they can to bring about a saner, safer world.

I do not agree with all of their proposals. In fact, I have disagreed publicly with some of the proposals that some of them have made. But their existence does not alarm this Senator. I do not think it is going to have any fatal disabling influence upon the judgment of any Senator. Indeed, it seems to me that we get this whole discussion out of perspective, when we suggest that a group of this character is either so large in size, or so pervasive in influence, as ever to threaten or undermine the Military Establishment of the United States.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota if it did not occur to him as being somewhat ironic that most of the speakers this afternoon are men who like to say from the public platform that the great danger facing America today is big government. That is a basic part of their credo, is it not?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator makes an excellent point. The Senator from Idaho has been among those who have reminded us in recent years that the growth of big government, and the growth of big Federal budgets, however necessary they may be—and I think they

are necessary to the defense of our country—has been brought about largely through programs that can be associated with warfare, rather than welfare.

Conversely, each time anyone raises a question about the possibility of some modest, carefully thought out reduction in some aspect of our military budget, we are immediately set upon as the enemies of security.

I suspect that one of the reasons why the junior Senator from South Dakota has been accused by Mr. Alexander of advocating a unilateral disarmament is that I have tried as best I could as a new Member of the Senate—and a very inexperienced one—to suggest a few areas in which minor reductions might take place in our Military Establishment without in any way jeopardizing our national security.

It has been my view that we would be a stronger country, better able to meet the challenge of international communism; and we would be a healthier society at home and more capable of meeting our commitments to our own people and to those overseas who depend on us, if we would find a reasonable way to divert a small amount of what is going into military purposes into constructive purposes at home.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. First of all, the fact that the Senator from South Dakota has been one of the few Members of the Senate to stand up and call for a more careful examination of our military budget is in itself a symptom of the affliction that ails us; indeed, of the political timidity and conformity that have come to plague the country.

As the Senator points out, we have big Government on the Potomac today primarily because of warfare, past, present, and future, not because of welfare. The welfare state, which is the bogey of these self-styled conservatives, and which oils their political spook show, now on the road from coast to coast, is largely the hobgoblin of their own imagination. If one would analyze today's Federal budget, he would discover that only 7 cents out of each Federal tax dollar is allocated to what are called welfare programs, while almost 80 cents of that dollar is paid out, in one way or another, to programs associated with national security, whether the payment be for past wars; for interest on the public war debt; for the space race, the arms race, the spy race; for our present involvements, or for foreign aid and dollar diplomacy; for preventive intercontinental ballistic missiles or our vast nuclear arsenal.

So, when political spokesmen go out across the country and in one and the same breath call for a shutdown of government at home and a showdown with communism abroad, we ought to have the commonsense to laugh them off the political stage.

I remind the Senate that it was not a Democrat, but the foremost figure of the Republican Party, one of the most honored men in the Nation today, Dwight David Eisenhower, one who spent

his whole life in the Army, who was commanding general of the American forces in Europe, and whose understanding of the military role is certainly not subject to question, who said, after 8 years in the Presidency of the United States, in a remarkable, candid, forthright, farewell address, that the thing which concerned him most, at the end of his Presidency, was the power and the influence—not of the Council for a More Livable World, of all things—but of the military-corporate complex that, to so large a degree, he felt might come to dominate the life and times of this Nation.

President Eisenhower warned us that this was the overshadowing problem with which we would have to cope in the future, based upon his 8 years of experience as President. Is not that the case?

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator has made an eloquent statement of the crux of the issue that is before us today. He has gone beyond that to pose the chief problem of our times, which is to find some way to save our society and our civilization from nuclear catastrophe, from nuclear destruction.

The Senator from Idaho referred to former President Eisenhower. In a speech that President Eisenhower delivered when he was in the White House, he said:

I hate war as only a soldier who has lived it can, only as one who has seen its brutality, its futility, its stupidity.

That was not a statement by the Council for a Livable World, those people who have been described as "fuzzy thinkers." That was a statement by a great general in wartime, a former President of the United States who, during the time he was in the White House, used his influence on the side of peace rather than war.

The same thing can be said of the late President Kennedy and of our great President Johnson, both men who understood from firsthand experience the terror, the brutality, and the senselessness of war, and who were willing, while keeping us strong in this dangerous world, to do whatever they could to move this country and the world a little closer to conditions of peace.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Is it not true that when President Eisenhower made the final speech of his term of office, warning of the military-corporate complex, he had in mind the extent to which its power and influence might dominate the thinking and the policy decisions within any future administration?

Mr. McGOVERN. That is my understanding.

Mr. CHURCH. Has the Senator from South Dakota heard any Member of the Senate, since that time, discuss in the terms of alarm we have heard this afternoon, the political activities, the campaign donations, or the other well-known lobbying efforts of the weapons manufacturers on behalf of candidates of their choosing? Has the alarm been sounded

in this Chamber about that kind of influence or that kind of lobbying in our contemporary life? If so, I have not heard it.

Mr. McGOVERN. I have not heard such a discussion. I was beginning to think, after listening to the way in which campaign contributions were deplored a while ago, that perhaps some Members of the Senate had found a way to be elected through the power of prayer.

I had called to my attention some weeks ago an editorial that appeared in the Idaho Observer of January 2, 1964, a newspaper published in the State of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, in which the journalist who has been under discussion today was taken to task for suggesting that there is some kind of special virtue about war, that man derives vigor from participation in war, whereas peace has a tendency to corrupt us with ease and somehow destroy the real muscle of a man; and that the only way we can really be men who can walk upright is to participate in combat with our fellow men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD at this time, because I believe the editor does an excellent job of laying that silly case to rest, reminding us again of the importance of what William James called, a good many years ago, the moral equivalent to war. I believe that we are still engaged in a search for the moral equivalent of war and that is, really, in my judgment, the hope and promise of most of the people who make up the Council for a Livable World.

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

WAR HAS NO VIRTUES

(By Dwight Wm. Jensen)

There is a man of limited prudence and judgment named Holmes Alexander who writes columns that are printed by the Idaho Daily Statesman.

A few weeks ago he did a piece on the virtues of war. He quotes a one-legged Medal of Honor winner who was headmaster when he went to school and who said war improves the breed. Any war which Holmes Alexander survives cannot be said to have improved the breed.

Alexander refers to "bilious propaganda about the idiocies of war and the cloying virtues of everlasting peace." He speaks of "the brine and bilge of contemporary peacemongering."

He sneers at writers who write about ways to end all war, and he says it is "the nature of man" to make war, and that "it is not to be altered by any power less than our Maker."

A better mind than Holmes Alexander's—and the 1960 census revealed that in Idaho alone there are nearly 700,000 better minds than Holmes Alexander's—Winston Churchill, who has some experience with war, said, "War is little more than a catalog of mistakes and misfortunes."

So war can be eliminated only by our Maker? You recall the cliché "God helps those who help themselves." We remember also the late President Kennedy's words that, "On earth, God's work is ours."

But Holmes Alexander would probably not care to quote Kennedy. The column we question appeared in the Statesman the day after that man's assassination and was a mocking sort of reflection upon Kennedy's search for peace.

Alexander is one of those great patriots who does such things as criticize the Supreme Court for its decision about Bible reading in the public schools. If he had read the Bible, in the public schools or elsewhere, he would have come across some words by the Son of our Maker:

"Blessed are the peacemakers."

Mr. CHURCH. I commend the Senator for the stand he has taken. I know him to be a man of great and good conscience—and of courage.

I close by restating I do not believe that the United States—which budgets 80 percent of its national revenue to programs related to warfare, past, present, or future, which spends more than half its annual operating budget to maintain its Armed Forces, where a vast corporate complex has a vested interest in armaments, where hundreds of societies and veterans' groups constantly side with the military viewpoint—is a country which has much to fear from a small association of scientists, college professors, professional people, and ordinary parents who are alarmed about the fact that we have raised a stockpile of weapons of such nightmarish power, that, if ever detonated, would be the equivalent of exploding a 20-ton bomb against the head of every inhabitant on this planet.

These citizens, the target of attack this afternoon, are merely trying to do what they can to effect a disarmament program, with enforcement controls and mutual inspection procedures, which might, one day, make it possible for the human race to live free from fright, beyond the shadow of a reckoning coming swift and final in the night.

I cannot believe that theirs is a pernicious influence, set upon the destruction of the United States of America. I do not, of course, stand on the floor of the Senate this afternoon to underwrite everything that any of these advocates may have said or may propose, because I reserve the right to make my own judgment.

Mr. McGOVERN. I reserve the same right, also.

Mr. CHURCH. I know the Senator from South Dakota does. I believe that the position he takes is a sound and sensible position. I commend him for it. Once again he renders his country a fine service, as he always has before, from the moment he first became a Senator of the United States.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Idaho for his invaluable contribution.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for yielding to me.

First, I should like to commend him, as well as my dear friend the Senator from Idaho, for the fine comments they have made in rebuttal to the quite extraordinary statements made by a number of Senators earlier this afternoon.

I endorse everything that the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Idaho have said. I wish I could have said it as eloquently and as convincingly.

I should like to pay my respects, briefly, to Mr. Holmes Alexander, who I note has been in the gallery while this series of speeches has been made.

I know him of old. His writings are syndicated, for reasons which have always escaped me, in one of our great metropolitan Pennsylvania newspapers.

I shall not deal in innuendo. I should like, rather, to deal in provable facts. As the Senator from South Dakota amply demonstrated from the record a few moments ago, Mr. Alexander is and has been for years a rightwing radical whose political philosophy, if adopted, would clearly take us back to the jungle and remove many, if not all, of the benefits of civilization.

Those are rather strong words, said in part, perhaps, in lighter vein. But, nonetheless, I firmly believe that Mr. Alexander has for years represented a philosophy on education exemplified by the one room, little red schoolhouse which has a rather supreme contempt for intellectualism and for eggheads, which would like to revert, in short, to the happy days of the early 19th century, turning its back on everything that has happened in the world since that date.

I am amazed that any Senator would take seriously these ridiculous and downright silly charges of Mr. Alexander against the Council for a Livable World.

I am proud to have received in the campaign of 1962, when I ran for reelection, rather significant contributions from members of the Council for a Livable World, who were encouraged to make contributions in my behalf by Mr. Leo Szilard, now unhappily dead, but one of the great scientists of the modern world and one of the inventors—as the Senator from South Dakota has said—of the atomic bomb, a man who devoted the declining years of his life, after he knew that he had incurable cancer, to the cause of peace and to the cause of a livable world.

I often wonder why Mr. Alexander, who follows that rightwing line of his, does not attack the real advocates in this country of general and complete disarmament under enforceable world law.

Why does he not attack Christian Herter, who was Secretary of State, and the first American of prominent office to advocate general and complete disarmament under enforceable world law?

Why does he not attack our late beloved President John F. Kennedy, who in three magnificent speeches, two of them in the United Nations, and the third at American University in the District of Columbia, laid it on the line that the foreign policy of our country was to advance the same cause which the Council for a Livable World has been advancing, and for advancing which it has come under attack by Mr. Alexander and his rightwing cohorts.

Why does he not attack John McCloy? Why does he not attack Arthur Dean? Why does he not attack William Foster?

Indeed, why does he not attack President Lyndon Baines Johnson, who advocates the same principles of foreign policy and disarmament which the Council for a Livable World is proud to espouse, to recommend, and to support?

What disturbs me is the attitude in the Senate toward the cause of peace, a just and enduring peace, negotiated from strength. For I believe, to borrow the words of the late President Kennedy, "that we should never negotiate out of fear, but we should never fear to negotiate."

We saw some rather ugly things in the Senate during the debate on the test ban treaty last year. The belligerence in the Senate which was referred to by the Senator from Idaho, is the same spirit of belligerence which was attacked by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in the last public address he made while still President of the United States. I do not like to see that spirit of belligerence in the Senate. I do not like to see that archaic and obsolete attitude toward the problems of the modern world. I would hope, perhaps, that some mild change in that climate might be created by the action of the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Idaho, who have shown the courage to rise on the floor of the Senate and state their own supreme convictions and their strong support of the policies of three Presidents of the United States—Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson—in support of a just and a livable world.

I thank my friend from South Dakota for yielding to me.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Idaho for their moving, eloquent, and informed statements here today. I was assured of my position before I took the floor this afternoon. But I am more assured of it after listening to the persuasive eloquence of those two Senators who have done so much in the cause of peace.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I did not hear all of the discussion on the Republican side this afternoon, as I was in and out of the Chamber. But I did hear the names of certain Members on this side mentioned. I am afraid that the implications were such as to make it difficult for them in their personal and political careers.

I am quite sure that was not the intent. I wish to say publicly, as majority leader of the Senate, that insofar as I am concerned, I have no doubt about the patriotism, integrity, and the devotion of men like the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and others. They have performed capably, well, and in the highest traditions of this body since they first became Members of the Senate. So as far as being for unilateral disarmament is concerned, as one Senator seemed to indicate, I do not know of a Senator on either side who is in favor of unilateral disarmament.

The Senator from South Dakota has a distinguished war record as a bomber pilot in World War II. He is the holder of the Distinguished Flying Cross.

The distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] served with distinction in the China-Burma-India area. I do not know of a Democratic or Republican Senator whose integrity, patriotism, or devotion to his country should be impugned in any way, even by implication.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina is willing, I would ask the Chair to make sure that the Chamber is kept fairly clear during this debate. The Senate will be in session until a relatively late hour this evening because of circumstances which are apparent to all.

I thank the Senator from South Carolina for yielding.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am proud to report to the Senate the committee's unanimous approval of H.R. 11049, with amendment, the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964.

This legislation is a broad and all-inclusive pay adjustment measure which, in my view, will rank among the most important actions of the Congress in recent years to strengthen the Federal Government and increase its efficiency.

I particularly emphasize that the committee's report is a unanimous report. Members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on both sides of the aisle, working harmoniously and with nonpartisan objectives, have together studied and discussed H.R. 11049, title by title, section by section, and, in some cases, line by line. The work of the members of the committee has been diligent, conscientious, and devoted. They have responded to word from the President of the United States that this measure is one of the most important in his legislative program for the 88th Congress, and their response, consisting of hard work in long daily meetings, has been made at a particular time in the history of the Senate when many other important demands were being made upon their time and energies. I congratulate the committee on the spirit in which the members have undertaken to improve H.R. 11049 as passed by the House of Representatives, and as chairman I thank them each individually for their intelligent and effective cooperation with the President and with me.

This bill, as reported, is directed toward accomplishing four purposes which will remedy a number of inequities and will establish pay relationships resulting in greater efficiency in the Federal civilian service and increased economy throughout all Government operations. The purposes of H.R. 11049 are:

First. To reaffirm the commitment of the Congress to the policy of adjusting the civilian career salary systems in accordance with the principle of comparability. This policy, one of the most reasonable and far-reaching determinations ever made by the Congress in the field of Federal pay, was declared in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, which clearly states the sense of the Congress that—

Federal salary rates shall be comparable with private enterprise salary rates for the same levels of work.

Second. To establish a new, consistent, and rational salary structure for positions of the highest level in the Federal Government.

Third. To provide for the first time a logical relationship between career salaries under the civilian statutory pay systems and the salaries of top positions in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches.

Fourth. To adopt a salary structure which will respond to the present-day needs of the Federal Government, to the end that recruitment and retention of personnel of the very highest level—from the bottom to the top—can be accomplished.

Perhaps the most widely discussed section of H.R. 11049 is its provision for an increase in the annual salaries of the Members of the Congress from \$22,500 to \$30,000 a year. Increases in congressional pay constitute a touchy and controversial problem always. Ignoring this problem will not make it go away.

The committee, recognizing the constitutional injunction that the Senate and House must establish the rate of pay for its own Members, has tried to abide by its responsibility. It is our judgment that the compensation of Senator and Congressmen ought to be increased by \$7,500 per annum. No one who serves in the Congress can be unaware that our duties and responsibilities have increased substantially since 1955, when congressional pay was raised from \$15,000 a year. We are all thoroughly familiar with the costs incurred in maintaining two homes and with the necessity for frequent trips to our home States, where we can listen to the views of those who sent us here. We all know that the days of midsummer adjournment are probably gone forever, and that ours has become more than a full-time job. In my opinion, these facts of life must be squarely faced and reckoned with, not only for the benefit of present incumbents, but also for those who follow us in the Senate and the House.

I say again that the congressional increase endorsed by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee is intended for the office and not for the present Member. It reflects not only the financial realities of running and serving, but also the prestige, dignity, and status of the Congress and its Members. I am confident that when H.R. 11049 comes to a vote, the Senate will face forthrightly its difficult responsibility for establishing equitable pay for its Members.

This action to adjust Federal compensation up and down the line comes none to soon. The Salary Reform Act of 1962 provides that the President shall report

annually to the Congress his recommendations—based upon studies conducted by the Bureau of Labor statistics—for any Federal salary adjustments he deems advisable. In accordance with the 1962 act, President Kennedy more than a year ago recommended comparability pay increases similar to those provided for in H.R. 11049; and suggestions for executive, legislative, and judicial pay have been before the Congress since the report last year of the President's advisory panel on Federal salary systems, the Randall report.

The fact that Congress did not act in 1963 to adjust Federal compensation has resulted in many unfortunate inequities and an alarming departure of Federal pay from the comparability pay line. The fact that the recommendations of the Randall report have not been interpreted into Federal legislation until now has resulted, furthermore, in serious difficulty for the President in obtaining and keeping the services of men of high caliber for the topmost executive positions in the Government.

The President has told me on more than one occasion that this is true.

The salary provisions for executive pay have been scaled down from the Randall recommendations, in recognition of the fact that in the upper levels of the Federal service—both career and executive—the Government can never financially reward its top officials in such a way as to compete with private enterprise. In other words, while the committee endorses—and trusts that the Senate will continue to endorse—the principle of comparability in all ranks other than those at the top, we are aware that those who serve their country in positions of high rank in all three branches of the Government must be willing to accept far less than their counterparts in the private economy.

This fact is recognized as part and parcel of our national life. Nevertheless, it is my view that the sacrifice that many of our leaders in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches have been asked to make are too great. The increases provided in this measure will go a long way toward rectifying a situation which all recent Presidents, particularly Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, have deplored and which they have time and again asked the Congress to correct. The report of the President's advisory panel is most pertinent on this subject. The panel makes these points:

It is not uncommon in the history of our country to ask our citizens to give up a high income to accept a lesser one in a responsible Federal office. But the sacrifice ought to be of a kind which many capable men—not just a few—are financially prepared to make. Furthermore, there are many able young men who have had no time to accumulate financial reserves. The country should not be denied the services of these men because of inadequate Federal pay scales. The Nation cannot afford to depend only upon rich men to run its affairs.

One of the most reasonable and beneficial provisions of title III, the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, is the es-

tablishment of an orderly series of five levels of executive compensation. Over the years through the various executive pay acts and organic legislation establishing new Federal agencies, some 19 different executive pay levels have sprung up within the Federal service. On occasion, the need for increased compensation has been reflected in the salaries paid the directors of newly created agencies, while similar top officials of older agencies have been overlooked. The prominence of some agencies as opposed to the inconspicuousness of others has also sometimes resulted in unjustifiable executive salary differentials.

This bill for the first time brings together an orderly and rational system of five levels, in which positions of equal rank and responsibility receive equal compensation. This arrangement is the result of intensive study and close cooperation between the committees of the Senate and House on the one hand, and the Bureau of the Budget on the other, and the administrative agencies, also.

As passed by the House, H.R. 11049 established six pay levels of executive compensation. The top three levels—levels 1, 2, and 3—are listed by position. The lower three levels—levels 4, 5, and 6—would be filled under the House bill through placement which the President would be authorized to make in accordance with standards spelled out in the act.

The Senate committee, on the recommendation of the Budget Bureau, has eliminated level VI entirely. This level was composed of a limited number of executives who could be most appropriately placed, it was felt, in level 5 or, for pay purposes, in the top grades of the general schedule. This arrangement also relieved the pay compression which existed between the executive salary schedule and the general schedule when there were six executive levels.

The committee has further amended the House bill to provide for statutory listing of the positions in levels 4 and 5, as opposed to granting placement authority to the President. The committee noted, however, that the President ought to have additional authority with regard to the executive schedule, so that he may respond to changes in organization, management responsibilities, or work apportionment in the executive branch. Accordingly, the bill as reported gives authority to the President to add 20 additional positions within levels 4 and 5.

Perhaps some of them would come from the regular classification list below, and some could be adjusted between level 4 and level 5.

In general, the committee endorsed the rationale of the executive salary schedule established in the House bill. Certain changes, however, were made. The compensation of Cabinet members is increased from \$32,500 to \$35,000, this change taking into account the heavy responsibilities of Cabinet officers and the prestige which accompanies these high positions and the necessary spending of money by Cabinet officials.

The \$30,000 salary for the deputies of Cabinet members has not been changed. These are the second highest Adminis-

trators in the executive branch, in many cases the directors of the daily operations of the Nation's departments and agencies. Accordingly, they should be adequately compensated, but at a rate reflecting the differences between their duties and those of Cabinet members. The committee's action in endorsing \$30,000 a year for deputy department heads and the same salary for Members of the Congress follows the traditional pay alignment in which Cabinet members are the only group paid more than Members of Congress.

The committee has reduced slightly the salaries for executives in levels 3, 4, and 5; from \$29,000 to \$28,500 for level 3; from \$28,000 to \$27,000 for level 4; and from \$27,000 to \$26,000 for level 5.

These are the changes in the bill as reported from the House.

It is my view that the Senate schedule more nearly reflects the responsibilities of the three lower levels and their relationship to levels 2 and 1.

The Randall panel makes clear the need for pay increases in judges, officers, and employees of the judiciary.

The committee accepted the salary scales for Federal judges enacted by the House, taking note of the fact that the increases are in the neighborhood of \$7,500, the same amount of increase which was approved for Members of Congress. The committee changed the annual salary of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts from \$28,000 to \$27,000 and the salary of the Deputy Director from \$27,000 to \$26,000, in recognition of the fact that these salaries were aligned with levels 4 and 5 of the executive salary schedule established at \$27,000 and \$26,000. Additionally, the committee reduced the salary of commissioners of the court of claims from \$27,000 to \$26,000.

In its discussions of compensation for the judiciary, the committee took into account the constitutional provision that Federal judges are appointed for life and that their salaries are discontinued only in the event of death, resignation, or impeachment. Thus, when Federal judges become inactive—optionally after 15 years at age 65 or after 10 years at age 70—they may, in effect, retire on full salary. It was noted also that many judges, upon reaching retirement age, continue their duties on a part-time basis while drawing full compensation.

H.R. 11049 provides pay increases for employees under the Classification Act ranging from approximately 3 percent in the lower grades, where comparability has been achieved, through 22.2 percent for grade 18, where the comparability pay line and the Classification Act pay line are still widely separated. It will be recalled that grades 16, 17, and 18, which will receive substantial pay increases under this bill, received no pay increases in January 1964 as did all other grades of the schedule.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It has been said that a large increase will be allowed to the

classes just mentioned by the Senator, grades 16, 17, and 18, and that is because the last time there was a pay raise these classified workers were not included. My question is whether the large increase which is now being granted is justified. What would have been the percentage increase if it had been granted when the last increase was made and the increase that these people would be entitled to now? In other words, does the large increase now exceed what the combined increase would be if it had been granted 3 years ago and again now.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If you refer to grades 16, 17, and 18 the answer is "Yes."

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the percentage of the pay raise for this classification?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The highest would be approximately 22 percent for grade 18. However, percentage increases in the lower grades are much smaller.

Mr. LAUSCHE. 22 percent. That 22 percent compares to what in the low classification?

Mr. JOHNSTON. GS-1 gets 3.1 percent. This grade has had many increases in the years past, when the higher grades were not increased.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Class 1 would require seven increases of 3 percent to bring it up to the 22 percent that would be granted to the highest. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. In that class the Government employs only 1,356 persons. Those are the charwomen, custodial laborers, and others in similar work categories. Their pay compares favorably with what they would get in private enterprise for similar work. That was all taken into consideration when the percentage increase was determined.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When was the pay raise granted that did not include the high classified people?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Grades 16, 17, and 18 received no increase in January of this year, when all other grades received an increase previously enacted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When did it happen prior to that time? Was that about 1962?

Mr. JOHNSTON. October 1962.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Were the high grades included in the 1962 pay raise?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the low grade received an increase of 3 or 4 percent in January of this year, how can we justify granting a 22-percent increase 5 or 6 months later to the high grade? I cannot follow that.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Because it is the committee's view that these top officials under the Classification Act deserve an increase. The administration has advocated it. The Bureau of the Budget has advocated it. That is what we are here for.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it on the basis of comparability in private industry that this high 22 percent has been granted?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct. Even with the increase, grade 18 would be below comparability. The Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission and the President of the United States have advocated attempting to attain comparability. The House has al-

ready acted by a big majority. We are here trying to do what we think is right and just. That is what I am here to do.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In addition to the increase of 22 percent, will the high classified employees in the course of time also become the beneficiaries of increased retirement pay on the basis of the new schedule?

Mr. JOHNSTON. They will, but that will be over a term of years. The retirement system provides that the 5 highest years be taken into consideration. It is the average for the 5 highest years.

A bill is pending in committee, on which some hearings have already been held, in connection with which the administration is advocating that certain changes be made in regard to the financing of the retirement system, to provide that it will be fiscally sound. The Government will have to pay more into the fund for the reason that for over two-thirds of the years of the existence of the retirement fund the Government has not been paying its full share. Another reason is that many of the employees of the Government are ex-servicemen, and they did not have to contribute toward retirement for the years of military service, but they are credited toward retirement for those years of service with the armed services. The Civil Service Commission has asked that we amend existing law to reform the method of financing the retirement fund. The committee is working on that bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To get back to the other point, the increase that would go to Members of Congress, from \$22,500 to \$30,000, would also provide a new remuneration to the Members of Congress in the form of an increase in retirement pay at the end of each year. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We will go into that at a later time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have been working on an amendment that I hope will appeal to the Senator. It would provide, first, that a Member of Congress, in order to obtain his increase, must certify that he is of the opinion that his services are worth that much money; second, that he believes the increase is necessary in order to provide for the essential expenses of rendering the services that are essential to his constituents and for the living expenses for himself and his dependents.

Does the Senator from South Carolina really think it is necessary to provide a pay raise for persons who feel that they might not want it, such as those who do not have children in college and do not incur expenses which might justify an increase in pay?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is a good question. I do not want to amend the bill along these lines; but I have thought at times that anyone who thinks he does not deserve the pay increase should be glad to give it back to the Government. The Government is there, waiting. That per-

son could give back the amount of his increase. If he did not think he was worth it, he could give it back.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am aware of the position of one Member of Congress, who says that after he pays his taxes, he donates to the church whatever he has left. I do not see any particular point in giving a person a pay raise so that he can give more money to his church. In a way, that conflicts with the doctrine of the separation of church and state, if all we are doing is paying money by way of a pay raise to enable the recipient to give it to a church.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Members of the Senate and House will give back about 42 percent of the pay raise.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In income taxes?

Mr. JOHNSTON. In income taxes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would hope that we could work that out. If any Member of Congress really believes that his services are not worth the amount of the increase, he should not take it out of the Treasury; it ought to stay in the Treasury. The people ought to have an opportunity to elect some cutrate representatives, if they wish. One could say in his platform, "I am not worth as much as another fellow. I am not worth that much salary"; and he could make his case on the basis that he is not worth that much for his services.

I hope the Senator from South Carolina will feel kindly toward my amendment. I do not feel that we should force on people money that they think is not necessary. That would be wasteful.

With that qualification, I am willing to vote for the Senator's bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Senator.

The substantial percentage increases for the upper grades are, in my opinion, warranted and deserved.

The committee acted to rectify what it considered an inconsistency in the House-approved general schedule, with respect to the so-called middle grades. Grades 9, 10, 11, and 12 were reduced from the President's recommendations to rates which reflect salary increases of less than 3 percent of present salary rates. Taking into account the contribution to the Federal service which is made by this important middle-management group, the committee increased the compensation of these grades to a 3-percent level. Similar increases were given the middle grades in the Foreign Service and the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

The bill has been amended to provide for 1-year step increases through step 7 for all levels of the PFS schedule. Under the 1962 act, 1-year increases through step 7 were limited to the first six levels, with 2 years being required in steps 6 and 7 for levels 7 and above. This has resulted in pay inequities caused by the longer service periods required—particularly in levels 7, 8, and 9—in steps 6 and 7 of the PFS schedule. The result has been rapidly diminishing salary differentials between level 7 on the one hand and levels 5 and 6 on the other, resulting from the fact that per-

sonnel in the lower levels advance more rapidly through the steps of the schedule.

The committee amendment will remedy these inequities and will materially benefit important groups of personnel in the postal service—supervisors, postmasters, inspectors, and others—many of whom spend the greater part of their postal careers in levels 7, 8, or 9.

The committee is in agreement with the Post Office Department that postmasters of fourth-class offices are, in general, being inadequately compensated under schedule II of the 1962 act. The Department's proposal to substitute a new schedule based upon PFS-5 and the number of service hours required on the part of the postmaster was carefully studied. It was the committee's view, however, that this proposed schedule, providing increases averaging approximately 27 percent, overcompensated for the deficiency. Accordingly, the act has been amended to provide for a new fourth-class office schedule, based upon six levels of revenue units. The percentage increases vary in general within the range of 10 to 15 percent, with increases substantially higher than 15 percent for postmasters of fourth-class offices in the lower levels, where increases are most urgently needed.

This modification of the Department's original proposal represents an equitable solution to the problem of marginal pay for fourth-class postmasters with low receipts, and provides significant and deserved salary increases for all other postmasters of fourth-class offices. The House-passed schedule would cost approximately \$12.7 million, while that of the Senate schedule would cost approximately \$4.8 million.

We took this up with the Post Office Department, too, and were informed that this would be agreeable to them.

The last pay raise granted congressional employees was an across-the-board increase of 7 percent in 1962. They received no schedule 2 increase, which, Senators will recall, was the second increment of the 1962 pay increase, becoming effective for employees of the executive branch in January 1964.

The committee has endorsed the pay-increase formula for congressional employees as set forth in the House measure. It provides for graduated raises ranging from 5 percent in the lower levels to 21½ percent in the upper. It is my belief that this schedule recognizes the principle of comparability and satisfactorily aligns the pay for our congressional employees with that of officials of their rank and responsibility in the executive branch.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that in the previous pay bill, the increase in salaries for congressional workers was 7 percent?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It was 7 percent across the board.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was in 1962, was it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under that pay bill, the top salary of an administrative as-

sistant to a Senator could be fixed at \$18,884.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That was for one person in the office.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that; but others would get similar raises.

In the bill which the Senator now proposes to have enacted, the base pay of \$8,880 and a gross rate of \$18,884 would result in a 21½ percent increase for administrative assistants and cause their salaries to go up \$22,945.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is more than the salary Senators receive today.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is true. We propose to raise the salaries of Senators in the bill, by 33 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. How can they justify raising the salary, let us say, of the Sergeant at Arms, who now receives \$21,500, to \$27,500, an increase of \$6,000? How can that be justified? In addition, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, as I understand, is provided with the use of an automobile and a chauffeur.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is what the Appropriations Committee lets him have.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that; but how can the committee justify that? How can the Senator from South Carolina go back home and tell his people that the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate has been raised in salary from \$21,500 to \$27,500, or an increase of \$500 a month, and is provided with an automobile and a chauffeur to drive it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Regarding the chauffeur and the automobile, it must be remembered that there are some occasions when the Sergeant at Arms is required to go out and advise Senators that they are needed back in the Chamber.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a car pool across the street which can be used for that purpose.

The salary of the Secretary of the Senate is to be raised from \$21,500 to \$27,500 or the same increase as the Sergeant at Arms—\$500 a month, or \$6,000 per year. How can the committee justify such an increase when an increase of 7 percent has already been given in 1962 and this increases the amount to 27.9 percent?

Mr. JOHNSTON. All this was based upon grounds of comparability.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of what?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Along lines comparable to salaries paid on the outside. Remember that this is for the whole of the Federal Government. Go to New York and see what the chief of police up there is paid.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator compare the Sergeant at Arms to the chief of police of New York City?

Mr. JOHNSTON. This position must be compared to that of those performing jobs of a similar nature, yes. I do not limit it to New York, of course.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the salary of the Architect of the Capitol would be raised from \$20,700 to \$26,000, or 26.1 percent.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Only 2 years ago, we gave him an increase of 7 percent. I

am wondering how the committee could present the Senate with a bill of this kind. District judges will be paid \$30,000, an increase of 33½ percent. Judgeships are life appointments which is a valuable consideration in itself.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator will notice that we have reduced many salaries below those approved in the House measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Some of the what?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Some of those salaries have been cut below those approved by the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am talking about the Senate carrying out its responsibility. I know what the House did. It did a bad job. But I did not expect the committee to come before the Senate and try to duplicate what the House did—more or less, because that is just what the committee did.

Will the Senator from South Carolina tell us, assuming that every Senator will increase his force according to the tables laid out in this bill, how much it will cost a year; does the Senator know?

Mr. JOHNSTON. In this particular bill, there will be a certain amount of money which can be spent; and the Senator can spend as much of it as he wishes, in accordance with the provisions of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows what happens, of course.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is what any Senator would be able to do in his office. Not a year has gone by that I have not turned back money in my own office.

Mr. ELLENDER. The same applies to me.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I believe that many Senators have done so. However, each Senator will be given a certain amount of money to operate his office.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why give it? Why arrange the scale so high that a Senator's administrative assistant will be constantly dissatisfied from here on out until he is paid the highest salary permitted under the bill? Some Senators give the raises automatically and this creates dissatisfaction among the assistants of those who do not.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Because many Senators cannot get the people with the abilities they need for their offices from their own particular States without paying them salaries such as will be found in this bill, and which are in relation to their abilities. That is the reason we put them in.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean to say that it is hard to get an assistant to help in his office?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator from Chicago and the Senator from New York and other places—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator does not have to pay it, unless he wishes to do so.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is true that the city of New York has the same name as the State of New York—

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very proud to come from the city of Chicago but I also come from the great State of Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Illinois. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope that "Illinois" will be substituted for "Chicago."

Mr. JOHNSTON. Of course—Illinois.

Mr. ELLENDER. When I first came to the Senate, as I recall, our little pages—and I love them all—were given \$5 a day for the days they worked. In this bill, their pay will be raised to more than \$5,000 a year. I hope they make that much money when they get out of college.

I believe that we have gone to an extreme on this subject. I am hopeful that a good look will be taken at this bill and that the Senate will make an attempt to trim it down, because I believe it is absolutely wrong, particularly when we consider that we just lowered taxes and increased salaries in 1962. Here we are, preparing to slap on the backs of the American people an additional burden which will cost in excess of half a billion dollars a year.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator will notice in the bill that many of the salaries in the Senate version are below those of the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. That does not make it good for the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON. But we must keep them somewhat in line. Does not the Senator agree with that?

Mr. ELLENDER. Keep whom in line?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Salaries in the two Houses. If we do not have similar pay scales many people now working in the Senate will wish to go over and work in the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not know there was that much competition.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I address myself to the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee [Mr. JOHNSTON]. As the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I notice that there have been two changes made in the Senate bill as against the House bill.

Let me emphasize that it is not so much the money involved as much as it is the principle that concerns me. The reason I bring it up now is that I am hopeful the Senator will give some thought to the colloquy we are going to engage in, so that when I bring up my amendment we can be in accord as to what is meant.

I notice that the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission has been placed in level 2. The other four members of the Commission have been placed in level 4.

The House placed the chairman in level 2, but it placed the other members of the committee in level 3.

The Senate committee dropped it down a further level.

The point I wish to make, and I believe it should be brought to the attention of the committee, is the fact that in 1954 and again in 1955—and I believe

I shall be substantiated in this by my distinguished colleague from the State of Tennessee—there was a serious question which came up in committee as to what authority, prerogative, and responsibility each of the five members should have. In considering the 1954 amendments to the Atomic Energy Act there was a proposal that the Chairman be the principal officer of the Commission. After much debate that was not accepted.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Congress repudiated that philosophy.

We wrote in the law specifically at that time:

Each member of the Commission, including the Chairman, shall have equal responsibility and authority in all decisions and actions of the Commission and shall have one vote.

Then in 1955 so there would be no uncertainty as to the intent, the Joint Committee recommended and the Congress amended the law to read:

Each member of the Commission, including the Chairman, shall have equal responsibility and authority in all decisions and actions of the committee, and shall have full access to all information relating to the performance of his duties or responsibilities, and shall have one vote.

Mr. President (Mr. INOUYE in the chair), the point I wish to make is that this Commission spends more than \$2.5 billion a year in keeping up the nuclear and thermonuclear posture of the Nation. It is a very responsible Commission. There are some who believe, possibly, that if we had one administrator as against the commission setup, as it is in the Space Administration, perhaps it might work more effectively, but I do not believe we need to debate that question this afternoon.

What I am intending to do—and I should hope that this would be amenable to the thinking of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina—is to bring it back to where the House had it.

I do not say that all members of the Commission should be at level 2. I believe that the Chairman should be at level 2, as the spokesman for the Commission, but I would hope the Senator would revert back when I bring up my amendment to the bill. As it was reported by the House, other members of the Commission would be put in level 3 instead of level 4.

I repeat, that it is not so much the matter of the money as it is the matter of the responsibility. If we are going to put the Chairman two grades above the other members of the Commission, we shall be downgrading the prestige and the responsibility of the other members.

I do not believe that should be allowed because I believe that would do the whole program irreparable harm.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am glad to have these remarks from the Senator from Rhode Island, and shall be glad to look into them.

Mr. PASTORE. That is the reason why I bring up the question now. I hope the Senator will take it up with his staff.

There is another point I should like to make; and I hope he will consider this, too.

I shall propose this amendment. And I hope that here again his thinking will be amenable to mine. Under the atomic energy law, we specify three Assistant General Managers. We say "no more than three." And the AEC under this statutory authority today has three Assistant General Managers. But the language of the bill, on page 127, line 5, is "Assistant General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission." That is in the singular. The only trouble is that we have three Assistant General Managers today at the equal salary level of \$20,000. But the Senator provides for only one Assistant General Manager. What shall we do with the other two? We will have to downgrade them as well as others to the level of their division heads. We must treat these three General Managers alike.

I hope the staff will look into that and make this correction as well.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I shall be glad to look into that question. For the information of the Senator, we left it up to the Bureau of the Budget. The recommendation came from them.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know where they get their notions. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy watches this operation. It is not that we are trying to grab anything for anyone on the committee. But it would throw the whole organization out of kilter. We have three Assistant General Managers operating on an equal footing. It is proposed to provide for only one. What shall we do with the other two? Bury them?

The House made provision for it by leaving it to the Executive to fill an unspecified number of positions which the AEC understands would leave these three positions equal in level 5. In line 5, we could make "Manager" plural, and put "three" in parentheses. That would answer the question.

I shall make those two amendments. I hope the staff will look into that.

Mr. JOHNSTON. We shall be happy to look into it. We do not claim that the bill is perfect in every sense. But we did try to do as good a job as we could, working with the departments, and with the Bureau of the Budget, and with the staff of the House.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I make no criticism of the Senator. He and I have fought shoulder to shoulder on some of these measures. At one time, I had the honor of serving on the committee. I know how assiduously the Senator has worked, and how vigorous he is in his presentations to the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I appreciate that. I discovered when the Senator was on the committee that he was one of the most active members. He did an excellent job there.

The committee amended the House bill by imposing a ceiling of \$22,945 on the schedule for employees on Senators' staffs and Senate committees. The House version sets a limitation of \$24,500 on employees of House committees.

The House bill further provides that the effective date of all increases in excess of \$22,000 would be withheld until the effective date of the increase for Members of the Senate and House, January 3, 1965. The Committee decided that since increases in excess of \$22,000, particularly in the executive salary schedule, are of vital and immediate importance, it would be unwise to postpone the date of their disbursement. Accordingly, the bill is amended to provide that amounts of salary in excess of \$22,000 per annum shall be postponed until January 3, 1965, only in the case of officers and employees of the Senate and House.

When this measure was considered on the floor of the House, Representative UDALL introduced an amendment, which was adopted, to provide that congressional pay increases would automatically go into effect in percentage amounts related to pay increases enacted for employees and officers of the executive branch. I believe that this provision is a good try at solving a hard problem, but it is my view that it would not accomplish its apparent purpose. The committee was in agreement that this provision should be deleted from the bill.

If the proposed arrangement prevailed, the Congress would in effect be acting to raise its own salaries whenever it approved executive-branch pay increases, and those who criticize Congress whenever congressional pay is considered could once again raise their hue and cry, and the problem would be at hand once more.

I believe further that if congressional and executive pay were tied together by statute, the result might be a slowing down of consideration of warranted pay increases for employees of the executive branch.

Mr. President, a question has been raised with respect to the economic effects of this measure. I would remind those who express this concern that the comparability principle requires the Federal Government as an employer to follow the moves of the national economy—certainly not to lead it. The established procedure is for review and adjustment to determine whether salary scales have lagged too far behind those of the private economy as a whole, and to bring them up to business levels, but not above business levels, if a substantial lag has developed.

Productivity in the Federal service has been on the rise, just as it has in other sectors of the economy. For example, in the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury, production increased 13 percent from 1960 to 1962, but the manpower utilized was actually reduced by 11 percent. In the Department of Insurance of the Veterans' Administration, manpower was reduced by 22 percent between 1960 and 1962 as the result of a 23-percent increase in productivity.

It is my understanding that these reductions in manpower were accomplished through attrition and that the executive branch is continuously taking action to assure that productivity increases continue to be the rule.

It has been stated that the average weekly earnings of Federal employees are

approximately \$22 higher than those of employees of the States. This comparison, however, fails to take into account the differences in the employment categories involved. The functions of State governments differ markedly from those of the Federal Government. The Federal payroll at the present time includes thousands of some of the most highly trained individuals in the country. No State has a space program, for example; no State has a department of defense. Therefore, in my view it is erroneous to attempt to find a meaningful relationship between such entirely different types of groups as Federal and State employees.

Economy and efficiency in the Federal service are dependent upon the quality of Federal management, and the maintenance of high-quality management can be assured only by salary levels that will permit competent managers to remain in the service. A recent editorial in the New York Times expressed the situation in this way:

Those who oppose waste and extravagance in Government spending argue that raising the level of Federal salaries would be unjustified and inequitable. Yet the biggest single cause of waste, in Government or in private industry, is inefficient management. The Nation has been fortunate that so many skilled people have been willing to accept the financial penalties involved in Government service. But with the pay scales and fringe benefits available to high caliber personnel in private industry constantly rising, the Government will find it increasingly difficult to attract and keep executives with the talent and the training required for formulating and carrying out policy.

Mr. President, I now call to the attention of the Senate the cost of H.R. 11049, as reported. I regret to advise my colleagues that there are typographical errors in the chart displayed on page 4 of the committee report, but I am happy to point out that the erroneous figures overstate rather than understate the cost of the bill.

The total cost figure for this salary bill—verified by the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission—is \$556,836,341. The major reason for the difference in this cost estimate is that the net cost of title I should read \$536,036,341 rather than the \$543 million figure shown in the table. These estimates include the cost of Government contributions to the various fringe benefit programs Federal employees enjoy.

This is less than \$13 million in excess of the amount included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1965. I have been advised that in line with the administration's policy this additional cost will be absorbed by employment attrition and efficient management of Federal agencies.

Mr. President, I have a letter from the Bureau of the Budget which I wish to read at this time:

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., June 29, 1964.

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and
Civil Service, U.S. Senate, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As requested by you, the Bureau of the Budget has examined the cost estimates of H.R. 11049, as reported to

the Senate. When table 4 is corrected to take into account typographical errors in title I figures, the situation is substantially as follows:

Disregarding minor adjustments which approximately cancel each other out, the aggregate costs of the Senate bill have been increased approximately \$14 million over the President's maximum budget figures of \$544 million for the cost of pay legislation. The additional cost is attributable to the Senate committee's action in raising the middle grades of the Classification Act, Foreign Service, and Bureau of Medicine and Surgery schedules so that they will receive a 3-percent increase. The Bureau supports this amendment in the interest of equity and closer comparability between Government positions affected and the same level of work in private enterprise.

We must point out, however, that the President's budget allowance was a maximum allowance. The fiscal year 1965 cost of the bill must be held within that figure. Accordingly, it will be necessary through attrition, nonfilling of vacancies, and other actions to increase the amount of absorption required of the agencies so as to cover the excess costs.

Subject to the foregoing understanding, the costs of the Senate version of H.R. 11049 are without objection.

Sincerely,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Acting Director.

Mr. President, I strongly believe that Americans everywhere will support the provisions of this measure as representing equity and fairplay. I urge the Senate's favorable consideration of H.R. 11049.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to address myself very briefly to the pending bill. First, I commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] in the manner in which he conducted long and thorough hearings on the proposed legislation. I also commend the members of the staff for their valuable assistance in writing the pending bill.

H.R. 11049 as it passed the House was a bill of six titles. The very nature of the proposed legislation required thorough study.

I saw with a great deal of pride and frankness that every member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee gave long and sincere study to this legislation. They were determined that if a bill were to be reported, it should be reported after each member of the committee had a chance to study and discuss all titles of the bill.

The Senate committee made some changes in the House bill. We believe they were changes which make for better legislation and eliminate certain inequities.

The Senate bill gives a small increase over the House bill in four middle grades in the general schedule. This change more nearly reaches comparability and will affect grades 9, 10, 11, and 12. Many of these employees are managers and engineers. The percentage of increase will run about 3 percent.

I believe an inequity was removed from the postal field service by permitting an annual step increase through step 7 from level 7 up. Annual step increases were

permitted in previous bills for the first six levels through step 7.

These are only two changes which it seems to me are significant in that they help the employees in the middle or lower brackets.

Some salaries were reduced in the executive pay schedule and a few were raised a little.

It is very difficult in a bill like this to establish a schedule entirely equitable in all instances.

Mr. President, I want to assure all my colleagues that a lot of study and effort was put forth to bring out a bill that was as nearly equitable as possible. It is now up to the Senate to cast its decision.

I shall support the bill, H.R. 11049 as reported by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. President, one of our colleagues, a very valuable member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is unable to be present today. He has left with me a statement in which he strongly urges passage of the measure. I have reference to the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong]. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FONG

H.R. 11049, the measure presently before this body is one which I fully support. As a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I know from first experience the hard work and long hours the committee spent to bring to the floor of the Senate as equitable a bill as was possible.

I commend the committee chairman, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, and the minority leader on the committee, Senator FRANK CARLSON, for their effective leadership and patience in hammering out a bill acceptable to all members of the committee.

It is only fair and equitable that the Congress pass the Federal Salary Act of 1964 at this time. In fact, it is overdue. In the Federal Pay Reform Act of 1962 the Congress wrote into law for the first time what is commonly referred to as the comparability principle. This provision meant that Federal salaries should be comparable to those being paid for similar work in private industry.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics was directed to make annual review of private industry salaries and report to the President its findings and comparison of Federal salaries with those prevailing in private industry.

H.R. 11049 is the first step since the comparability principle was written into law in which Congress is asked to keep faith with the provision it approved in 1962.

The committee held extensive hearings over a period of approximately 8 months on Federal pay. Upon completion of the hearings the committee met in executive sessions for over 2 months in an effort to write a fair, equitable, and just salary act.

H.R. 11049 covers the full scope of Federal salaries—from executive to clerks. It is a comprehensive measure which, while bringing most Federal salaries into comparability with those in private industry, also corrects certain inequities in the Federal pay structure.

The average salary increase for Federal employees under the Classification Act is approximately 4.2 percent and under the postal field schedule 5.6 percent.

In the higher pay levels the committee admits that comparability cannot be followed, and in other levels the Federal pay scale con-

tinues to lag 2 or 3 years behind private industry pay. However, H.R. 11049 is as equitable a bill as can now be written. It is a good bill and will assist greatly in retaining highly trained and qualified personnel in the Federal service.

I strongly urge the passage of this measure.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have wanted to vote in favor of the pending bill to increase the pay of Federal employees. I have consistently supported such measures in the past, and hope to do so again in the future. If it were possible to evaluate this bill on its own merits alone, without regard to any other consideration, I would approve it and vote for it.

But it is not possible, in my judgment, to separate this bill from other action that Congress has taken in this session. Just a few months ago, we enacted the largest income tax cut in history. This was done to combat unemployment, stimulate investment, and enhance the rate of our economic growth. The tax reduction, which had the effect of increasing everybody's take-home pay, was carefully designed to promote the growth of production and employment, so that Federal revenues, collected at a lower rate from an expanding economic base, might rise to balance the budget and eliminate further deficit spending.

On the basis of the evidence already in, we have reason to believe that the objective we sought, in enacting the tax cut, is achievable, providing we hold the line on Federal spending and avoid further cuts in tax revenue. We pledged ourselves to do both, when we cut the income tax a few short months ago. I believe we should keep that pledge today.

Last week, I kept the pledge by voting against all reductions of Federal excise taxes, even though I know these taxes to be a nuisance and harassment to the small businesses of my State. I have asked the merchants of Idaho, who so strongly desire the repeal of these excise taxes, to wait until a balanced budget is in sight. This year the deficit may run to \$9 billion; next year, if we hold the line, it should be much reduced. In these prosperous times, we have to strive to restore a balanced budget, for we cannot continue indefinitely to spend more money than we take in.

I know that my stand against the repeal of the excise taxes, at the present time, was not popular with the businessmen of Idaho, and I fully appreciate that my vote against this bill will not be popular with Government employees, including the postal workers, who need the pay raise most, and who have been my special friends.

But I cannot, in good conscience, apply one standard to some of the people I represent, while applying a different standard to others. With the Government operating so much in the red, this is not the proper time to vote, either for further reduction in revenue, or for further increases in pay.

I hope that all those affected may understand that I take this position for the purpose of upholding fiscal responsibility. If we keep our pledge to hold the line, the day will soon come when Federal salaries can be adjusted, and Federal excise taxes can be repealed,

without adding to the debt, or enlarging its burden upon future generations. Then is the time to do it.

I intend, of course, to apply to myself, the same standard I am asking all the people I represent to accept for themselves. Accordingly, I shall vote to strike the proposed congressional pay raise from the bill, and I shall vote against the bill itself.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is with some reluctance that I shall vote against this pending bill. My firm belief in the principle of comparability between salaries paid civil servants and those paid in private industry is evidenced by my previous votes on Federal pay legislation.

I would be pleased to vote now for salary increases for the lower and middle brackets of the classified service and for postal workers. I cannot, however, support this legislation primarily because it contains large increases for the Members of the Congress and, secondarily, because of the unfairly generous treatment of the higher grades in the classified service.

It is true, Mr. President, that congressional salaries were last reviewed a decade ago and perhaps a case can be made for some adjustment.

During the period from 1945 to 1960 there were seven across-the-board raises which averaged out annually 4.1 percent for classified and 4.9 percent for postal employees. That is a total percentage raise of 61.5 percent for the classified employees and 73.5 percent for postal.

Considering only the period since 1955 when the last congressional increase was made in Members' salaries, the percentage raise for postal and classified aggregated 51 percent. But such reasoning completely overlooks the fact that the people of this country, in the very week that the Congress has been forced to raise the legal limit of the national debt, deserve better than to have that Congress vote for ourselves a large salary increase. They deserve leadership by example. This is the time for restraint, not for new and greater expenditures.

The cost of this bill would exceed half a billion dollars. It tends to be inflationary. Both in the interests of economy and in stemming the upward spiral of living costs, it should be rejected.

This administration professes to be economy minded, yet we are continually confronted with new spending proposals, each of which contains the elements for expansion in future years. Instead of approving such measures, now is the time to reverse the trend. Yet the pressure by the administration for more and more such spending schemes continues unabated.

As the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] pointed out in his recent letter to President Johnson, despite claims by the administration that stringent personnel ceilings have been imposed, the facts are the Federal payroll is running at the rate of \$16 billion a year, and going up; Federal employment is still approximately 2.5 million. This is well above the 2,352,000 jobs existing when President Eisenhower left office, after trimming 201,000

jobs from the payroll in his 8-year administration.

The Johnson administration, despite its economy claims, continues to push for more and more employees. In his fiscal 1965 budget, the President asked for new positions in 13 out of 24 major agencies.

The President must be willing to exercise restraint in his own requests both for spending and for new jobs. Then he will have earned the right to ask the people of America to reward those who make this Government operate.

Justification for higher salaries for the Congress, the top grades in the classified service, and for appointive positions is based on the argument that it is difficult to attract and maintain competent men and women in high Government posts when industry and business pay much better salaries.

Mr. President, the motivation for Government service at these levels must be based on more than dollars and cents. A Cabinet officer undeniably is paid less than a business executive with comparable responsibilities. But, we could never expect to pay the Secretary of Labor, for example, what the giant unions pay their presidents, or to match the salary of the Secretary of Defense with the multi-hundred-thousand-dollar salary of a huge manufacturing firm.

It is reported that Gov. LeRoy Collins is leaving a \$75,000 a year job as president of the National Association of Broadcasters to accept a Government post paying less than a third of that. These people come to Government positions because they are motivated by a desire to serve, not because of the salary. The same is true of the Members of the Congress.

It is unfortunate, Mr. President, that we are not allowed to consider a bill giving increases to those Government workers who unquestionably deserve them. On balance, however, the bad in this bill outweighs the good; accordingly, I shall vote against it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in my opinion, we have a solemn obligation to act favorably on this very commendable and very necessary pay bill.

When the Senate passed the Salary Reform Act of 1962, only three Members of this body voted against it. That measure committed Congress to the very sensible and reasonable proposition that Federal employees and postal employees should be relieved of the necessity of incessantly petitioning Congress to keep them abreast of the Nation's economic parade. The act, as it was passed, introduced into the Federal pay structure, for the first time, a scientific and dignified apparatus for adjusting Federal salaries whenever they fell significantly behind the accepted norm for similar jobs in private industry.

The late President Kennedy, using the apparatus we had approved, told us, on April 29 of last year, that postal employees' pay and Federal employees' pay had fallen considerably below accepted standards in private industry. We were morally committed to do something about that situation, but today, 14

months later, we are getting our first opportunity to live up to our obligation.

It was for this reason, Mr. President, that in committee I offered the amendment which was agreed to, and which will make this pay raise for the postal employees and the classified employees effective on July 1, 1964, instead of in the first pay period following the enactment of the legislation.

The fine people who man our postal service and our classified service have waited long enough for their comparability pay raise. With each passing month, they have been slipping behind the economic parade. When we pass this bill today—and I feel confident that we shall—there will have to be a conference, and then consideration by both Houses of the agreement reached by the conferees. All this adds up to more and more delay. In my opinion, it would be unconscionable for us to ask the Federal workers and the postal workers to take a further financial beating, just because in our legislative processes we have been somewhat dilatory.

Mr. President, I doubt that there can be any serious argument against the pay raises which this bill provides for Federal employees in the upper echelons of the service. All responsible authorities, both those in Government and those in private industry, agree that these positions must be more attractively compensated.

The U.S. Government is the largest and the most important business operation in the world. The Government is filled with positions calling for great intelligence, great judgment, great learning, and great moral courage. The decisions such men must make, as all of us know, often affect millions upon millions of human beings, both at home and abroad. Their decisions involve enormous sums of the taxpayers' money. They could conceivably involve the peace and security of the free world.

We simply cannot continue to compensate such positions with a wage that would be considered, in private industry, inadequate for an office manager or an assistant to a very junior vice president.

President Johnson has pointed out that we must prevent our Federal pay structure from becoming one that will repel the talented and will attract only the mediocre. We are perilously close to that point now. I think it is a miracle that we have been able to attract and retain the high caliber of men and women that we have today in the Government. But already the signs are becoming all too apparent that too many of the best and most talented people in the Government are finding the Federal service a luxury in which—in fairness to their families—they cannot continue to indulge. We are losing topflight people every day; and the only way we can stop this expensive exodus of talent is to make the positions more attractive than they are now.

If our huge and complex Federal Government is ever dominated by second-rate managers, we shall then be in serious danger of becoming a second-rate country.

We must repair the flaws in the present pay structure, and we must plan

boldly for the future. This bill does both.

It is a good bill. Under the able leadership of our chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], our committee deliberated over its provisions in depth and at length. When we approved it, we did so without a dissenting voice or vote.

The bill deserves the same enthusiastic support from the Senate as a whole; and I sincerely hope and trust that it will receive it.

It is our moral duty to pass this bill; and it is a matter of enlightened self-interest to provide for a Federal pay structure that will attract and retain the best available talent in the land.

FREE ENTRY OF CERTAIN MASS SPECTROMETERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4364) to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CURTIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

MEAT IMPORTS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that the Senate Finance Committee has just approved the Mansfield amendment, No. 465, to limit beef imports. The committee approved this amendment with a modification offered by Senator CURTIS. Under the amendment adopted, imports of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef after 1964 will be limited to 674 million pounds annually. This is generally the average annual amount which was imported in the 5-year period ending with December 31, 1963. Restrictions were also placed on importation of mutton, lamb, and certain prepared meats, on a pound basis.

The amendment provides for increases in the stated quotas whenever the average price in the United States for that meat equals or exceeds 90 percent of the average parity price provided the semi-annual production of cattle in this country exceeds 7,352 million pounds.

The amendment was adopted to H.R. 1839, a House-passed bill relating to the importation of wild birds and wild animals.

The bill will be reported to the Senate tomorrow.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of 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.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I shall call up my amendment. Before I do so, I point out that I am very anxious to obtain the yeas and nays on the amendment. I talked with the majority leader about it. At the present time it appears that there are not enough Senators in the Chamber to order the yeas and nays. So I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor, for the purpose of bringing a sufficient number of Senators to the Chamber so that I may ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin wish first to offer his amendment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be called up and that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment (No. 1084) is as follows:

Beginning with line 23 on page 108, strike out over through line 8 on page 115.

Redesignate titles III and IV as II and III, respectively; redesignate sections 301 to 310 as 201 to 210, respectively; and redesignate sections 401 to 403 as 301 to 303, respectively.

Beginning with line 4 on page 166, strike out over through line 2 on page 167 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE IV—EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 401. This Act and the increases in compensation made by this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1964."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I believe there are enough Senators present to have the yeas and nays ordered.

I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLER. If the yeas and nays are ordered on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, will it be open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be open to amendment, but not modification.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment is simple. It would delete from the bill, title II, "Federal Legislative Salaries." It would eliminate that part of the bill which provides pay increases in salaries for Members of the House and the Senate and employees of the House and the Senate.

A congressional pay increase is unjustified. When I say "unjustified," I mean exactly that word. It has not been justified in the hearings or in the Randall report.

During the hearings there was a little discussion of congressional pay, but very little, indeed. I challenge any Senator

to go through the hearings and find—the only one I could find was by the distinguished minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN—a statement in favor of a congressional pay increase. And even this eloquent statement is an undocumented generalized approval. The Randall report confines its justification to executive salaries.

I think a strong case was made, and a persuasive case so far as I am concerned, for an increase in salaries of executive and judicial employees. The testimony is voluminous and the comparability criterion that was introduced is most convincing. The fact is that this Government cannot hire people to serve in responsible and onerous jobs of our Federal Government if they are not paid on a basis comparable to what they can earn in private employment.

Since there last was a substantial increase for members of the Cabinet and judicial officials, there has been a great increase in salaries all over the country, but particularly in the highest salaries.

I feel very strongly that the need for a pay increase in those categories has been fully justified. It has been fully documented. It would be false economy if Congress should refuse to permit the Federal Government to pay sufficient salaries to enable the Government to hire some of the best administrators in the Nation to serve in responsible and important positions, in which persons could exercise their judgment in securing efficiency and economy.

But the same argument cannot be made for Members of the House and the Senate. This is a most difficult issue to debate, because we are all involved. It is difficult for us to argue against a pay increase for Members of the House and Senate.

I cannot think of anything that would make one lose popularity among one's colleagues more than to argue against a pay raise for them. In fact, I am having trouble with my wife on this issue. I am sure that those who vote for my amendment will find they may have trouble with their wives, children, or other members of their family who disagree. So it is not easy to make this argument. But the fact is that a pay increase is not necessary for Members of the House and Senate.

A Member of the House or Senate now receives \$22,500 a year. That pay is three times as high as the income of the average American family. Only 1 family out of 50 in the Nation receives as much as \$22,500 or more.

When one is paid this handsomely in any line of work, really the only justification to pay more is that we must pay more if we are to get the people to do the job. That is the justification for the increase for Cabinet officers and judicial officers. But the same justification cannot be made for Members of the House and Senate.

We all recognize the great expense involved in running as a candidate for the House or Senate. Why? Because there is great competition for the job. Candidates for the House and their supporters are willing to contribute, typically, \$25,000 or \$30,000, for a single campaign. In many States candidates for the Sen-

ate will conduct campaigns that cost \$250,000 or \$300,000, and some Senate campaigns cost \$1 million or more.

On the basis of competence and efficiency, I should say that the services of virtually all Members of the Senate could be valued abstractly at \$50,000 or \$100,000, or even more. Most Members of this body could make more on the outside than we make here. We have chosen to serve in this body because we like it, because the nonmonetary rewards are far greater than the monetary rewards. There is no question of the satisfaction that comes from serving in the Senate, in being one's own boss, in not being an administrator appointed by somebody else, of being able to work in accordance with one's own conscience, of, in effect, choosing one's own field, and devoting time and attention to it and meeting the great challenges that face our country in being a top American policymaker. That is the real compensation. Whether the salary were increased to \$30,000, or \$50,000, or \$100,000, the incentive to run as a candidate for the Senate or the House in my judgment, would not be substantially increased.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have a tabulation in my hand showing the pay increases that were granted generally to the Federal employees beginning in 1955. If I am incorrect in this statement, those who are experts in the matter may challenge me.

In 1955 a 7.5-percent pay raise was granted to the general employees.

In 1958 a 10-percent increase was granted.

In 1960 a 7.7 percent increase was granted.

In 1962 a 5.5-percent increase was granted, effective in 1962, with the provision for a 4.4-percent increase effective in 1964.

These figures show that since 1955 the general employees have received, in the aggregate, pay raises amounting to 35.1 percent.

I come now to the pay raises granted to Members of Congress.

In 1955 the pay was raised from \$12,500 to \$22,500.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. The salary was \$12,500, with an allowance of \$2,500 for expenses, but the salary was \$12,500, according to the report submitted.

Mr. MONRONEY. If the Senator will yield for a correction, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 established a \$15,000 salary for Members of the Senate and House. At that time, in 1946, Members were enjoying a salary of \$10,000 plus a \$2,500 allowance. When the Legislative Reorganization Act was passed a \$15,000 salary superseded the old salary, and that was the salary until the time it was raised to \$22,500 in 1955.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, it was \$12,500, with \$2,500 for an allowance. What does the Senator from Oklahoma say it was then?

Mr. MONRONEY. Then it was \$15,000 salary, and the expense allowance ceased to exist.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In 1955 the salary was \$15,000. Then it was raised to \$22,500. That is a 50-percent increase. It is now proposed to raise it from \$22,500 to \$30,000. That is a 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ -percent pay raise over 1955. If we take the \$15,000 pay in 1955 and compare it with the \$30,000 in 1964, the pay raise is 100 percent. How can we go back to the taxpayers and voters and say that we have granted, in the aggregate, a 35-percent pay raise to the general employees, but have granted to ourselves a 100-percent pay raise? I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin how he can answer conscientiously anyone who challenges him on the basis that he gave a 100-percent pay raise in 9 years to himself and gave the little postal carrier and the janitor and the washwoman 35 percent in the aggregate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. In general, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio. But I do think that on the basis of the Randall report and on the basis of the hearings, it is possible to justify a substantial increase for members of the Cabinet and some of the other leading administrators in our Government, on the comparability basis. It is a matter of judgment, but I think the Randall people were efficient. I think they were honest. I think they were objective. I believe that when they said that if we wish to have the kind of people who are competent to do important administrative and judicial work, it is necessary to pay them appropriately, they were right. I accept that.

Some of the increases are very substantial. I reject the principle that it is not possible to increase the salary of a Cabinet officer, and the salary of the other people in the Federal Government with responsible jobs, without at the same time increasing the salaries of the Members of Congress by the same amount. The jobs are entirely different. There is no comparability.

No member of a State legislature gets anything like the salary that we do.

It is true that when we get into the area of administrative jobs, we find that in California and in Illinois and in Pennsylvania, for example, in some cases 90 or 100 people get more than \$25,000 a year. They are administrators. Those States have found that the only way they can get competent people is to pay them an additional sum.

For ourselves, I do not find any justification for the proposed increase.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I cannot find any justification for the disparity that exists between the aggregate pay raises that were granted in 10 years to the general employees, amounting to 35 percent, while we are granting to ourselves an increase of 100 percent. We are in no different category so far as want and need are concerned.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On the basis of want and need there is no question about it. I feel strongly, and I have felt very strongly for years, that the rank and file Federal employees deserve better pay.

We can justify it on the basis of justice and need, and that it is necessary to do it in order to get people who fill comparable jobs outside the Government. But the only way we can justify paying more than \$20,000 a year is that a pay increase is necessary to pay that amount to attract qualified officials. The argument can be made, on the basis of the Randall report, that it is necessary to pay the additional amount to get the people who are competent to handle the important sub-Cabinet and Cabinet jobs.

That argument cannot be made with regard to Members of Congress.

If I run for reelection this fall I will have a very strong opponent, and most Members of Congress will also. All of us are well aware of the fact that there is plenty of competition when it comes to these jobs we hold.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator lost all of his staff members, does he think there would be others available in Wisconsin to work for him on the basis of the pay that he is now paying his staff members, without an increase?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe that is true in my case, too. I believe every Member of Congress has 10 applicants for every job he has available in his office. I should like to ask the Senator one more question. In addition to this pay raise of 100 percent in 10 years, I have before me a tabulation of what my retirement pay and the retirement pay of the Senator from Wisconsin will be. He has served 6 years. At the end of 6 years it is \$281.25 a month. With the increase in the salary from \$22,500 to \$30,000, the retirement pay would be \$406.25. That is for that 6 years' service. At the end of 12 years, on the basis of \$30,000, my retirement pay would be \$30,000 times 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ percent times 12 years. It would be \$6,000 a year. The point I am trying to make is this: Is it not a fact that in addition to the increase in pay, we would eventually become the beneficiaries of a liberal increase in our retirement pay?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no question about that. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We would become the beneficiaries of a liberal increase in retirement pay without having to pay anything into the retirement fund to support that increased pay.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There would be some increase, but nothing in proportion to what we would get out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We would pay in nothing on the basis of past service. We would pay on the basis of future service.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, is it not a fact that we pay in about 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ percent?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But only on the future salary. We do not pay it on the past salary.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator has found a different way of doing it. Apparently he has a new way of doing it, because I have been paying into the fund for 18 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us make this point clear. A person who goes to work for the Federal Government at \$5,000 a year and pays in 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ percent on his

\$5,000, and finally works himself up to a \$15,000 salary, has his retirement calculated on the \$15,000, on which he did not, through his entire service, pay 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ percent, and not on the basis of the \$5,000.

Mr. MORTON. That does not apply alone to Members of Congress. That applies to the entire Federal pension plan. It is figured on the basis of the average of the top 5 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is why the Federal pension fund is in the red in the sum of \$39 billion.

Mr. MORTON. If that is so, let us rewrite the law.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is not \$39 billion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is underfunded in the sum of \$39 billion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Kansas, for a clarification of this point.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not want to get into an argument between the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Wisconsin. However, readers of the RECORD should have the facts stated accurately. The Senator is really a little low in some of his figures.

Since 1955 there have been six salary increases for Federal employees, including increases of 7.5 percent in 1955, 8.1 percent in 1956, 10 percent in 1958, 7.7 percent in 1960, 5.5 percent in 1962, and 4.1 percent that became effective on January 1, 1964. That aggregates more than 51 percent.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has mentioned congressional increases in salary. The salary in January 1955 was \$22,500. Therefore, a salary of \$30,000 would not be a 100-percent increase; it would be an increase of 33 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No; I stated that clearly. If it was \$15,000 in 1955, and would become \$30,000 in 1964—

Mr. CARLSON. It was \$15,000 in 1946.

Mr. MONRONEY. The salary of Members of Congress was changed in March 1955. It is necessary to compare the salaries correctly by using the same base period; for example, the increase in 1955. It will be found that about the same amount of increase, about 35 percent, has been given to all Federal workers regularly throughout the 10-year period.

Under the committee's proposal, Members of Congress would receive an increase of about 33 percent effective January 1, 1965. Members of Congress did not receive an increase in 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, or 1960. Their salaries were increased in 1955. So let us keep the figures straight. The percentage is approximately concomitant between the starting figure in 1955 and the amounts by which Federal workers in the civil service have been raised during the intervening period and what is now proposed to be effective in 1965, a 33-percent increase.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I correctly understand that the Senator's amendment is designed to correct all the inequities in the bill?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure there are many inequities in the bill at which the amendments of other Senators are aimed. My amendment is aimed at the title dealing with Federal legislative salaries, title II.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are we to assume that if the Senator's amendment were adopted, he would favor the bill?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not understand the Senator's reasoning.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall favor the bill whether my amendment is adopted or not. I hope the amendment will be adopted; but I shall vote for the bill anyway, because I think it is so badly needed to get and retain the kind of efficient people needed in the Federal Government. I am for the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I disagree with the Senator so far as he says it is necessary to raise salaries in order to get efficient personnel for the Government. People are running over themselves wanting to get into the Government, just as they are running over themselves trying to be elected to Congress.

I do not disagree with the Senator in the main; but if his amendment is adopted and the bill is passed, he will be voting a pay raise for his administrative assistant to a limit that is higher than the Senator's own salary now.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; that is not correct. I would delete all of title II, which affects administrative assistants and all other Senate employees.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thought the Senator said his amendment affected only Senators and Representatives.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I was misunderstood. The amendment affects not only Members of the Senate and House; it would not permit an increase in pay for congressional staff members and would not permit increases in pay for Members of the House and Senate.

The Senator from Arkansas makes a good point. I think it is necessary to keep salaries in line.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The salaries of members of the Senate staff, under the bill, would be higher than salaries Senators now receive.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But my amendment would prevent that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would the Senator's amendment apply to all Members of Congress?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It applies to the salaries of Members of the Senate and House and to all other legislative salaries. All legislative salary increases are deleted by my amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under the Senator's amendment, would the members of the staff, from the lowest to the highest paid, receive no increase at all, whether in the House or the Senate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The answer is no. No increase. Of course, there is the possibility that a Senator who now has extra clerk hire available might increase his staff members, but my amendment would not by itself provide an increase

in salaries for employees of the legislative branch.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would the Senator's amendment allow the \$7,500 increase for Cabinet officers?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. As I understand, the Senator's amendment would preclude any increase in salaries for Members of the House and Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Members of the Senate and House and the staff.

Mr. PROUTY. I am sympathetic toward the Senator's position with respect to congressional salaries; but I believe some justification can be made for a reasonable increase in staff salaries. So at the proper time I shall offer a substitute which would eliminate the provision for an increase in congressional salaries; and if that should be adopted, I shall offer a second amendment, which would permit an increase in staff salaries up to \$22,000. In other words, the staff would not receive more than Members of Congress receive.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would be \$500 less.

Mr. PROUTY. That would be up to the Senate to determine.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe the committee did its work carefully, as it has always done in the past, to try to bring the salary payments, not only of the staff of other employees of the Senate, in proper relationship to what Senators receive. So we either must cut out the whole thing or, in effect, cut out nothing. Otherwise there will be a large number of employees of the Senate and of Senators who will receive, under the amendment the Senator from Vermont proposes to offer, more than Senators receive.

Mr. PROUTY. I wish to ask the Senator another question. A Senator does not have to grant an increase to his staff members if he does not wish to do so, does he?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; but there are doorkeepers and others, who are not responsible to any one Senator, who would be paid more than Senators are paid under the Prouty amendment.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I compliment the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for offering his amendment. I have been a Member of the Senate for a relatively short time—7½ years. In that time, I have consistently supported and voted for legislation designed to update the pay scale and fringe benefits of our Federal workers to insure them a standard of living equal to and commensurate with their counterparts in private industry.

Specifically, since 1957, Congress has passed three pay-increase bills which have increased the pay of Federal employees by a total of 27½ percent. These included a 10-percent increase in 1958, a 7½-percent increase in 1960, and a 10-percent increase in 1962, a part of which took effect only on January 1 of this year.

We are now informed that the pay of Federal workers is again lagging behind that of those in private life who are doing similar work and, therefore, are being called upon to further increase these salaries. In addition to classified and postal employees, the bill includes increases, some as high as 33 percent, for Members of Congress and leading members of the executive branch and the judiciary, including members of the Supreme Court.

My inquiry has verified the fact that the bill would increase the salaries of the pages sitting in front of us to \$5,004 a year. I do not see how anyone can justify that.

The bill comes to us in revised form after a previous bill, which provided even larger increases for high officials in the executive branch and Members of Congress, was defeated in the House earlier this year.

I support the principle of comparability between Government and industry and of paying a salary which is sufficient to attract qualified people to serve the Federal Government. I believe that the bill, in providing a one-third increase for Members of Congress, with similar increases for the executive and judicial branches, goes far beyond that point and, in fact, is completely unreasonable in this respect.

I point out that in addition to our salaries, the Government contributes 7½ percent toward our retirement benefits, which is a fringe benefit vested after only 5 years of service. The able Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], in an earlier colloquy with the Senator from Wisconsin, stated in detail how beneficial this is to all Members of Congress. If the salary of \$30,000 is retained in the bill as it came to the Senate, 7½ percent of that, in addition, will be contributed by the taxpayers of the country toward our retirement benefits, and it will be vested after only 5 years of service.

Only last week, this body voted to increase the national debt ceiling to an all-time high of \$324 billion.

In the past 34 years, we have balanced the Federal budget only about six times. It has been unbalanced 28 times. Although the exact figures will not be available for some time yet, I am informed that the fiscal year which ended at midnight last night, will probably show a deficit in excess of \$8,800 million. It is estimated to be approximately \$6,600 million for this fiscal year.

In the face of this kind of national financial picture, I cannot in good conscience vote for a bill which, among other things would increase my own salary by one-third, and in its present form would cost the taxpayers over one-half billion dollars annually.

I hope that the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, to strike the exorbitant increases for Members of Congress and to bring into reasonable proportion the increases for other Federal officials, will be adopted.

In the event that it is, I shall be glad to support the bill.

In the event that it is not approved, I cannot vote for it.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Georgia very much.

Before I yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], let me say that the point the Senator from Georgia makes about the effect of this proposal on responsible fiscal policy is particularly important. Not only have we the problem of the national debt, but only a few months ago we voted the biggest tax cut in the history of the Nation, a tax cut which certainly will deepen the deficit for this year, at least. There is no question about that.

The tax cut not only benefited many Americans, but it also benefited Members of Congress. It benefited Members of Congress far more handsomely than most Americans.

My staff people have computed that a typical Member of Congress, if he has no outside income, received the benefit from the tax cut of increased take-home pay of \$18 a week, or \$900 a year, which is a far greater increase than the overwhelming majority of the American people received from the tax cut.

It will be remembered that when we voted for the tax cut, it was made explicit that we would do everything we could to cut down Federal spending. How in the world can we honestly say we are working to keep Federal spending down if we vote ourselves a 33 1/3 percent increase in salary?

There might be a time for this kind of increase later, but not this year, not in a year when we have already voted a heavy tax cut, when we have deliberately planned to unbalance the budget to the extent that we have.

I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to participate in this debate, because the salaries of the very young men who serve us on both sides of the aisle have been mentioned. These boys receive \$387.11 a month. They serve during the sessions of the Congress. They serve an entire year at their present salary—12 months. At \$387.11 a month, the total for the year is \$4,655.40.

This bill would increase the salaries of these young men, following the pattern of other salaries, by \$29 a month. It is true that it would total a little over \$5,000—\$5,004.60.

The record should be made clear that these boys are serving by the month. If the session lasts 12 months, that is the salary they would get.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to express my support for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. There should be no question in the minds of the American people and those of us in this body on the justification of the proposed pay raises for the postal workers and the classified employees. Whether based on merit, comparability, or cost-of-living increases, Federal employees who are legally denied the opportunity to use the bargaining techniques

of their counterparts in private industry, deserve fair and thorough consideration at this bargaining table. We should be directing our attention to this question and this alone.

Inclusion of the congressional pay raise in this bill is totally inappropriate. Any such increase for Congress involves entirely different considerations and should be voted up or down on its own merits. If there is no justification for an increase at this time, then it certainly should not ride through on the legislative coattails of merited increases.

Entirely apart from the merits of whether we are entitled to more money or not, the fact is that there is virtually nothing in the hearings record dealing with the question of congressional pay raises. Whether the figure of a 33 1/3 percent increase was picked out of thin air and whether it may be justified or not is unknown.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. That is exactly what this congressional raise is—legislative coattail riding.

Look at the hearings. There is virtually no justification for a congressional increase. There is some justification for an increase in the executive and judicial departments. Many prominent organizations and persons have appeared and documented the case for executive and judicial pay increases. However, there is no justification for the increase for Members of Congress. It has been argued that if we increase the salaries of the executive and the judicial branches, we should also increase the congressional. Why? Why?

We increase the salaries of the executive and the judiciary, therefore we have to do it if we are to get competent people to do the job in those two branches of our Government. That argument does not apply to Congress.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator is correct. Let me add one comment. I would prefer to have this amendment apply only to Members of Congress. I understand the problems to which the Senator's amendment is directed. But, in my judgment, the staff members as employees of Congress are deserving of increased compensation now. It would be preferable to adopt the substitute proposal of the Senator from Vermont, which is limited to Members of Congress.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from New York. I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am strongly in favor of increasing the pay for postal and classified personnel, and also for the judiciary. But I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin to eliminate legislative salary increases. Nevertheless, I believe it should be realized that the actual take-home pay of a Senator or Representative is very much less than commonly believed, after he meets the necessary political expenses of his office. I do not believe that any Senator who votes for an increase in pay should be singled out by the voters, or by anyone else, for condemnation. Nevertheless, for a number of reasons, I am opposed to this increase for Members of Congress. I shall vote

for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I am keenly aware of the difficulties of living on our present congressional salary after meeting the necessary costs of such items as: First, trips back home and travel inside the State, plus, second, the cost of radio and television reports, third, the entertainment in Washington of constituents; fourth, donations to charitable organizations and causes which are expected, and, indeed, almost demanded of public officials; and, fifth, contributions to party funds and to the campaigns of other candidates. After these deductions together with income taxes and contributions to the retirement fund are subtracted from the salary of \$22,500, my actual take-home pay in nonelection years is almost never above \$7,000 and in election years even less.

All this is a strong argument for an increase in congressional salaries and I do not have the slightest criticism either expressed or implied for those of my colleagues who so vote. But I cannot bring myself to do so for the following reasons:

First. We in Congress have some opportunity for legitimate outside earnings. It is true that the work in Congress is steadily increasing and is at times almost crushing. But there are still opportunities, on weekends, and when Congress is not in session, to earn additional modest amounts in law practice, business, writing, and lecturing. Any danger of a consequent conflict of interest with one's duties as a Congressman can largely, if not entirely, be averted by requiring full disclosure of outside income and ownership as Senator MORSE and I advocated many years ago and as is now being urged by Senators CASE, NEUBERGER, CLARK, and KEATING.

Second. We should remember that with all our financial difficulties we in Congress are still in a very favored economic position. We should never forget that at least 40 million Americans, or slightly over 20 percent, are living in poverty and that 90 percent of American taxpayers have incomes under \$10,000 a year. Probably less than 2 percent have an income of \$30,000 for which we are now asked to vote. And yet we are supposed to represent the great bulk of the American people. The danger is that if we provide a salary of \$30,000 for ourselves, then it will be easy for us to think as \$30,000 a year men customarily do—and to forget what it feels like to live as do the overwhelming majority of our fellow Americans whose interests we should have at heart.

Third. Finally, I resent esthetically being put in a position where I must vote on my own salary. No one with any personal dignity likes to exercise the power he possesses to vote himself an increase. I am willing to vote for an increase to others, and, indeed, I favor the other portions of the pay bill, but I would prefer that any increases in congressional salaries should come primarily from others, such as on the recommendation of an impartial committee. I know that in the present instance this

is almost impossible to effect and that we are now compelled to decide on our own condition. In addition to the reasons which I have stated, I would therefore have a certain squeemishness in voting myself an increase, however justified this might be on other grounds.

For these reasons I shall support the motion to eliminate congressional salary increases from the bill. But I wish to add that in my judgment there should be no condemnation of those Senators who do vote for the increase and against the amendment. For I know from experience just how difficult the problem is for those without large private resources and that this is particularly hard for those with large families to support and educate.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina, chairman of the committee, who has been patiently waiting for a long time. I apologize to him.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I should like to follow up what the Senator from Illinois has just stated. When we put the \$7,000 on top of the present salary rate, we find that we would receive only 58 percent of the increase. The rest of it will be taken out for income taxes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may seem to be arguing in part against myself, but, as I stated, if we deduct the expenses of trips back home, travel inside our States, the cost of radio and television reports, entertaining our Washington constituents, donations to charitable organizations, the cost of which is expected—indeed, is almost demanded of public officials—and legitimate and proper contributions to party funds, and to the campaigns of other candidates, there is not much left. I believe that this does make a strong case for an increase. Nevertheless, I am opposed to the increase. I am not given to self-flagellation, but I am opposed to the increase, the reasons for which I have explained.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to the Senator from Illinois that although he is supporting my amendment, he has made the strongest argument against it that has been made yet.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is much to be said for such an increase since this is a complicated question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is, indeed, but this extraordinarily judicious and judicial cast of mind is typical of the senior Senator from Illinois. It is typical of his approach to all questions.

In reply, however, our TV, newsletter, and other reporting to our constituents is strictly voluntary. Certainly it is voluntary in the view of those against whom we run. This reporting is a fine thing in democracy. But it is construed by many as self-serving. Some Senators do not ever make a TV or newsletter report to their constituents.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is perhaps the greatest traveler in the Senate. I do not know any Senator who is more energetic than he in getting back home to see his constituents. I shall not inquire what his travel bill is, but it must be very large judging from my own travel

bill which amounts to approximately \$3,000 a year. I think all these items should be taken into consideration. But, nevertheless, since we can have legitimate outside occupations in which to increase our income we Senators are still in a very favorable economic condition in comparison with other citizens of the United States. It is humiliating to be forced to increase one's own salary. There is an esthetic objection which I have to that.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, about a half hour ago I was challenged rather vigorously as to the correctness of my statement with regard to when the pay raises were put into effect.

Since that time, I have had copies of the acts brought to me. I submit that the acts will demonstrate without any question that the salaries of Congressmen in 1946-57 was \$12,500. I have here Public Law 601 of the 79th Congress, chapter 753, 2d session. This law was passed as the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. That is the act which the Senator from Oklahoma said provided for a salary of \$22,500.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Oklahoma said nothing of the kind. I stated it provided a salary of \$15,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. All right. Let me read what it states:

Effective on the day on which the 80th Congress convenes, the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of \$12,500 per year.

That is what I said. The language of the act definitely establishes the correctness of what I said. I further stated that it was in 1955 that the salaries were raised from \$12,500 to \$22,500.

I have here Public Law 9 of the 84th Congress, chapter 9, 1st session, House Resolution 3828. The act was approved by the President on March 2, 1955. This provides:

The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of \$22,500 per annum.

A half hour ago I stated that the salaries in 1946 were \$12,500. They were raised in 1955 to \$22,500. They are now intended to be raised to \$30,000. These laws speak for themselves.

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

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

Sec. 4. (a) Section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of \$22,500 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of \$35,000 per annum."

(b) Section 601(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (rela-

tive to expense allowances of Members of Congress), is hereby repealed.

(c) Section 104 of title 3 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of the Vice President) is amended by striking out "\$30,000" and substituting therefor "\$35,000".

Sec. 5. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on March 1, 1955.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Compensation of Members of Congress

Sec. 601. (a) Effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes, the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of \$12,500 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President of the United States shall be at the rate of \$20,000 per annum each.

(b) Effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes there shall be paid to each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from the Territories, Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, an expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses relating to, or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liability shall incur, or accounting be made; such sum to be paid in equal monthly installments.

(c) The sentence contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1946, which reads as follows: "There shall be paid to each Representative and Delegate, and to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, after January 2, 1945, an expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments.", is hereby repealed, effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes.

(d) The sentence contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, which reads as follows: "There shall be paid to each Senator after January 1, 1946, an expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments.", is hereby repealed, effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I repeat that from \$12,500 to \$30,000 is a \$17,500 increase since 1945, or 140 percent.

If those who challenge me—and I see them on the floor—can find any written law, and not their memory, I wish they would find it and show it to me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before I yield further, in order that we might have some order in this debate, I would ask other Senators who ask me to yield, to make their statements brief, if they would, or wait until I yield the floor. Then, if they want to carry on a debate, they can carry it on themselves. The way this debate is being conducted now, with this Senator farming out the floor, is not an orderly way to proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would the Senator consider a time limitation on a vote on the amendment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator from Ohio is willing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We will be here late on this one amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No. I object because I found myself running out of time on

every occasion when an important vote was up.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator from Ohio would yield for a minute, I think the Senator from Montana only mentioned a time limitation on my amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. As far as I am concerned, it does not make a bit of difference to me. I know what I shall do. The Senators can speak from now until doomsday. I shall still vote the same way. We shall stay late tonight. If the Senators do not want to get on to a vote on the amendment, it is no skin off my nose.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will accept any limitation that the majority leader wants to impose. Would the Senator from Ohio be amenable?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would be willing to talk about it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would the majority leader propose a time limitation on this one amendment alone?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would like, on this one amendment, to propose that we vote on this amendment at 6 o'clock.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have a substitute to this amendment. I do not like to delay it. It will not take me very long. But I want to protect myself.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Excuse me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on page 217 of the Senate hearings on the Federal pay legislation, it is shown that the pay scale of 1946 was \$15,000, the total compensation being \$15,000. According to footnote 5, this includes a \$2,500 expense allowance which was tax free until 1953, when it was made taxable under the provision of the Revenue Act of October 20, 1951.

This allowance was discontinued effective March 1, 1955, by the same legislation which increased the salary rate for Members of Congress to \$22,500. So, the record is absolutely clear that the pay that Members received was a total of \$15,000, \$2,500 of which was tax free at that time.

It was tax free at that time and it was changed by the Revenue Act of 1951 and made subject to the normal income tax. So we are talking about a salary of \$15,000 up to 1955, at which time it was changed to \$22,500.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I rise briefly in order that the record may be corrected in connection with the statements made by my distinguished colleagues, from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and New York [Mr. KEATING], to the effect that the hearings disclose no compelling arguments for increases for the Members of the Congress of the United States.

I refer to May 18 of this year when the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], appeared before our committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will permit an interruption, I should like to say that the Senator from Wisconsin

specifically mentioned the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and said that he did make an appearance on congressional salary increases. As usual, it was a very effective and eloquent appearance. But I said that that was the only appearance in favor of the congressional increase that I could find. And that appearance was not documented. So far as I can find, no organization appeared to document and support specifically the proposed congressional pay increase.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Randall Commission had done so. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] referred to that study. I did not hear all of the Senator's prepared speech of today. I only heard him say in his colloquy with the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] that there had been no argument advanced during the hearings for a congressional pay increase. I heard that only a few moments ago. I repeat a very valid argument was made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] before our committee. President Lyndon Johnson has effectively and energetically advocated an increase for Members of Congress. Perhaps there are a few Senators who voted to decrease their salaries while they were Members of the Congress of the United States. In 1933 I served with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], as Members of the House. I voted to decrease our salaries to \$8,500 a year. So from time to time we have the opportunity and the responsibility to act. We are charged by the Constitution of the United States with setting our salaries. It is a task we must meet by law.

I find no fault with any Senator who disagrees with our committee in its bill. However, I remind the Senate that the Senator from Illinois advocated not the \$7,500 increase included in the recommendation of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and as contained in the measure. He recommended an increase to \$10,000. I think that point should be included as a part of the record. I emphasize that I have no disposition to argue with a colleague on this subject. It is a challenge that, very frankly, we should vote on. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has said, in essence, that in a few minutes or a few hours we will vote as we believe. I believe any Senator knows whether he or she will vote for or against an increase.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is perfectly right when he says that the committee did exercise discretion in not going as high not only as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] recommended but as high as the Randall Commission recommended.

The President of the United States also recommended a \$10,000 increase for Members of Congress. I am not saying that the committee was particularly excessive, but I do say that neither in the hearings nor in the report of the Randall Commission—and I have the report beginning on page 12 of the hearings—could I find any justification for the proposed congressional increase except, as the Senator from New York so well said, it was a free ride on the increase for the executive and the judicial

branches. There was no specific justification for the proposed congressional pay increase.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not true that in the opinion of the Senator from Wisconsin each and every Senator knows exactly whether he or she will vote for or against the proposed congressional pay increase?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed. That is why I was ready to vote on the question some time ago and why I was ready to agree to a request for a time limitation on the debate as proposed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the proposed pay raise is justified, and I shall vote for it.

I have in my hand my income tax return, which Senators are free to look at. The return has been checked by representatives of the Federal Government. I have been one of the guinea pigs.

In my 1960 return I have itemized my deductions. The Government looked over the return. They disallowed about \$100 or \$200, I believe, by the time they got through examining the returns.

On the return I have listed such expenses as my home office expenses; additional telephone and telegraph; public service broadcast, in connection with which I paid for the film, although the station ran it free of charge as a public service; publication clipping service, so that I could see what a low rating I have been getting from the newspapers in my State, and occasionally a complimentary remark; photographs sent out to someone who thought enough of me as to wish a picture that they could hang on the wall; petty cash for the office staff, and that sort of thing; entertaining constituents; dues to professional organizations; unreimbursed office expenses that I incurred.

All of those expenses add up to \$28,078. My salary was not exactly \$22,500 because I received some additional allowances, such as postage, on which I made a little money. Some allowance should be made for that. I grossed \$24,000 and my expenses were \$28,078. So the best I can make of it is that I was \$4,000 in the red.

Those figures demonstrate that I have not allowed anything to send my daughter to college. No allowance has been made to operate my home in Louisiana. The figures did not allow for transportation back and forth from home to office and personal expenses. Nothing of that sort is included.

What I have stated is what I can deduct because I had the expenses that go with being a U.S. Senator.

Last year I made out better. I think I actually came out better by about \$3,000. But I am the lowest paid man in my office. In other words, by the time the expenses are considered, the boy who runs errands between my office and the Senate Chamber is paid twice

as much in terms of net income, as I am paid.

Mr. President, I believe I should make a few dollars out of the job. It is most difficult for the Senator from Louisiana to explain to his wife why he is serving for a minus income. I am donating my services because I love the country and the job.

Some Members of Congress are bachelors and some have children who are away, supporting their own families, and are doing so adequately.

Mr. President, I am having prepared an amendment which I shall offer, which will provide that before a Member of Congress receives the proposed pay raise, he will sign a statement, first, that he is of the opinion that his services justify his receiving the proposed pay raise.

Second, that unless he receives the pay raise, he will not be able to meet his essential expenses of providing the services that he is trying to provide for his State, his constituents, and his Nation as a Senator. If he really did not believe that, and if he could not subscribe to that statement, he would not receive the increase. For example, he may be like my friend on the House side, whose name I shall not mention, even though he makes no secret of his attitude. According to his own statement, he gives his entire salary to the church. After he pays his taxes, whatever he has left over he gives to the church. He is working for God and the country. If all we are doing is acting upon a proposed pay increase in order that Members of Congress may donate more to the church, I could not go along with the proposal because it would violate the principle of separation of church and state. [Laughter.]

We should not pass a pay raise bill which would merely put more money into a church's till.

But if some Member of Congress has need of the increase in order to provide the service that is expected of him and that he would like to provide for his constituents, then he should be able to state that he is worth that amount of money to the country for the services he is rendering and that the expenses he incurs actually justify his receiving the increase. I would not require that a man make money in his private endeavors in order to carry the expenses of being a U.S. Senator. The salary should be adequate so that one could give up his law practice, if that were his sole source of income, in order to serve his country as a Senator. On that basis I expect to vote for the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has said that in 1960 his expenses were \$28,000. Obviously the proposed \$7,500 increase would not be nearly enough. On that basis it could be argued that if our salary were \$40,000 it would not be sufficient.

We are outgoing people. We love to entertain our constituents, to serve our constituents, and to report to our constituents. We would find ways of spending that much and more. But this kind of spending is voluntary. It is usually political. And it is frequently self-serving.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My amendment would make it possible for my friend from Wisconsin to be a cutrate Senator. He could say, "If the people up there don't want me, they can vote for someone else, but I come cheaper." [Laughter.]

Let us consider some Members who are not really worth the money paid. They attend only about half the rollcalls. They would not need to certify that they were worth the money. They could then do their job at a lower figure. They could say, "I have not done much. I have not been very constructive, but look at all the money you are saving with me in Congress. It will not cost you much to have me around." A man could be a cutrate Member of Congress under my amendment. [Laughter.]

I hope there will be some. I am satisfied that there are some Members of Congress who are not worth that money.

On the other hand, the last two Presidents of the United States have been Members of the Senate. My guess is that as Senators they worked as diligently to discharge their duties to our country as they did when they were President. When President Lyndon B. Johnson was sitting in the seat now occupied by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], he tried to serve his country as well as he is now doing in the White House, although now he receives in pay several times what he made then as a Senator.

Mr. President, unless I miss my guess, though it is the same man, he is worth a great deal more money because it was the decision of the people to put him where he is.

Some of these people are being very inadequately paid, while other people are being paid too much. I am going to offer an amendment that will leave it to the conscience of Members of Congress as to whether they should get such pay or not.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall be delighted to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. I am sure all 100 Senators will feel free to vote for it. When it becomes law we can cheerfully sign to the effect that our services justify our salaries, and that our services are essential to the Nation.

I said before that I thought the services of Senators are worth \$50,000 or \$100,000, but we know that we do not have to increase the pay of Senators to persuade them to serve here. There is much competition, outstanding competition—too strong competition—for this office. Therefore, there is no justification for paying a salary increase of a whopping one-third when a Congressman already makes more than what 98 percent of the people of America receive.

The Randall Commission made the case for the executive department. It did not make a case for Members of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Perhaps the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, instead of providing that a Member should certify as to what he thinks he is worth, should provide that the people back home should say how much they think he is worth.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That would be a dangerous amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I want to support the Senator from Wisconsin in his pending amendment. I think a pay raise for Members of Congress should be decided on its own merits, without being a coattail rider to this bill. Some employees of the Government will be getting less than a 1.6-percent increase. I do not know why we should hook on a 33½-percent increase for Members of Congress as a rider to this bill. I think a pay raise for Members of Congress should be considered as a completely separate bill. I would like to support portions of the pending bill.

There is nothing in the law which requires a Member of Congress to spend \$8,000, \$10,000 or \$15,000 to advertise himself and to help get himself reelected. If Members of Congress want to be reelected they should pay for it out of their own pockets, the same as our opponents are required to do.

I am in favor of the cost-of-living increase proposed in this bill for the postal workers and other civil service workers. This amounts to a raise of from 2 to 5 percent.

If the pay for Members of Congress is increased by 33½ percent it also has a mathematical effect of increasing the retirement benefits by 6½ percent for each year for the next 5 years. This should certainly be taken into consideration when the retirement fund already is insolvent.

Certainly the proposal to raise salaries of Members of Congress should be dealt with in a separate bill rather than hooked onto this bill as a coattail rider.

In line with what the Senator from Ohio has said, there seems to be an argument as to what the congressional salaries were in prior years. In 1946 congressional salaries were \$10,000, beginning in 1947 the congressional salaries were \$12,500 plus \$2,500 expense allowance, the latter item being tax free.

In 1953 I introduced the amendment which made that \$2,500 allowance taxable. This made the whole \$15,000 salary taxable.

In 1954 there was another increase of 50 percent, to \$22,500.

So, mathematically, Members of Congress had a 50-percent increase in dollar income in 1947 and another 50 percent increase in 1954, and the present proposal would be a 33½ percent on top of that, which means that if the bill is passed Members of Congress will be receiving a 300 percent increase over and above what they were receiving in 1946. Congressional retirements are increased at an even larger percentage under these bills.

I think these facts should be dealt with and pointed out when an attempt is being made to hook an increase onto a pay bill which increases the pay of the average Federal employees from 2 to 5 per-

cent. This proposal should be separated and made on its own merits. If it cannot be supported on its own merits it should not pass.

I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin which would strike from the bill all proposed increases for the legislative branch. If this is successful I will support the other provisions of the bill. But if they are kept tied together I shall not vote for the bill.

When Congress has balanced the budget but six times in the past 35 years I do not think we merit a raise of the proportions suggested here.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Delaware. He is correct when he says that this congressional salary increase is strictly a coattail rider. There is no question that if a congressional pay raise were proposed by itself, it might face quite a different fate than what is now proposed.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 457 Leg.]

Aiken	Hruska	Monroney
Allott	Inouye	Morse
Beall	Johnston	Morton
Bennett	Jordan, Idaho	Moss
Burdick	Keating	Mundt
Carlson	Kuchel	Nelson
Church	Lausche	Prouty
Clark	Long, La.	Proxmire
Cotton	Mansfield	Randolph
Douglas	McClellan	Scott
Fulbright	McGovern	Sparkman
Gore	McIntyre	Thurmond
Hart	McNamara	Walters
Hickenlooper	Mechem	Williams, Del.
Holland	Miller	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CASE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MUSKIE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. TOWER, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RBICOFF], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent to attend the funeral of a relative.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute and ask that it be read and given immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the language contained in the pending amendment, insert the following: "On page 114, strike out lines 17 to 24, inclusive.

"Beginning with line 5 on page 166, strike out over through line 2 on page 167 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 501. This act and the increases in compensation by this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1964."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to advise Senators that I intend to speak briefly. If they will remain in the Chamber, perhaps we can vote in the near future.

The amendment would merely strike from the bill the provisions permitting increases in congressional salaries. There is much logic in some of the arguments to the effect that an increase in congressional salaries is needed. I remember reading in the New York Times magazine several months ago an article by a Member of the other body who was serving his first term in Congress. Formerly he had been a professor in a university. He said, if I recall the article correctly, that his university salary, which was about half the amount of his congressional salary, enabled him to get along much more comfortably and to save more at the end of the year than he could possibly have saved as a Member of Congress. There is much merit in that argument.

Yet people throughout the country have a feeling that the salaries which we receive as Members of Congress are high enough to enable us to live luxuriously. They fail to realize and appreciate the tremendous burden of expenses which the average Member of Congress must assume in his campaigns, his entertain-

ment of constituents, his travel, and in many other ways—expenses which no business or professional man is faced with.

Despite these things, we cannot blink the fact that we knew what the office paid when we sought it. Nor can we deny that millions of other Americans are forced to live, day by day, on the tiniest fraction of our own incomes.

The disabled worker, the unemployed family man, retired folks living on meager pensions—all of these know what it means to tighten their belts and to go without things they might like to have or which they actually need.

At present, however, the Federal budget is far out of balance. It is likely to be out of balance for some time. Should we not in such circumstances establish some list of priorities, some catalog of claims and rights, that ought to take precedence over our own?

Let there be an increase in congressional pay, but let it come on that day when social security benefits, compensation for the disabled, and aid to the unemployed are at adequate levels of decency.

Let it come when our Federal financial house is in order and when we have taken care of first priorities first.

Many Members of the Senate and House feel that they need and can justify a pay increase; but who among us would deny that there are others who need help much more than we do?

The argument may be made that if my amendment in the nature of a substitute were adopted, it would make it possible for members of the legislative staffs to receive greater compensation than is paid to Members of Congress. However, if my amendment in the nature of a substitute is approved, I shall offer a second amendment which would make it impossible to increase staff salaries beyond \$22,000. Thus, staff would not be entitled to more compensation than is being paid to Members of Congress.

That is all I wish to say. I am ready to vote at any time.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Do I correctly understand that the Senator's amendment in its present form would limit all staff increases to the maximum of the salaries paid to Members of the Senate and House?

Mr. PROUTY. No; the second amendment would do that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The first amendment, however, would bar an increase for Members of the Senate and House. In other words, their salaries would remain at \$22,500. It would permit the compensation of the Librarian of Congress, the Public Printer, and the Architect of the Capitol to go to \$26,000; it would permit the salary of the Deputy Librarian of Congress to go to \$24,500; and would permit the compensation of the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the legislative counsel of the Senate to go to \$27,500?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct; but, as I have explained, I shall

offer a second amendment, in case my amendment in the nature of a substitute is approved.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the amendment of the Senator from Vermont were rejected, it would mean that the entire legislative title of the bill, title 2, could be eliminated, and no increases would be provided for members of the legislative branch?

Mr. PROUTY. No, indeed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, which is a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, does not prevail, the Senate will have before it the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, which simply deletes title 2 and eliminates legislative increases. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I think we are putting the cart ahead of the horse with respect to the amendment. If we adopt the Prouty amendment in the nature of a substitute, and if we then defeat the second Prouty amendment, we shall be in a rather ludicrous situation.

Furthermore, if we adopt the Prouty amendment in the nature of a substitute and then adopt the second Prouty amendment, or if we adopt the Proxmire amendment, consider the situation that will confront us.

On page 115 of the bill, provision is made for the salaries of Cabinet officers at \$35,000.

On page 116, salaries of \$30,000 are provided for such persons as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

On page 117, salaries of \$28,500 are provided for the Deputy Postmaster General and, among others, the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Director of the Peace Corps.

Beginning on page 20, salaries of \$27,000 are provided for the Deputy Administrator of General Services; six Assistant Administrators of the Agency for International Development; four Regional Assistant Administrators of the Agency for International Development; the Deputy Director of the Peace Corps; Counselor of the Department of State; Legal Adviser of the Department of State; Governor of the Farm Credit Administration; Inspector General, Foreign Assistance; members of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and many others.

I note that, beginning on page 124, salaries of \$26,000 are provided for other types of Federal appointees, such as the Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture; the Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency; four Deputy Administrators of the Small Business Administration; Associate Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Deputy Associate Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Chief Forester, Forest Service; Chief Postal Inspector; Chief, Weather Bureau, Depart-

ment of Commerce; Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission; two Associate Commissioners, Indian Claims Commission; and such other persons as Associate Director for Volunteers, Peace Corps; Associate Director for Program Development and Operations, Peace Corps.

One would think there would be a few volunteers in the Peace Corps headquarters.

Another such position is that of Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Hundreds of such people would be drawing salaries considerably higher than the salaries of Members of Congress.

This is a very unfair, unwise, and stupid move. Do not think that we shall be fooling the folks by taking such a step. I doubt whether any votes would be gained by such a move as this.

If Senators do not want to ride in on the coattails of the Post Office and Civil Service employees, the thing to do is not to provide salary increases for the judiciary and executive branch, including the hundreds of people to whom I have been referring, and for all Members of Congress. Then take up a separate bill. Let those stand on their own merits. I have not had the floor very long. Many Senators will please face it and not suggest a vote at this time because I am perfectly capable of going for a long time; but I am going to say something on this subject, because I believe there is much—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The Senator will suspend. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Chair.

I believe there is a little bit of what we might call, very politely, window dressing in the Chamber, in discussing this bill.

The Senator from Ohio pointed out a certain position for Members of Congress that has occurred in the past few years. I wish that the Senator from Ohio had given us a comparable list of increases in salaries of the various officials which I have read off, as well as the Federal judiciary.

Let us treat everyone alike, instead of singling out Members of Congress.

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

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Examination of the record will show that pay raises have gone on in extravagant fashion with all except the lower class of employees. The proportion of the increase may not be so great for commission members, board members, judges, and others, as it is for Senators.

Mr. MILLER. In many cases, it will be found to be about the same. I believe that the RECORD should show this.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I directed my remarks to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin because it dealt only with the legislative branch, but I believe that my remarks are just as effective against the judiciary, board members, and others.

I read in the newspaper the other day that an exhibitor of a foreign country at the New York World's Fair had to pay \$150 to get a clogged sink loosened.

If we keep passing this kind of pay raise, how will we ever stop the inordinate and extravagant demands that will come in from all over the country?

If we begin to give ourselves this huge pay raise, will anyone dare to open his mouth against inflationary measures?

We recommend 3.2 percent as a general pay increase, but we are going to give ourselves 33 1/3 percent over the \$10,000 which we gave ourselves in 1955.

I agree with what the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] said 2 hours ago: How can we do it?

This haste for a vote, this shouting to vote, seems to me to be an indication that we wish to drop the curtain as quickly as we can so that our voices will not go out to the country on what we are doing here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I find it a little difficult to understand why we are so anxious to pick on ourselves all the time, and so loath to say anything about the executive branch downtown which will get the large raise that is contemplated in this bill. They have got cars and chauffeurs.

How many Senators in the Chamber have cars and chauffeurs?

What kind of people are we?

Do we have a position of importance, or do we not?

Do we have to fight for a job, or are we appointed?

There are too many Senators who are picking on Members of their own body, finding fault with ourselves.

We are all for the "little guy." No one wishes to do anything to hurt him. But, now we have something directed against us. We are getting too much. We knew what the salary would be when we ran for office. Of course we did.

The responsibility for raising our pay, or as the Senator from West Virginia said, for lowering our pay, lies with us. We have to make that choice. We have to go back home and tell the people what we did or did not do.

I wonder what kind of people we are.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise only because of what the majority leader has just said. I should like to sustain him. I shall vote against these amendments. I shall be happy to explain it to my people.

With respect to an increase in salary, as a Senator, I have always spent more than I have received in salary. I probably always will, due to the requirements of this position.

As a Senator from New York, with the manifold accompanying duties imposed, many of which, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has listed, I have in-

curring substantial expenditures for research, living in Washington, and travel.

Mr. President, our job as U.S. Senators, is to earn what we receive. We should make no apology for it. We are entitled to a decent living. I have been on many boards of corporations. I was a lawyer representing substantial businesses long before I was a Senator or Representative. During those days, we would be delighted to pay \$30,000 or \$35,000 a year to a good branch manager of a bank, or to a vice president, or to the manager of a modern industrial plant provided that he did a good job.

The majority leader is absolutely right, we should not be apologizing. We should be determined to stand up in a refreshing way, which the American people will like, and respect. We should say "yes," we are going to pass this pay bill as it was reported by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee because on the scale of salaries paid modern business executives, we are worth it.

I am 60 years old. I have been a successful lawyer. I have earned three times what I shall receive as a Senator at \$30,000 a year. I need apologize to no one. There is no need for any other Member of this body to do likewise.

What we should resolve is that we will do a good job, and that we will do the job which is fully worthy of the pay we shall receive.

I am sure that the American people will be refreshed by the fact that we will face our responsibilities in that way.

A Senator is entitled to a decent and a dignified living.

It is impossible to earn a decent and a dignified living unless we do something about a pay adjustment in light of modern conditions.

One other point: We have a major role in the operation of the \$100 billion business of the running of the Federal Government. Let no one forget that. We and the other body are the "board of directors" of that business. It is the greatest business mankind has ever conjured up.

It seems to me that we should be able to make ourselves worthy of this salary increase to the American people.

We must not compare ourselves with those earning \$4,000 to \$5,000 a year, as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] propose, and that we reduce our pay to that level. Of course not. We demean ourselves in the eyes of the country.

We need only compare ourselves with those of commensurate responsibility.

I believe that \$30,000 a year is a very fair salary—very fair. I am fully prepared to justify it to any fairminded jury of Americans in my State—or in any other State of the Union.

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

Mr. MILLER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe that the whole case is misstated in discussing congressional salaries.

We are not appropriating money or authorizing it for EVERETT DIRKSEN or for BARRY GOLDWATER or for JACOB JAVITS

or for WIN PROUTY. This authorizes the money that shall be paid for the office that we occupy.

If the people back home do not believe we are worth it, it will not take them very long to haul us back from Washington.

It is about time for us to recognize the fact that this authorizes pay for an office which is set up under the Constitution of the United States.

Tragically enough, this is one of the unsolved problems in the Constitution of the United States, because it provides that the remuneration of Senators and Representatives shall be ascertained by law.

What is the lawmaking body? Congress is the lawmaking body.

We have no choice. We have authority over the President's salary. We have authority to fix the salaries of judges, except that we cannot reduce them. We have authority over the salaries in Government, and we have the vexing task of fixing our own salaries.

It is about time for us to face the issue.

What is the Senate going to look like, when the House of Representatives by a majority of 87 has put this pay raise for Representatives in the bill—and if I had it to do, it would be larger—believe me. But what is going to be the comparison?

It will be said, "They have some guts in the House of Representatives, but the Senate would not stand up to it."

I had something to do with this bill twice before. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] will remember that in 1946 in the formulation of the Reorganization Act, when he was vice chairman of the committee, a pay raise and a retirement system were provided. Did we receive any backlash? Certainly we did not. I offered a resolution in 1954 to set up the Segal Committee of 18 persons.

They made their report. And then we had to discount their report. I am sorry I ever let it happen without making a protest. But timid people said, "Cut it \$2,500." And I let them talk me into it, for which I am sorry. We have the same thing now. It is said, "If we cut it just a little, maybe you can take it." I did not find that the electorate took any exception to it particularly. Then we raised it. Now, I suppose, judging from the remarks of my distinguished friend from Ohio, we are far ahead of the game.

Will my friend from Iowa bear with me a few minutes?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We started in 1789, when Representatives and Senators received \$6 a day when they attended a session. A farmer receives five times that much today.

In 1815, 26 years later, an annual salary of \$1,500 was finally set. We had to wait 26 years to catch up. Think of it. We do not see workers doing that when collective bargaining is involved.

In 1817, the rate was placed at \$8 a day.

In 1855—38 years later—there was a change in congressional salary. It then became the munificent sum of \$3,000 a year.

In 1865, the last year of the war, it was placed at \$5,000.

Six years later, it was set at \$7,500. They never did catch up.

Then, in 1874, what was done? The rate was reduced back to \$5,000.

In 1907—31 years later—the salary of Members of the House and Senate was raised. Then, it went back to \$7,500.

In 1925—they had to wait 18 years for the next pay raise—the salary was set at \$10,000.

So there have been only four increases since the Civil War—a period of 99 years. Just think of it. When we talk about reducing our salaries, or removing them from the bill, we demean our own bodies. I will not do it. If my people want to drag me back home, they can do so. I have defended these pay raises before. And I intend to do so again.

The Senator from Ohio raised the question about how this proposal compared with the situation of employees in Government. I have a statement from the Budget Bureau. They took as a base the postal clerks, and, taking grade 4, carried through a comparison with congressional salaries from 1935 to 1964.

That is a period of 29 years. And what was the aggregate? The employees received a total increase of 194 percent. The Representatives and Senators received a 170 percent increase. We never did catch up. And it is about time for us to catch up.

If we want to put it on a base of productivity and take 3.2 percent as a productive level from 1955 to 1964, even on that basis, our pay ought to be \$31,000.

In 1935, when I was in the House, our pay was \$10,000. How much income tax did we pay? \$188. So, after taxes we had about \$9,800 left.

The purchasing power of the dollar then was 100 percent. So we can say that out of our salary in 1935 dollars, we had a purchasing power of \$9,800.

What was it in 1955? We went up to \$22,500. Deductions for living expenses were \$3,000. The net salary was \$19,500. The income tax was—not \$188—but \$3,954. After taxes, what did we have left? \$15,500. The purchasing power of the dollar had dropped to 51.3 percent. So, how much did we have left out of \$22,500 in terms of 1935 dollars? We had \$7,975 left—indefinitely smaller by nearly \$2,000 than we had in 1935.

In this bill, a salary of \$30,000 is proposed. There would be deductions of \$3,000 and a net salary of \$27,000. The income tax will be—not \$188—but \$5,532. After taxes, what have we left out of \$30,000? \$21,468.

The purchasing power of the dollar as of now is 44.4 percent. The purchasing power of our salary in 1935 dollars is \$9,532. We are \$400 behind what we received at \$10,000 in 1935.

If one questions the figures, call up the Deputy Director of the Budget, call up the Director of the Civil Service Commission. They will supply a copy of the figures.

Any way we take it, this increase for Members of Congress ought to be larger than that which is provided for in the bill. I am not going to modify it. But I hope we shall not face this issue with

a degree of timidity and let the ballot-box scare anyone. JOE EVINS, of Tennessee, made a count of every House Member who voted for the House increase in salary in 1955. Not a Member who voted for it who was defeated was at the polls.

Is it not about time that we assert our own prestige and take our place in the sun of government?

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. We do not hear the executive branch mentioned. The opponents take on their own branch. It will not pay off at all.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me tell Barkley's story and then I shall yield.

It will be remembered that when Barkley went home, an old fellow told him: "I voted for you. I am not going to vote for you again." He said, "Why not?" The fellow said, "I am not going to vote for a stupid guy who voted not to increase his salary when he was entitled to it."

Now I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator might yield to me for one brief statement.

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Illinois mentioned a comparison of the situation in 1964 with that existing back in 1935. The Senator did not mention that in 1935 Congress stayed in session for 5 months on an average in the year. The Members of Congress had 7 months in which to practice law. Two-thirds of the Members of the Senate were lawyers. My father made a lot more money as a lawyer than as a Senator. As a matter of fact, as I remember it, my mother told him that he could not afford the job. He replied: "Congress is going to raise the pay." The first thing they did was to cut the pay when they got in.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I remember that. I was on a couple of investigating committees, and from one end of the year to the other, I was scarcely at home. This is a 12-month job, any way we take it.

Go back home and see what happens. Constituents will make a beaten path to the offices or to the homes of Senators, or wherever they can find them, because the world is full of business which is somehow localized and centralized in this body.

Every amendment that has been offered—and there are 8 or 10 of them—ought to be voted down by the Senate, because they degrade this body. We ought to have short shrift of it and take some pride in the fact that we are attaching a paycheck to a job and not to the person who is in it. Let the people decide whether he has earned it or not. I am sorry. I thank my friend.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator need not be sorry, because he has said as eloquently as any Senator why we should vote against the pending amendment. I repeat that all we have to do is to look at the pages in the bill to which I re-

ferred and look at the hundreds of Federal employees who would be drawing more pay than a Member of the U.S. Senate if the Prouty amendment and the Proxmire amendment are adopted.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, after careful thought, I have decided to vote against the congressional pay raise. I cannot in good conscience vote to increase my salary at a time when many of my constituents are financially pinched. So I will support the amendment to eliminate the increase in congressional salaries from the bill.

It is true that the cost of living in official Washington is very high. It is true that with five children to rear and educate, I have some financial anxieties with my present income. Each year, I must reach heavily into my salary, to cover the cost of travel to and from my State. Each year, I must devote a part of my salary to postage, television films, radio tapes, and the entertainment of constituents, not covered by the office allowance.

But I cannot bring myself to vote to raise my pay, when thousands of farmers, ranchers, cattle feeders, businessmen, and working people are under as much or more financial pressure than I am. If the congressional pay raise is eliminated from the bill, I could then vote to raise the salary of other Federal workers and postal workers who are hard pressed to make ends meet. If the amendment to remove the congressional pay raise fails, however, I will vote against the entire Federal pay raise bill.

So far as I am concerned, I would rather see Congress provide adequate allowances for the operation of our offices, including travel allowance. We would not be in need of a salary increase if we did not find it necessary to devote so much of our salary to traveling back and forth to our States and to financing such costs as telephone calls, telegrams, and other costs that may run to several thousand dollars a year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] in the nature of a substitute. 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 Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], are absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay" and

the Senator from Florida would vote "yea".

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent to attend the funeral of a relative.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 60, as follows:

[No. 458 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Burdick	Hartke	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Robertson
Cannon	Hruska	Scott
Church	Keating	Simpson
Cooper	Lausche	Symington
Cotton	Mechem	Thurmond
Curtis	Morton	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Moss	
Fulbright	Mundt	

NAYS—60

Aiken	Hart	Metcalf
Allott	Hickenlooper	Miller
Anderson	Hill	Monroney
Bartlett	Humphrey	Morse
Beall	Inouye	Muskie
Bennett	Javits	Nelson
Bible	Johnston	Neuberger
Brewster	Jordan, N.C.	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Proxmire
Carlson	Kuchel	Randolph
Case	Long, Mo.	Russell
Clark	Long, La.	Smith
Dirksen	Magnuson	Sparkman
Dodd	Mansfield	Stennis
Dominick	McCarthy	Talmadge
Douglas	McClellan	Tower
Eastland	McGee	Walters
Goldwater	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	McNamara	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—15

Bayh	Fong	Pell
Boggs	Hayden	Ribicoff
Edmondson	Jackson	Saltontall
Engle	Kennedy	Smathers
Ervin	Pearson	Yarborough

So Mr. PROUTY's amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the attention of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], for a moment, because I need a little help and clarification. There are some aspects of this bill that disturb me very much, but, at the same time, I think most of the increases are justified.

Am I correct that, so far as the civil service workers are concerned, the increase for them is at a much lower percentage—somewhere between 3 and 5 percent—as compared with the percentage of increase for Cabinet officers, judges, and others in the so-called higher pay brackets?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is true. It is higher.

Mr. MORSE. What is the difference?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The increase is about 33 1/3 percent for Members of Congress and of the Cabinet. Does the Senator want the figures all the way to grade 1? The increase for that low grade is 2 or 3 percent, because those employees have received more frequent increases in the past.

Mr. MORSE. They have been receiving many increases, but the increases give those in the lower brackets an annual income of approximately how much?

Mr. JOHNSTON. For the classified employees, the grades go all the way down to 1, and the increase there is very low.

Mr. MORSE. Many of them are in the salary bracket of \$8,000 or \$9,000, as compared with \$20,000 or \$30,000 in the upper brackets. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. We must act on proposed legislation as it comes off the calendar. Sometimes the order in which it is considered is not what we would prefer. It is too bad that the Senate does not have before it the legislative appropriation bill ahead of the bill it is now considering. I have listened to some very interesting debate this afternoon about problems that confront Members of Congress in regard to salaries and costs and expenses of the job.

The so-called political expenses of the job certainly should not be borne, directly or indirectly, by the taxpayers. We sought the job, and we should be expected to pay the so-called direct and indirect political expenses of the job. Yet some of the speeches this afternoon surprised me a little in that they seemed to imply that we ought to give some consideration to the fixing of salaries based on what we have to pay for so-called political expenses.

However, there is a type of expense connected with the job that is based upon a formula which is applied that works many inequities within the Senate. I refer to the allowances that are granted for so-called office expenses, using as the determining factor the population of a State as compared with others, with not too much weight given to geographical distances, nor too much weight given to the actual difference in the business done as compared with other offices.

I do not want to engage in any personal discussion other than to say, for example, that some of us who come from States with relatively small populations are greatly limited in the expense allowance to our offices, but are put to much heavier expenses than are other Senators, for a variety of reasons. I suppose such a matter is determined to a great extent by the discussion of Senators.

I shall be brief when I make this statement, but for many years on the floor of the Senate I have said that I think the taxpayers are perfectly willing to pay for the legitimate expenses of a Senator's office in transacting Senate business.

I have not kept records on this matter, except for the past 12 years.

I plow back into my desk, and have for years, the equivalent of three honorarium speeches to pay the extra cost of transacting business in connection with long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and airmail stamps, which run to \$800 to \$900 out of my own pocket.

I mention it now only because I hope that when the Senate considers the legislative appropriation bill this year, the Appropriations Committee will take a long look at the formula. I have insisted for years that if more money were to be allowed for the expenses of a Senate office, it should be on an accountable basis, and that accounting should be published for the benefit of the public.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I invite his attention to the fact that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] is present? He happens to be chairman of the subcommittee that handles the matter the Senator from Oregon is discussing. I merely wanted to call to the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma what the Senator from Oregon is discussing.

Mr. MORSE. It is important that we take care of the actual official Senate expenses of our offices rather than put Senators in the position where they do the business but pay for it out of their own pockets. I do not think the taxpayers expect that.

I wanted to make that point in this discussion. It does not have a direct bearing on the issue before us; it has an indirect one.

I do not know why there is this reticence to allow an accounted expense allowance which actually covers the official cost of operating the office of a Senator in serving the people of a State and of the Nation.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I merely wish to say that I agree 100 percent with the Senator from Oregon. He is absolutely correct. In fact, I go further and say that a Senator from Hawaii or Alaska or Washington or Oregon has an enormous travel expense. The present allowance is for only three trips home. Under those circumstances it is very unjust. The way to handle the situation is not by way of a general salary increase but, as the Senator has implied, by permitting a Senator to be compensated for all the legitimate expenses of his office.

I shall support such a proposal in any way, shape, or form with regard to telephone and telegraph expenses. I agree that the taxpayers would understand such a proposal.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. There is some confusion between official duties and political interests. I recognize that fact. However, following the course of action that I follow in the Senate, if I did not go home at least one weekend a month, I would not have any political boards left on my fences back home. One does not go home one weekend a month free of expense.

I see my good friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] smiling. That is why, through his good offices or the

good offices of the Senator's assistant in Chicago, I will stop off in Chicago and make a speech, which will cover the expenses, or perhaps make a speech in San Francisco or Seattle or somewhere else.

Let us face the realities when we get to the legislative appropriation bill, and see to it that we take a good, long look at the problem.

That leads me to my next point. We should make very clear that with respect to expenditures for telephone calls and telegrams and for air mail stamps, there should be a public accounting once a year.

My next point is that in due course—not tonight—I shall offer an amendment to the bill. I have several amendments, but I shall offer one which will be the old 1946-as-revised-from-time-to-time Morse full public-disclosure bill. A Senator came to me a few minutes ago and said:

One of the things that I like about your public disclosure bill is that it does not limit itself to Members of Congress, but covers the judiciary and the Cabinet and other officials in the high income bracket.

I shall press that amendment later. Those are factors we ought to consider in connection with the pending bill, rather than speed the bill through very quickly, as there is at present—and I say this most respectfully and noncritically—pressure in the Senate.

I am always unhappy when I cannot accommodate myself to certain proposals. Some amendments ought to be considered. I cannot accommodate myself to proposals that have been made in the past hour for a unanimous-consent agreement to fix a time, to limit debate on amendments, and to limit debate on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Senator from Oregon for bringing to the attention of the Senate some of the matters we have considered in committee in recommending an increase in congressional salaries.

If Senators will look at pages 116 and 117 of the bill, they will note that we brought the compensation of Members of the Senate and the House in line with those of Under Secretaries of the executive departments. They have traditionally been in that bracket. So far as additional expenses are concerned, we did not consider the expenses that the Under Secretaries have either. I do not believe that the Members of the Senate and of the House ought to be in a lower bracket than the Under Secretaries of the executive departments.

There are about 19 who have the same salaries as Members of the House and of the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Iowa proposes to strike lines 2, through 6 of the Proxmire amendment No. 1084 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "through line 3 on page 166"; on page 2, line 1, change "title IV" to read "title II".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Members of the Senate, very briefly, all the amendment would do would be to transform the Proxmire amendment, which eliminates legislative salary increases into an amendment which would eliminate salary increases for the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government. It keeps intact the classified employees' salary increases.

It seems to me there ought to be a choice offered to the Senate. The choice the Proxmire amendment presently offers is really no choice at all. If we were to support the Proxmire amendment we would be singling ourselves and our staff members out for a discriminatory type program as against the executive and judicial sides of the Government.

If my amendment is adopted, the Proxmire amendment will be before us to vote on, and we can decide whether we wish to take care of only the classified employees or whether we wish to take care of the employees of all branches of the Government.

That is the choice we would have.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, everybody would be stricken out except the voters.

Mr. MILLER. May I say to the majority leader that I have no intention of doing anything like that with my amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. MILLER. To evaluate my amendment in that fashion is very much to oversimplify the problem.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It takes in millions and leaves out a few thousand.

Mr. MILLER. That oversimplifies the point. The Proxmire amendment in its present form singles out the legislative branch. I do not think that is the choice we ought to be offering the Senate. It seems to me we ought to be given the choice of taking care of the classified employees and nobody else, or taking care of the classified employees and not singling out the legislative, judicial, and executive branch.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree in that respect. If we are to do anything with respect to Congress, we had better do it to the other branches of the Government, too.

Mr. MILLER. The majority leader now states my proposal exactly. I am happy that he gets the point.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, while the amendment can be excused on the ground that, if we are going to strike against Congress we should also strike at those employees in the executive and judicial branch of the Government who are supposed to use their brainpower to make plans in an atomic age for a future that we hope America can have, I think we would be killing the very thought behind the kind of bill President Kennedy and President Johnson, and most students of government, have urged us to pass. The crisis in the executive branch of this great Government in the atomic age, with a hundred billion dollar budget, with a burgeoning population, automation, and all the various problems that are on our doorstep, must be solved by the best minds money can obtain.

Surely; we would save some money. We would save \$20 million out of a cost of \$556 million, by taking this step. We would reduce the prospect of having the best people that can be found in the field to fill the jobs in the executive department. Yes, we will appeal to a lower class of people to run for Congress, because they will know it will not be possible to manage and pay expenses and put anything aside to educate their children. They will know there will be no opportunity to hold their heads up in respectability in carrying on the duties of office, as we are expected to carry them on by our constituents back home.

Four million one hundred thousand dollars is the cost of congressional pay. That is 0.7 percent of the total cost. We will pay the legislative employees and other officers \$9,600,000. In this great Government of ours, with more than 2 million employees trying to supply the services, including the military and other needs, only 536 Members of Congress plus 2 other officers are elected. That is the total elective complement of our great democracy: 435 Members of the House, 100 Members of the Senate, plus the President and Vice President. The rest are all appointed.

Is it worth anything to preserve, to attract, to try to bring into the elective system men of competence? Perhaps we do not need them; but I have never found that a good salary, a salary that would help a man to pay his expenses and live in respectability, denied qualified persons the opportunity to run for office.

Why did the people support the Reorganization Act of 1946? It was because they wanted Congress to amount to something. They wanted to have competent persons working on our staffs, not retired mail carriers acting as secretaries for the Committee on Banking and Currency, or an inexperienced person from back home acting as the secretary or chief staff member of the most important committee of Congress, the Committee on Foreign Relations. No; they wanted good staffs, so they directed Congress to pay to the staffs of Members of Congress salaries equivalent to those paid in private business. That is what we did. That is why Congress has been measuring up to its responsibility in trying to meet the challenge of the new problems of today. We have been able to have just as good members of the staffs working and assisting us to pass legislation as the executive offices downtown have in administering it. Let us not downgrade our staffs.

The majority leader and the minority leader have described Congress as the people's branch of the Government. We will get what we pay for. Members of Congress must have decent salaries if they are to pay their own expenses in entertaining friends at lunch. In trying to maintain the positions we are expected to maintain as Senators, both here and at home, we must have a suitable standard of living. We try to provide for education, to maintain our libraries, to have the things we need. I think this is worth bringing the pay of Members of Congress up to parity. Parity was not set for us by a committee

or by Congress or by members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of either House. It was set after a careful study and as a result of executive leadership. It has been urged upon us by both President Kennedy and President Johnson.

We have tried to establish parity with the Federal judges. Our pay will come out even with theirs at \$30,000. We will have parity with the under secretaries of the departments at \$30,000. If Senators will look through the bill, they will see that we have tried to establish parity of service and qualifications.

We provide a higher salary for Cabinet members; but historically Members of Congress have been linked with the pay of Federal judges, which have been less than that paid to the Cabinet.

Let us not downgrade the branch of the Government in which we serve, because millions of people throughout the world would be willing to give their right arms to have a legislative body such as ours—staffed with personnel such as that which serves the Senate and the House.

I hope the Senate will defeat the Miller amendment and the Proxmire amendment and will then move on to pass the pay bill, which has been so long in coming to us.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa would agree with much of what the Senator from Oklahoma has said, but I cannot quite understand why he made the statement he has made against the Miller amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am against the Proxmire amendment. I would be forced to say that if we adopted the Proxmire amendment, we would be doing ourselves a disservice by downgrading ourselves far below the current going rate. We have praised the value of the staffs in the executive department.

I do not choose to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, because I am against the Proxmire amendment. I favor the bill as it has been reported. It is a good bill. It will serve the country well. I think the civil service employees are entitled to a pay increase. So are the executives and other officials who have not had a raise for 10 years, while the other employees have had a 30- or 35-percent increase. The schedule works out fairly.

I shall have to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Iowa because I do not believe in cutting out the very heart of the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Why not support the Miller amendment to the Proxmire amendment and then vote against the Proxmire amendment as amended? If the Senator does not do that, he will not afford the Senate a decent choice on which to vote. If the Proxmire amendment carries, the Senator would be demeaning the legislative branch as against the executive and judicial branches. If the Senator votes for the Miller amendment, he will not have to demean himself in that way.

Mr. MONRONEY. Then I would have voted for an amendment that would destroy at least a great portion of the bill, the portion that would attract efficient, effective executives. I shall not vote for this amendment. If I am to be against

the Proxmire amendment, I must also be against the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Oklahoma would have plenty of opportunity to vote against the principle he is talking about, once my amendment and the Proxmire amendment were adopted. I am trying to give the Senate a reasonably fair choice as to whether it wants to provide a general salary increase for executive, legislative, and judicial officers, along with the classified civil service, or wants to let those three groups stand by themselves in a separate bill. That is a fair choice. But under the Proxmire amendment, unless it is modified by my amendment, the Senate will not have a fair choice.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should say that the Senator's amendment, if adopted, would put on record many Senators as being against an excessive pay bill. Therefore, they would be asked to vote for the Proxmire amendment, because the funds for the brainpower we are hoping to attract to the legislative and executive branches would have been stricken from the bill.

Mr. MILLER. I intend to vote for the Miller amendment as a modification of the Proxmire amendment. I think I could in clear conscience vote against the Proxmire amendment as modified.

I think the Senator from Oklahoma could vote for my amendment to give the Senate an adequate choice, and then turn around and vote against the Proxmire amendment, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent to attend the funeral of a relative.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts

[Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 64, as follows:

[No. 459 Leg.]

YEAS—21

Bennett	Ellender	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Cannon	Lausche	Smathers
Church	McClellan	Talmadge
Cotton	Mechem	Thurmond
Curtis	Miller	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Mundt	Young, Ohio

NAYS—64

Aiken	Hartke	Morse
Allott	Hickenlooper	Morton
Anderson	Hill	Moss
Bartlett	Holland	Muskie
Beall	Hruska	Nelson
Bible	Humphrey	Neuberger
Brewster	Inouye	Pastore
Burdick	Javits	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Proxmire
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Case	Keating	Russell
Clark	Kuchel	Scott
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Smith
Dirksen	Long, La.	Sparkman
Dodd	Magnuson	Stennis
Douglas	Mansfield	Symington
Eastland	McGee	Tower
Fulbright	McGovern	Walters
Goldwater	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Metcalf	
Hart	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—15

Bayh	Fong	Pearson
Boggs	Hayden	Pell
Edmondson	Jackson	Ribicoff
Engle	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Ervin	McCarthy	Yarborough

So Mr. MILLER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. 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 Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent to attend the funeral of a relative.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily ab-

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 53, as follows:

[No. 460 Leg.]

YEAS—32

Allott	Hartke	Robertson
Burdick	Holland	Simpson
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Smathers
Cannon	Keating	Stennis
Church	Lausche	Symington
Cotton	McGovern	Talmadge
Curtis	Mechem	Thurmond
Dominick	Moss	Williams, Del.
Douglas	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Prouty	Young, Ohio
Gore	Proxmire	

NAYS—53

Aiken	Hart	McNamara
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Metcalf
Bartlett	Hill	Miller
Beall	Humphrey	Monroney
Bennett	Inouye	Morse
Bible	Javits	Morton
Brewster	Johnston	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Nelson
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Neuberger
Case	Kuchel	Pastore
Clark	Long, Mo.	Randolph
Cooper	Long, La.	Scott
Dirksen	Magnuson	Smith
Dodd	Mansfield	Sparkman
Eastland	McCarthy	Tower
Fulbright	McClellan	Walters
Goldwater	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	McIntyre	

NOT VOTING—15

Bayh	Fong	Pell
Boggs	Hayden	Ribicoff
Edmondson	Jackson	Russell
Engle	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Ervin	Pearson	Yarborough

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I announce that my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], is unavoidably detained on official business. But if he had been present he would have voted "nay" on the last amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I call up my amendment. The cosponsors to the amendment are Mr. CURTIS, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. BENNETT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] proposes amendment No. 1078, reading as follows: At the appropriate place insert a new section as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this bill the effective date of any increase on any salary of \$20,000 or over, shall be the first day of the first month after the close of a fiscal year with a balanced Federal budget.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no further votes tonight.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

CONFERENCE ON ROLE OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the so-called Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 or war on poverty legislation is before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It will be considered next week by the full committee. I shall have some amendments to the legislation at that time. In the meantime, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that at my instance, there was a conference on the role of the Federal Government in the war on poverty, called at New York University on May 11, 1964.

The conferees were headed by cochairman Dr. Miguel A. de Capriles, dean of the School of Law of New York University, and Dr. Alex Rosen, dean of the School of Social Work of New York University. The conferees included some of the most distinguished men and women in the country, men and women from great foundations, governmental agencies, and universities interested in this particular field.

Mr. President, my office has developed a digest from the stenographic transcript of the ideas and concepts which were developed there. I believe that this information from so many experts is worthy of the consideration of every Senator both now and when we finally come to consider this very important measure. As it develops in a very interesting way the lines of an editorial in the New York Times of June 24, 1964, headed "War On Poverty," I ask unanimous consent that in the body of the RECORD there may appear the digest of the conference to which I have referred, followed by the editorial from the New York Times of June 24.

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

DIGEST OF CONFERENCE ON THE ROLE OF THE
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN THE WAR ON POVERTY,
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, MONDAY,
MAY 11, 1964

CONFEREES

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS and staff, Mr. Allen Lesser.

Cochairmen of the conference: Dr. Miguel A. de Capriles, dean, School of Law, New York University; Dr. Alex Rosen, dean, School of Social Work, New York University.

Others:

George Brager, Mobilization for Youth, New York City.

Ersa H. Poston, State division for youth.

Anne M. Montero, city commission on human rights.

Benjamin H. Lyndon, dean, School of Social Welfare, State University of New York, Buffalo, N.Y.

James R. Dumpson, department of welfare, New York City.

Clark Tibbitts, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

John J. Hurley, Bureau of Family Services, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Father Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, D.J., Fordham University, Bronx, N.Y.

Henry H. Foster, Jr., professor, School of Law, New York University.

Winslow Carlton, group health insurance, New York City.

John P. Walsh, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Ben Zimmerman, mayor's commission for youth, Syracuse, N.Y.

Peter Kasius, State department of social welfare.

Willard Heckel, dean, Rutgers School of Law, New Brunswick, N.J.

Felician Foltman, New York State School of International Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Edward W. Foss, Department of Agricultural Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Marjorie Buckholz, Graduate School of Social Work, New York University, New York City.

Melvin Hermann, Mobilization for Youth, New York City.

Alexander Allen, Urban League of Greater New York, New York City.

James E. McCarthy, Mobilization for Youth, New York City.

John M. Martin, Fordham University, Bronx, N.Y.

Edward Feitelberg, office of the president of the council, New York City.

Elma L. Greenwood, National Council of Churches, New York City.

Bernard Lander, professor, Hunter College, New York City.

William F. Walsh, mayor, Syracuse, N.Y.

The conference directed its attention to three major areas of the war on poverty—youth, unemployed workers, and the aged—and their relationship to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Opening the discussion, Senator JAVITS made the points that the war on poverty should be regarded as a long-term war which requires bipartisan support, that it calls for a selective approach rather than a one-shot omnibus attack, that it should be waged jointly with State and local governments, and that it is more than a one-man job and should be guided by a board of strategy with an executive director which would enlist the cooperation of civic and community leaders and organizations. He further emphasized that the unemployed should not be lumped with the endemic poor, and that in any comprehensive program there should be provision for close coordination with numerous existing Federal programs.

I

Dr. Melvin Hermann, who heads the youth and work program of Mobilization for Youth, made a sharp distinction between youth unemployment and youth poverty, stressing that they are different problems. Among the former there are those who are unemployable, those who are employable but have no jobs, and those who are underemployed because suitable jobs for their capabilities are not available.

Reduction of the school dropout rate, though highly desirable, is no panacea for youth unemployment, Dr. Hermann said, adding that graduation from high school is no guarantee of employability. Worth exploring, however, is the possibility of extending school counseling and guidance services for youth beyond 18 or 19 and until they are placed in jobs. Related to employability is the health of youth and Dr. Hermann said that in 1 group of 100 youths under 21 in his program about 50 percent had serious medical problems. He emphatically approved continued heavy involvement of local and State agencies in Federal program of vocational education, and raised a number of questions arising from training programs in which allowances are paid, which directly affect local welfare program considerations.

Turning to title I, part A, of the Economic Opportunity Act, Dr. Hermann asked how we can recruit and train the personnel needed to man this and other projected programs in light of the present extreme shortage of professional personnel. He described as a "frightening notion" the prospect of turning young recruits over to forest rangers for training and teaching. He also asked how we could insure that youth are selected and guided into appropriate programs; who would take the responsibility of directing youth who already had experienced long periods of failure, into programs where they could succeed.

Answering a question by Dean de Capriles on the problem of providing jobs, Dr. Hermann warned that there was a danger of placing too much emphasis on motivation without assurance that jobs would be available for the youths who were being encouraged in this way. In the discussion that followed, Commissioner Dumpson added that many youth were rejected for jobs because they were Negroes or Puerto Ricans, and Winslow Carlton said that the youth's experience of failure was often reinforced by the fact that his parents had the same experience, thus making this a problem of the whole community rather than of just one individual.

Peter Kasius of the New York State Department of Social Welfare, commented on the need to involve State and local agencies intimately with the Federal programs so that there could be continuity after the Federal authorization had ended. Senator JAVITS said that the consent of the State must be obtained in any relationship between the Federal Government and local governments. Commissioner Dumpson cited the risks in this limitation and suggested that where the State refuses to act, the Federal Government then be given authority to proceed without its consent.

The discussion then touched on possibilities of rehabilitating rejected draftees and holding the draft examination at 18 years of age rather than 22 or older as at present in order to clear up health and training problems. Professor Lander cited objections to using the draft or the Department of Defense because it was not set up to become an educational institution. Both George Brager, of the Mobilization for Youth, and Dean Rosen questioned whether industry would have jobs for these young people after they had been trained. Professor Lander pointed out that in view of the development of automation, education now had the responsibility of projecting its training program for jobs of tomorrow rather than those now available. In this connection industry would have to cooperate and come up with some indication of its future needs. Dr. Hermann said schooling had to be made relevant—just to "upgrade the unemployed" was not enough; and Mrs. Anne Montero, of the city commission on human rights, suggested a national census or inventory of unfilled jobs.

II

Winslow Carlton, of Group Health Insurance, summarized the problem of poverty as it applies to the aged. He said there was practically nothing in the legislation for the older citizens, and cited the general need in this group for more income, including an increase in social security benefits and old-age assistance payments.

An income survey in 1962 for those over 65 showed a median income for nonmarried persons of \$1,130 per year, and \$2,875 for married couples. Families headed by a person of 65 or more made up one-third of all the families counted as poor on the basis of

the 1964 annual report of the Council of Economic Advisers. In the OAA program where the range of benefits was from \$34 a month in Mississippi to \$111 in New York, the problem was how to increase benefits in the poorer States.

Another problem area defined by Mr. Carlton concerned workers between 50 and 65, and the difficulties they face when plant closings and other factors lead to their unemployment. Not unrelated to the general problem is the fact that many in this group have children under 18.

The relevance of a Federal program of health care insurance for the aged in this problem was also stressed by Mr. Carlton, who touched on some of its economic consequences on retired persons. Dean Benjamin H. Lyndon suggested the possibility of developing a single package of assistance incorporating all current programs of aid to the aging.

Senator JAVRS emphasized the essential role of the local community in assuring success of an antipoverty program and in this connection suggested making use of the accumulated experience and knowledge of the older citizens in various capacities. Miss Greenwood suggested that the 50-year-old group with technical knowledge be used as teachers, and Senator JAVRS added that he had always been an advocate of early retirement and that this might be an answer where it would be uneconomic to restrain people so close to regular retirement. He urged that business be asked to cooperate more fully in this as well as all other aspects of the war on poverty; suggested that business be asked for money, teaching personnel, and jobs.

His suggestion was supported by Father Fitzpatrick who underlined the cause-and-effect relationship between business and welfare. Business can never be called efficient, he said, when it is eliminating jobs through automation for which we then have to inaugurate make-work programs in order to keep the people alive.

Another major point was raised by Dean de Capriles over the question of the transferability of pension rights, and Senator JAVRS urged that a study be undertaken that would develop ways of establishing some form of Federal banking system for pensions.

In connection with the Economic Opportunity Act, Dean Lyndon said that the 2-year limitation on Federal Government participation was too short a period, and Professor Foss suggested a phasing out operation to be built into the act to insure some continuity after that period.

III

The afternoon and concluding session of the conference was opened with Prof. Bernard Lander's presentation on unemployment. He saw the situation as highly explosive now and even more so in the next decade unless Federal, State, and local governments along with the private sector proceeded to plan ahead in a systematic and organized fashion.

Delinquency is one problem and research indicates that as many as 20 percent of all youth in the United States will be in the juvenile courts before they reach adulthood. Another even more serious problem is the 5.4 percent unemployment rate, and the challenge which automation presents. Professor Lander offered a projection that in the next 15 years 50 percent of the present labor force will be able to do the job that 100 percent of our present labor force is doing. At the same time, he noted, 50 percent of our population in that period will be under 25 years of age. We face a real cultural lag resulting from the creation of new social problems as the result of technology and the resolution of those problems by new social and educational techniques.

He warned against the danger of development of a welfare subculture in which generations of families live under welfare with destructive consequences for society.

Emphasizing the vital need for systematic future planning, Professor Lander welcomed the project of a war on poverty but cautioned against the belief that the bill before Congress would solve the problems of poverty. Even if passed in its entirety, he said, its impact would be very slight. He was critical of the lack of coordination on the Federal level of programs concerned with youth such as delinquency, vocational rehabilitation, and education.

The relative nature of poverty and how it differs from poverty 50 years ago was discussed by Dean de Capriles, and Winslow Carlton added that racial inequality and denial of equal opportunity as well as unemployment were also problems in the war on poverty. Miss Buckholz raised the question of women in the employment picture and the consequences for them of automation as well as the problem of discrimination against women who have children.

Dr. Lander drew the conclusion that we need to rethink our entire educational program and its goals, and it should be done in conjunction with our economists. His research shows that delinquency is not merely a consequence of economic deprivation but a consequence of moral deprivation. Professor Foster suggested using panels of qualified retired persons to work with delinquents and other social problems, including marriage counseling.

The farm section of the Economic Opportunity Act was called into question by Professor Foss who asked why we should try to put people back on the farm when we have now about 30 percent of the farm work force producing what 100 percent produced a decade or so ago. Father Fitzpatrick, however, said that we should try to meet the challenge of making small farms feasible.

In this connection Senator JAVRS presented the question of what to do with the diminishing number of farm families as part of the larger question of how to join the problem of unemployment with the war on poverty. The Senator also referred to the need to stimulate the economy, but Miss Greenwood offered the view that no matter how much the economy was stimulated there would not be a place for unemployables. She said that what was needed was not only a short-range plan such as the present legislation but also a long-range program.

Mayor Walsh, of Syracuse, offered area statistics to demonstrate how 1 egg-producing farm was able to produce today what it took 100 to do years ago. His point was that no matter how many people were put in jobs there would always be a large group of unemployables caused by various social problems. Professor Lander reiterated this view but emphasized the role of the local community.

Senator JAVRS concluded from his statement that (1) he believed the community action program would be a good start and should be retained in the bill; (2) people receiving unemployment compensation should not be eligible for aid under this program but (3) become eligible when they have exhausted their benefits. He favored the use of advisory boards locally patterned on those used by the National Institutes of Health; that is, a board that can veto but cannot initiate or order action. Mr. Carlton pointed out that similar boards were recommended by the National Social Welfare Seminar in connection with the proposed National Service Corps.

After the Senator had left, Professor Martin led a discussion of the meaning of unemployed in relation to poverty, citing examples of persons who were employed but nevertheless have such a low income that they

must be classed among the poor. And on this discussion of the "employed poor," the conference ended.

[From the New York Times, June 24, 1964]

WAR ON POVERTY

President Johnson's declaration of war on poverty has served as a compelling reminder to many Americans that millions of their fellow citizens are existing in a bleak netherland of hopelessness in the midst of unprecedented prosperity. The very fact that the United States has produced mass affluence while maintaining something close to mass poverty is an uncomfortably formidable challenge.

This crusade can be won, but the sheer magnitude of poverty cautions against a quick or inexpensive victory. Taking an annual money income of \$3,000 a year for a family as a minimum level, the administration estimates that there are 9.3 million families, or over 30 million Americans, living in want. This calculation may not be entirely accurate, but by any economic yardstick the number is intolerably large. Hidden in rural wastelands or submerged in urban squalor are a potentially explosive force, posing both a reproach and a constant threat to the stability of our society.

Given the large sums and extensive efforts, public and private, already being expended many are skeptical about the President's plans. Some insist that the poor will always be with us, that nothing can be done to transform the shiftless and the lazy into useful citizens; in their view, handouts are the only answer. Others think that the only solution lies in speeding up growth. Pointing out that the third of the Nation living in poverty during the 1930's has been reduced to one-fifth, they are confident that poverty will shrink as the economy expands.

But neither handouts, which would be exceedingly costly, nor a sustained period of full employment, which has yet to be attained, will solve the problem. At best, they can alleviate it. For poverty is not simply a matter of money or jobs. Most of the currently unemployed live well above the poverty line; many of the poor are now employed, but lack the skills or the discipline to command decent wages or steady work.

Economic growth has bypassed the poverty stricken, who are untrained rather than lazy, alienated rather than shiftless. A faster pace is essential to provide the means for the struggle, but it also adds to the numbers unable to adjust to our increasingly complex society. Whether or not the administration is correct in asserting that poverty is inherited—that the children of the poor are doomed to remain poor—it is clear that new ways must be found to eliminate the self-perpetuating nature of poverty.

President Johnson recognizes the need for a wholly new kind of attack that can reach the hard core of poverty. The administration's plans for "opening up the gates of opportunity," however, amount to little more than a cautious and piecemeal reconnaissance. In terms of expenditures, it is requesting additional outlays of just \$500 million, which will be used mainly to duplicate or expand existing programs.

The administration wants to establish an Office of Economic Opportunity to supervise and coordinate the antipoverty effort. The manpower retraining program already in operation would be supplemented with a job corps designed to give basic education and work experience to the most underprivileged young men and women and a work-study program enabling those of greatest promise to acquire a college education. The administration also favors Federal assistance to communities mounting local action campaigns, plus a special fund to help individual farm families and small businesses. In

addition, it plans to enlist 5,000 volunteers who will provide help on many fronts.

Sargent Shriver, who is to serve as the President's chief of staff, has emphasized that these are practical programs. This is true politically, for the program represents an attempt to muster widespread popular support by covering every obvious target at the least possible expenses. Its practicality lies primarily in its emphasis on conventional methods and limited objectives.

The most promising of its plans is the Job Corps for teenagers who have yet to become mired in the pit of the poverty; in contrast, its assistance to improve the lot of marginal businessmen and farmers is inadequate. Flaws in the community program will distort its impact. Under the proposed legislation, localities with specific plans are certain to get help, even though they are in a position to obtain funds locally or from existing Federal programs. The danger is that there may be little or nothing flowing to the backward communities where poverty is most entrenched.

For all its shortcomings, the administration's program does symbolize its commitment to wipe out poverty. Its plans can provide valuable intelligence in establishing priorities for the larger and more extensive battles that must come.

The promise of these initial skirmishes depends on establishing adequate criteria to assess them. The first need is for comprehensive statistical evaluation of all undertakings. This is especially important in the redevelopment of Appalachia lest vast sums be spent without raising incomes and living standards.

Winning the war on poverty calls for a multiple offensive employing all the measures now available. It is essential to sustain economic growth that can help open up new opportunities, and to prevent any rise in the numbers below the poverty line. The Government's housing and welfare programs must be expanded, and the plan to provide medical care for the aged enacted.

Success also will demand special measures requiring more imagination and larger resources than the administration is deploying. If the campaign is to be more than an appealing battle cry in an election year, it will have to make a much more intensive effort to improve educational facilities and enlarge needed public services. These can open up opportunities for the young, create jobs, and enhance individual dignity.

Even then the administration will be conducting only a partial war. It has completely overlooked the plight of those aged 65 or older who head 3.2 million families in the ranks of the poor. They cannot be removed from poverty by schooling or retraining or public works; but they can be elevated above the poverty line without any lengthy reconnaissance or elaborate strategy. It will take direct cash payments—a solution that the administration has not yet contemplated, despite its propaganda barrage.

The President's sincerity is manifest. But the war against poverty cannot be won on the cheap. It will take a concerted attack, involving long and costly battles. There is no question that we possess the means to win; but our willingness to employ them has yet to be demonstrated. Mr. Johnson has fired the first shot. He has not mounted a program with promise of total victory.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO MEET DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE THIS WEEK AND NEXT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on

Banking and Currency be authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate the remainder of this week and next.

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

PRESIDENT JOHNSON COMES TO MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the State of Minnesota was paid a singular honor the past weekend by a visit from the President of the United States and Mrs. Johnson. It was a weekend we in Minnesota shall never forget, for the people of my State poured out their hearts to the President and our First Lady in one of the warmest welcomes it has been my privilege to witness.

The President and Mrs. Johnson responded to this welcome by providing new inspiration, not only to the people of Minnesota, but also to the people of the entire Nation and the free world.

A holiday atmosphere surrounded the President's visit; large crowds and some 20 bands turned out along the parade route to greet him and Mrs. Johnson in St. Paul and Minneapolis. There was enthusiasm and joy in the faces of the thousands of men, women, and children who lined the route to see and greet our President and First Lady.

The President and Mrs. Johnson spoke on Saturday at the State convention of our Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party in the St. Paul Auditorium, and paid tribute to the progressive spirit of our party.

Later that evening President and Mrs. Johnson attended a large reception held in Minneapolis, in his honor, by the President's Club, and addressed more than 2,000 persons at a "Salute to President Johnson" dinner in the Minneapolis Auditorium. It was notable that certainly as many Republicans as Democrats were on hand to meet and listen to the President, and the applause was vigorous and bipartisan.

The culmination of the President's visit was his address on Sunday afternoon, before a crowd of more than 100,000 persons attending the Svenskarnas Dag, or Swedish Day, celebration in Minnehaha Park, in Minneapolis.

Svenskarnas Dag is one of the great holidays of the Upper Midwest, and this year it became a historic event, for President Johnson chose the occasion to deliver a major foreign-policy address, with a stirring message of peace.

The President told us that—

After decades of war and threats of war, we may be nearing a time of peace.

His message was a pledge of peace with freedom and honor.

But he also warned:

Today, as always, if a nation is to keep its freedom it must be prepared to risk war. When necessary, we will take that risk.

But then the President served notice on the world:

As long as I am President, I will spare neither my office nor myself in the quest for peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the speeches and the remarks

of President and Mrs. Johnson during their visit to Minnesota.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON ARRIVAL AT MINNEAPOLIS-ST. PAUL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

I want to thank the band and all the good people who have come out here to give us such a warm welcome. I like your weather, I like your Governor, I am very fond of your Senators and your entire congressional delegation in Washington.

Secretary Freeman is my strong right arm. As a matter of fact, I know of no State in the Union that supplies better public servants than the State of Minnesota. And aside from all of that, I like this good Texas weather.

I want to particularly thank the band for coming out and giving us such good music.

I hope all of you have tickets to the dinner tonight. And if so, I will see you down there.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE DEMOCRATIC-FARMER-LABOR PARTY, ST. PAUL, MINN., JUNE 27, 1964

Chairman Farr, Governor Rolvaag, my friend and ally, Senators Gene McCarthy, my long-time friend and one of the great leaders of the U.S. Senate, Hubert Humphrey, Congressman Joe Karth—I appreciate that wonderful introduction—John Blatnik, Mrs. Joseph, George Farr, my fellow Americans, I came here this afternoon to express the Nation's thanks for the work of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party. Your members man the highest posts of this National Government. Your programs have shaped the policies of this national administration. Your ideals and imagination have inspired this entire Nation with new purpose, with renewed vitality, and with a fresh sense of our national destiny.

A few years ago you stood almost alone in the Midwest—a symbol of hard-hitting, progressive, imaginative leadership. Today, as we meet here, the entire Midwest is filled with the ferment of progress that you began. Your National Capital is afire with the principles and programs that you stand for. You no longer stand alone. You are part of a great national forward march, and I am here to tell you that as long as I am President of the United States you will never be alone.

In the past 4 years we have moved farther and faster toward the goals that we share than at any time in our country's history. All America can be proud of that record. And you can be proud of the part that you played in making that record. But we are not going to the American people and tell them that they never had it so good, or don't rock the boat, or let's keep what we have, or stand pat, or keep cool. No, that is not the kind of a party you are, and that is not the kind of country this is.

We are going to tell the people that the progress of the last 4 years is only the beginning. It is the first step toward the greatness that is within our grasp.

We are going to tell them that this is not the end of the road. It is only the beginning of the journey. We have a long way to go before we wipe out racial injustice and give every American of every color equal opportunity to vote, to go to school, and to share in American society. But that is the road that we are going to take. We have a long way to go before our Nation faces up to its responsibility to give its farmers a fair reward for the enormous abundance they have created. But that is the road we are going to take. We have a long way to go before every child in this world can grow up free of the threat of nuclear war. But that is the road that we are going to take. We have a long way to go before we

wipe out poverty in America and give every man a chance to find a job. But we are going to wipe out poverty and we are going to reach full employment.

Everywhere we look there are tasks more towering, challenges more complex, than your country ever faced before. They will not be faced easily and painlessly and without risk. But you have proved in your own State, and we have shown in America in the last 4 years, that the only limit to our possibilities of the future is our vision of the present. In 1960, John Fitzgerald Kennedy came here and asked you to help him get America moving again. You answered his call. America began to move. And this year, you and I are going to keep America moving. It is a long way from the fields of Minnesota or the hills of my native Texas to the center of government in Washington. But it was Woodrow Wilson who reminded us that: "No matter how humbly a youngster is born, no matter where he is born, no matter what circumstances hamper him at the outset, he has got a chance to master the minds and lead the imaginations of the whole country."

Many of us here today can testify to the truth of that observation. This State has supplied to Washington some of our greatest Democrats. Orville Freeman and Walter Heller are two of my strongest right arms. And no State in the Union has two better Senators than GENE McCARTHY and HUBERT HUMPHREY. And in your congressional delegation in the House, of which JOE KARTH is a very fine example, you have great quality but you need better quantity.

Yes, we are proud of the opportunity that is given to all Americans, and we are going to use all the skill and all the energy that God has given us in order to keep these doors of opportunity open for every child in the land. It is wonderful to be here with you today. I am proud of this great welcome I have received in Minnesota. I hope you will invite me back.

Thank you very much.

REMARKS OF MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON TO THE DEMOCRATIC-FARMER-LABOR PARTY, ST. PAUL, MINN., JUNE 27, 1964

Friends, it is wonderful to be back in Minnesota again. I remember when we were here in the campaign of 1960. It was Turkey Day in Worthington. It was raining in sheets and there were thousands of turkeys in the streets. But in spite of all of those hazards of campaigning, you hard working Democratic-Farmer-Labor workers brought this State through for the Democratic Party.

Now we are back, the sun is shining, and the streets are full. Instead of turkeys they are full of what I think must have been Democrats by the way they were cheering and waving.

I want to say a word of thanks to the women from Minnesota who work so hard for our party. I don't know three better campaigners than Muriel, Jane, and Abigail. I just want to say that we are very proud, Lyndon and I, of the work that all of the women in this State do for the party, and we know that you are proud, too.

I am so glad I got to come along.

REMARKS OF MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT FUNDRAISING DINNER, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., MUNICIPAL AUDITORIUM, JUNE 27, 1964

Friends, I would like to say two things. When Lyndon told me about coming to Minnesota, I was quick to want to sign up to come, too, because I wanted to thank you all for the caliber of people you sent to Washington, and I wanted to say that when you elect a Senator you just don't send HUBERT HUMPHREY but you send his wife and family, all working for your State; and when you send GENE McCARTHY there is Abigail there, too, and the family, working for

the State. And when the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, is there, Jane is right there with him, helping him so much. We think a great deal of them down there.

And another thing, it is easy for Lyndon and me to fly in here and enjoy a big, gay, successful dinner like this, but I have some concept of how much hard work went into making it so, all the details and the generalship, and the telephoning, the real effort. To each of you who had a part in that, for Lyndon and me, may I say a very warm thank you.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT FUNDRAISING DINNER, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., MUNICIPAL AUDITORIUM, JUNE 27, 1964

Governor Rolvaag, esteemed Governor Rolvaag; my old friend and one of the great leaders of the Senate, Hubert Humphrey; my good friend and patriot, Senator Gene McCarthy; distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman; my indispensable Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Walter Heller; your own outstanding congressional delegation, my friends, John Blatnik and Joe Karth, Don Fraser, Alec Olson; my fellow Americans, every year, for more than 40 years Minnesota has cast its vote for the winning side on election day, and this year you are going to keep that record. Minnesota can be pleased with its contribution to the growth and the wisdom of our country. The men that you have sent to Washington are your proudest assets, men like Hubert, Gene, Orville, Walter Heller, Lee Loevinger, Gene Foley, and the able Congressmen in your delegation. As Lady Bird has already done and I want to repeat, I thank each of you and the Nation thanks you for men like these.

Someone asked Mr. Rayburn one time why Texas had so much influence and power in the House when they had a Vice President back in the early Roosevelt period, they had a majority leader of the House, they had 8 of the 15 chairmanships. He said, "We have a very simple formula. We pick 'em young, we pick 'em honest, we sent 'em there and we keep 'em there."

In the past 4 years, you good people of Minnesota have seen your principles and your beliefs shape the course of an entire Nation. The result has been unmatched progress for all the people of this country. Minnesota believes in growing opportunities for all Americans. In the past 4 years, under Democratic leadership, we have reached new heights of prosperity. Since 1960, in your State alone, personal income, your income, has gone up more than \$1 billion. Wages, your wages, under Democratic administration, have gone up 10 percent. And taxes, under the leadership of GENE McCARTHY on the Finance Committee, have gone down. This tax cut, and we probably wouldn't have had it except for a Minnesota legislator on the Finance Committee in the grueling days when one vote and one voice meant the difference—this tax cut this year will return more than \$100 million to the people of Minnesota, and will create thousands of jobs for the people of Minnesota. And that is just the beginning as we enter our 41st straight month of expansion free from any semblance of recession, the longest period in this decade.

Minnesota believes in human rights. Under the leadership of HUBERT HUMPHREY and with an assist every now and then from some of the rest of us, we are about to pass the strongest and best civil rights bill in this century. We are going on from this bill to give every American citizen, of every race and color, the equal rights which the Constitution demands and justice directs. This will not be a simple task. The events of the past few days again illuminate how painful can be the path to racial justice. No law can instantly destroy the differences that are shaped over centuries. But that is not the

question. For once a law is passed, no man can defy it, and no leader can refuse to enforce it. For if our laws are flouted, our society will fall. And I would remind you good Americans tonight that there is a law more hallowed than the civil rights bill, more hallowed than even the Constitution of the United States. That law commands every man to respect the life and dignity of his neighbor; to treat others as he would be treated. That law asks not only obedience in our action, but it requires understanding in our heart. And may God grant us that understanding.

Minnesota also believes in peace. In the last few years, we have moved a long way down the road to peace. We signed a treaty ending nuclear tests in the atmosphere. We have called a halt to the spreading poison of radioactive fallout. We have cut back on our nuclear production and persuaded our adversaries to cut back on theirs, too. We have signed agreements increasing the exchange of men, of ideas, and of scientific knowledge. And this year, I can assure you neither the acts of enemies or the demands of elections will cause us for a moment to cease our constant search for a world at peace. I want to repeat again to you good people who have made this sacrifice to come out here this evening, in all of these fields your principles, Minnesota principles, have helped to shape the progress of all America.

But we will not let the record of the last few years lull us into confidence or complacency, or contentment. For most important of all, Minnesotans have always believed in the future, and that future contains battles to be fought, enemies to be faced, and victories to be won. The problems are new, but their solution rests tonight, as it has always rested, on the resources of our land and on the strength of our people.

Only 7 percent of our people feed the rest of us better and cheaper than in any land in the world. Yet for years we neglected the men and women whose toll and talent worked this wonder. Well, since 1961 we have begun to move toward giving them a fair reward for their labor under the leadership of one of the greatest Americans I know—Orville Freeman.

Since 1960, our farmers have realized an income gain totaling \$2 billion. Farm income is 16-percent higher on a per farm basis. And the farmer has been rescued from the despondency and the despair of the fifties. And we are going to continue to give the farmer his rightful place, his rightful share in American society. And I am going to keep looking to the men of Minnesota to lead the way.

We will not limit our efforts in rural areas to commodity programs. We are pledged to an all-out effort to create more jobs and greater prosperity for all the inhabitants of the countryside. Our commitment to eliminate poverty is a total commitment, in the countryside as well as in the city. We can never be content with anything less than parity of income and full participation in the great society for all our farm families and their neighbors.

I have lived most of my life close to the soil. I know the doubts and the toil of seeking sustenance from the land. But I have also been to every part of this Nation. And I also know that modern America was possible because of the produce of our farms. I have traveled to the capitals of far countries, and I know how our country is the envy and the wonder and the model of all the world.

I do not yet know the answer to all the problems of agriculture, but I have good men to help me and a good many of them are at this table tonight. And I do have an immovable intention that those who sacrificed to create America—and who sustain it still—shall never be shut out from the triumphs of its success. Partnership is the

path to the future. For tonight, progress does not come from being antibusiness or anti-labor, anti-consumer or anti-producer. More and more, all Americans are realizing that programs which fairly benefit one group usually benefit all. And as long as I am your President, this Government will not set one group against another. We will build a creative partnership between business and labor, between farm areas and urban centers, between consumers and producers. And this is what I mean when I choose to be a President of all the people.

Next year, and years ahead, contain new and vast challenges. But we still have an important job to do this year. We must help complete one of the most dynamic, progressive sessions in the history of the Congress. We have already passed the largest tax cut in the history of any Congress. We have already passed and signed into law the most comprehensive education program in history. We are about to pass the most hopeful, comprehensive civil rights bill in the history of our land. And after coming out here and getting the inspiration and stimulation that comes from looking into your good faces and shaking your hands, we are going back to Washington to fight for a poverty program, a program which will launch an all-out war to end poverty in this rich country once and for all. And I ask you now: Will you help us?

We are going back to Washington tomorrow to fight for hospital care for older Americans, under social security, so that our senior citizens will not be rewarded for a lifetime of labor with a nighttime of fear. Will you help us?

We are going back to Washington to fight for a food stamp program so no American will ever go hungry; a housing bill to give every American a decent roof over his head; an extension of Hill-Burton to provide hospitals for the sick. Will you help us?

And we are going back to fight for more than 20 other bills, each of which will help some of our fellow human beings to ease their burden and improve their life, and move America forward. We will move toward our new problems, guided by a great tradition. Under Franklin Delano Roosevelt, we established the principle that it was every American's right to share in the progress of his Nation. The result has been the highest standard of living in the history of the world. Some say that this standard has restricted freedom. But the fact is because of it, every American is freer to shape his own activities, set his own goals, do what he wants with his own life, than at any time in the history of man in any country in all the world. And in the future we are going to enlarge that freedom. But in some ways our problems are more difficult than those of Roosevelt. Then the need for action was plain. Tonight, the primary task of leadership is not only to solve problems, but to alert the Nation to the need to solve them. We will undertake that task, too.

We will use this year to set before the American people both the danger and the opportunity that lie ahead. Because, with their understanding support, no job, no program, no height of greatness is beyond the grasp and the hope of this Nation.

We are a very fortunate few, 190 million Americans, in the sea of a world that is made up of 3 billion people. As I said, we have more freedom than any society has ever known. We have more to eat and more to wear, and more luxuries to enjoy—television, automobiles—more recreation, more free time, than any people have ever known. We have much to preserve and much to protect. We have a system of government that is the envy of men around the globe; a system where the capitalist can put in his capital and have a reasonable expectancy to get it back with a fair return and without fear of

going to bed tonight to wake up and see it confiscated or burned the next morning.

We have a system where the manager of that capital can get up at daylight and work to midnight, developing stomach ulcers trying to manage money and men and bring them together, but he still has the hope of retiring at 65 and sharing in the profits that he helped to create. And finally we have the producers, the men, the horny-handed sons who get out and produce a better mousetrap at less cost than can be produced anywhere in the world. And capital and management and labor divide the fruits of their joint effort. If your future depended on our numbers, our adversaries could defeat us tonight. If our future depended solely on our resources, I can look to another land that has more acres, that has more people, that has more resources, water, oil, than we have. But our future doesn't depend on that and that is not the strength of our future. Our forefathers left us a system of government, and it is from that system that we get our strength, from that system that provides an incentive to every person, that says give to the world the best you have and the best will come back to you.

I never for a moment entertain a doubt that there is any commissar or any regimented slave labor anywhere in the world that can outproduce or outsurpass or outlive our system of capital, management, and labor in the good old U.S.A. But our job is to let our own people know that we not only never had it so good—we have to make it better. We must not be content to sit back in our rocking chair and let the rest of the world go by, because we must have objectives, we must have ambitions, we must have the pioneering spirit today that came to this Nation 200 years ago. And we have to move it further in the next two centuries than it has moved in the last two.

And that is saying something, isn't it? And how are we going to move it? Not by eating on ourselves, not by blaming each other, not by dividing up in harassing groups that can find something wrong with what their fellow man does. We are going to build it by uniting our people, by bringing our capital and our management and our labor and our farmers all under one great Democratic tent, and saying to all of them, "Contribute your part, do your share, and you will share in the fruits that are ours."

I know there is not a man and woman in this hall tonight that doesn't want to move America forward. And you have moved it forward, by coming here and giving us this inspiration, in addition to that \$100. And just to show you how much I appreciate it, and I want each person in that chair tonight to know that I realize you could have taken that \$100 and gone to a cool spot to spend a 2-weeks summer vacation—you could have taken that \$100 and bought some things for your family that they needed; you could have found many uses for that \$100, but you decided you would invest it in leadership for your country. Whether you are Republicans, Independents, Democrats, or Farm Laborites, whatever you are, you are good Americans and we are going to try to justify your expectations.

I am not like Al Smith was, when he was making a great campaign speech in New York one time. I am not like HUBERT HUMPHREY is when he is speaking with unlimited debate rules in the Senate where he can speak all evening. I am just somewhere in between. But maybe some of you will ask me how was Al Smith. I will tell you. Al was out speaking one night on the sidewalks of New York and he had a pretty enthusiastic crowd. One old boy stepped out of a bar, kind of unfriendly to Al—he had had himself a beer or two—and he said, "Al, tell them all you know. It won't take you very

long." And Al said, "I will tell them all we know and it won't take any longer."

Well, I haven't told you all I know or all that we all know. But I do want to tell you this: You have so much to be proud of. Don't go home tonight with a martyr complex feeling sorry for yourself. Think about how the less fortunate in this country and in the world are, and count your blessings. Resolve tonight to do unto others as you would have them do unto you, and let's all leave here thankful for what we have and determined to leave this world a better place than we found it.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT SWEDISH CELEBRATION AT MINNEHAHA PARK, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., JUNE 28, 1964

Senator McCARTHY—thank you very much—Governor Rolvaag, Senator HUMPHREY, Members of the Congress, the chairman of the day's event. Mr. Johnson and all the other Johnsons in the crowd, ladies and gentlemen, the Bible counsels us: "To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven * * * a time of war and a time of peace."

So I come today to speak to you in the hope that, after decades of war and threats of war, we may be nearing a time of peace. Today, as always, if a nation is to keep its freedom it must be prepared to risk war. When necessary, we will take that risk. But as long as I am President, I will spare neither my office nor myself in the quest for peace. That peace is much more than the absence of war. In fact, peace is much the same thing in our world community as it is here in your community, or in the small community of Johnson City, Tex., where I grew up.

If, in your town, every morning brings fear that the serenity of the streets will be shattered by the sounds of violence, then there is no peace. If one man can compel others, unjustly and unlawfully, to do what he commands them to do, then your community is not a place of peace. If we have neither the will nor a way to settle disputes among neighbors without force and violence, then none of us can live in peace. If we do not work together to help others fulfill their fair desires, then peace is insecure. For in a community, as in the world, if the strong and the wealthy ignore the needs of the poor and the oppressed, frustrations will result in force. Peace, therefore, is a world where no nation fears another, or no nation can force another to follow its command. It is a world where differences are solved without destruction, and common effort is directed at common problems.

Such a peace will not come by a single act or a single moment. It will take decades and generations of persistent and patient effort. That great son of Sweden, Dag Hammarskjöld, once said: "The qualities it requires are just those which I feel we all need today—perseverance and patience, a firm grip on realities, careful but imaginative planning, a clear awareness of the dangers—but also of the fact that fate is what we make it."

With these qualities as our foundation, we follow several goals to the single goal of peace. And what are those goals? First is restraint in the use of power. We must be, and we are, strong enough to protect ourselves and our allies. But it was a great historian who reminded us that: "No aspect of power more impresses men than its exercise with restraint."

We do not advance the cause of freedom by calling on the full might of our military to solve every problem. We won a great victory in Cuba, because we stood there for many days, firm without using force. In Vietnam we are engaged in a brutal and a bitter struggle trying to help a friend. There, too, we will stand firm to help main-

tain their own freedom, and to give them counsel and advice and help as necessary.

Second is the search for practical solutions to particular problems. Agreements will not flow from a sudden trust among nations. Trust comes from a slow series of agreements. Each agreement must be fashioned as the products of your famous craftsmanship are fashioned, with attention to detail, with practical skills, with faith in the importance of the result.

And so, even while we are caught in conflict in one part of the world, we labor to build the structure of agreement, which can bring peace to all the rest of the world. In this way we have signed a treaty already ending nuclear tests in the atmosphere. Already we have cut back our production of atomic fuel and weapons. Already we have established a hot line between Washington and Moscow. Already we are meeting with the Soviets to pool our efforts in making fresh water from the oceans. These agreements, by themselves, have not ended tensions or they have not ended war. But because of them we have moved much closer to peace.

And the third point that I want to bring up is respect for the rights and fears of others. We can never compromise the cause of freedom. But as we work in our world community we must always remember that differences with others do not always flow from a desire for domination. They can come from honest clash of honest beliefs of goals. And in such cases our strength does not entitle us to impose our interest. Rather, our desire for peace compels us to seek just compromise. And we must also recognize that although this is very hard to do, that other nations may honestly fear our intentions or the intentions of our allies. There is no need for such fear. For we in America seek neither dominion or conquest. But where it exists, we must work to dispel that fear.

The fourth point that I want to make is cooperation in solving the problems which are greater than immediate conflicts. Most of our neighbors in the world live in the midst of hunger and poverty. Most of our neighbors live in the midst of disease and ignorance. We are proud of the fact that here in America, across the world, American workers and American food and American capital are building industry, and are expanding farms, are educating the young and are caring for the sick, and are feeding the hungry.

We will continue to seek such cooperation. No peace and no power is strong enough to stand for long against the restless discontent of millions who are without hope. For peace to last, all must have a stake in its benefits.

Fifth, is the ability to adjust disputes without the use of force. It is, in short, the pursuit of justice. We can find guidance here in our own country's historic pledge to the rule of law. That is a pledge to abide by the law and to accept its settlements. It is a pledge to submit to courts and to be satisfied by court decisions. It is a pledge to respect, uphold, and always obey the law of the land. For if any take grievances and disputes into their own hands, the safety and the freedom of all is in peril. "Due process" is the safeguard of our civilization. As a President of the United States and as an individual citizen, I stand totally committed to the integrity of justice and the enforcement of the law. But legal government depends upon law-loving and law-abiding citizens. Today, the key to peace in our own land is obedience to the great moral command that no man should deny to another the liberties the Constitution creates, as the law defines these liberties. And it rests on the even more hallowed rule that, whatever our disagreements, we treat others with the peaceful respect that we reserve and desire for ourselves. So, too, we seek a world

community in which answers can win acceptance without the use of force. For this purpose, all the machinery of the international justice is useless unless it is infused with the good faith of nations. On a worldwide basis, we place much hope in the United Nations.

Twenty years after World War I the League of Nations was discredited. Twenty years after World War II the United Nations is, thank God, a stronger force for peace than ever before. Our support, the steadfast support of nations like Sweden, has made that possible. And let any of those who might choose to criticize the United Nations always remember that where the United Nations has gone, from Iran to the Congo, the Communists have not conquered. This is not because the United Nations supports our cause or because it exists just to help us against our enemies. It is because the United Nations is on the side of national independence, on the side of peaceful justice, of self-determination, of human freedom, and that is the side that we are on, too.

These are the several tasks—these are the several paths that we take to peace. At times in the solitude of my office, peace seems discouragingly distant. My days are often filled with crisis and conflict. Yet each time that I come here among the people of my country I feel new hope and renewed faith. There was a legendary figure who, each time his feet touched the earth, redoubled his strength. Your friendship and your warmth and your wishes are equally the source of my strength.

I know that all the power of my great office will never bring peace unless you want it, unless you are willing to work and fight and die for it. For with you not me—not even the members of your great delegation in the Congress, and I should say now that no State in the Union has a right to be prouder of their Senators or their Congressmen than the great State of Minnesota—and in the Senate with HUBERT HUMPHREY and GENE MCCARTHY—no State has a better or more gifted reputation.

As President and as leader of your country, I want to thank you for those Congressmen, too, and I want to express the hope that we will not only have all those four Democratic Congressmen back next time, but you will give us some additions to help us along the way. I am proud of your progressive, young, great Governor, my old long-time friend, Governor Rolvaag.

I want to remind you finally, as I finish, that it is with the people and not with their leaders that the final question whether the liberties and the life of this land shall be "preserved to the latest generations." If you can do this, if you do do this, then our children's children will gladly remember us in the ancient phrase: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

Please take care of things out here in Minnesota for GENE MCCARTHY so he can help me take care of things in the Nation.

REMARKS OF MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT SWEDISH CELEBRATION AT MINNEHAHA PARK, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., JUNE 28, 1964

Friends, I am so glad I got to come along because on this gay, festive holiday, I look around and see the flag that belonged to the country from which many of your ancestors came, and every now and then I will catch a glimpse of somebody in a costume that may have come from Sweden. I will bet if I had gotten to join some of those families' picnics I might have gotten a good bite of Swedish food.

I feel I have seen a very colorful, strong, wonderful thread that goes into making up the fabric of America and, therefore, I understand Minnesota better by being here, and I understand my country better.

May I just say one more word? We in Washington, the women, have come to know the wives of the officials that you send there with so much admiration and liking.

Jane Freeman and Muriel Humphrey, and Abigail McCarthy are people that you can be so proud of, and they work right shoulder to shoulder with their husbands.

Thank you. I am glad to have shared this day with you.

AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY HAILS SENATE PASSAGE OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just had an opportunity to read the excellent statement delivered by AFL-CIO President George Meany to the opening session of the NAACP annual convention, in which he hailed the Senate's passage of the civil rights bill.

In this address, Mr. Meany termed passage of the civil rights bill "a truly historic legislative victory—a victory, not just for Negro Americans, not just for the oppressed minorities, but for the Nation." I surely share these eloquent sentiments.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release containing the full text of George Meany's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NEWS FROM THE AFL-CIO

AFL-CIO President George Meany today hailed Senate passage of the civil rights bill as "a truly historic legislative victory—a victory, not just for Negro Americans, not just for oppressed minorities, but for the Nation."

In a letter of greeting to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, opening its convention in Washington's Statler-Hilton Hotel today, Meany extended credit to the leadership of both parties in the Senate saying that America could be "proud that this was not a partisan victory."

He added, "But let us recognize that a law is the beginning of justice, not its fulfillment."

To translate the principles of the civil rights bill "into the daily life of the Nation more than a law is needed," he said. "There must be from this point on a far more intensive effort, in every phase of community life, to build new bridges of understanding, so that the law reflects the affirmative will even of those who feared it."

"If this effort is to succeed, other steps must be taken. We in the AFL-CIO have repeatedly insisted that for equal opportunity to be realized we must have full opportunity. And full opportunity means jobs at good wages for all."

"The principles and purposes of the bill, now so close to final enactment, will not otherwise be realized. This battle was not waged to win equal rights to unemployment, or an equal distribution of poverty."

Meany concluded, "One battle is all but won; the even greater one lies ahead. All of us must enlist for the duration and I pledge to you that the AFL-CIO will never abandon this fight."

The full text of Meany's letter follows: "You meet on the threshold of a truly historic legislative victory—a victory, not just for Negro Americans, not just for oppressed minorities, but for the Nation."

"As Americans we can all be proud that this was not a partisan victory. An overwhelming majority in both political parties united to make it possible, expressing,

through their votes, the overwhelming consensus of the American people.

"It seems to me entirely right that the credit is shared by Senators MANSFIELD and HUMPHREY, on one side of the aisle, and Senators DIRKSEN and KUCHEL, on the other; and not only by them, but by the many others who steadfastly supported them. And while the Senate victory is fresh in our mind, we must never forget the great leadership of Congressman CELLER and Congressman McCULLOCH in the House of Representatives who rose above party rivalry in order to serve the national interest.

"This broad based unity in Congress came about, in turn, from unity on another front—the unity represented by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, of which we of the AFL-CIO are proud to be a part. Through this conference the veterans of the fight for freedom—your own NAACP, the other civil rights organizations and the labor movement—enlisted the invaluable support of the church groups and others, welding a force for progress which has few parallels in the annals of our country. In particular, you in the NAACP can take pride in the indispensable role of Roy Wilkins, who as chairman of the conference did so much to strengthen the bonds of unity. And thus the cause of justice has prevailed.

"The cause has prevailed—or will shortly prevail—as a matter of law. This is right; this was necessary. But let all of us recognize that a law is the beginning of justice, not its fulfillment.

"A law is written in words. A law can reinforce a principle. But for that principle to be translated into the daily life of the Nation, more than a law is needed. There must be from this point on a far more intensive effort, in every phase of community life, to build new bridges of understanding, so that the law reflects the affirmative will even of those who feared it.

"If this effort is to succeed, other steps must be taken. We in the AFL-CIO have repeatedly insisted that for equal opportunity to be realized we must have full opportunity. And full opportunity means jobs at good wages for all.

"The principles and purposes of the bill, now so close to final enactment, will not otherwise be realized. This battle was not waged to win equal rights to unemployment, or an equal distribution of poverty.

"The true goals of the civil rights bill will be attained only when the education and the income of Negro citizens are on a par with those of the community as a whole. These goals cannot be reached by the wave of a magic wand; they must be woven, strand by strand, throughout the fabric of American society.

"To really translate this new freedom into true equality, at every level of American life, requires educational parity and economic parity in fact as well as in the law of the land.

"We in the AFL-CIO are deeply dedicated to the full realization of equality in America. Therefore we call upon all who joined in the great campaign to enact the civil rights bill to join with equal fervor in a broader campaign that is essential for its final accomplishment—the campaign to translate the bill's promises into reality; the campaign for full employment, for decent wages, for adequate housing, for assured medical care, for unlimited educational opportunities, for all Americans everywhere in America.

"Only in this way can the great concepts on which this country was founded, the great concepts which will soon be reaffirmed and reinforced by law, truly become living reality in the day-to-day life of our Nation.

"One battle is all but won; the even greater one lies ahead. All of us must enlist for the duration and I pledge to you that the AFL-CIO will never abandon this fight."

NORTH VERNON, IND., REFUTES READER'S DIGEST ON ARA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a great deal of public opinion is undoubtedly influenced by a magazine with the millions of copies in circulation which the Reader's Digest has. Such a magazine should be doubly aware of its public responsibility for fair and accurate presentation of facts. But, as has been noted by others in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and on the floor of the Senate, the attack on the Area Redevelopment Administration published in that magazine's May issue was a biased presentation, whose effect was to alienate many people from support of a program which, in truth, has made many genuine contributions to hard-pressed communities involved in the program.

One of those communities, and one which was specifically mentioned as an example of the alleged faults and failures of the ARA, is North Vernon, Ind. After reading what the article stated in the context of his personal knowledge of his own community, the editor of the North Vernon Plain Dealer and Sun, Dick Mayer, was incensed. He wrote an editorial on the subject, which appeared in his paper under date of May 28. In it, he not only cited chapter and verse on the distortions he found in the magazine's mention of North Vernon, but he also went on to a positive recital of the values which the ARA has given to that community.

Mr. President, in this editorial is an eloquent case study of the benefits of the Area Redevelopment Administration to be found in many a North Vernon throughout the Nation, the Reader's Digest notwithstanding. In fact, President Lyndon Johnson, on receiving a copy of the editorial from the Plain Dealer, replied in a letter whose contents the paper noted in its issue of June 13. The letter included the following:

Your town is a shining example of what can happen to make life better and more hopeful through the cooperation of local people and the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "We Can't 'Digest' It," be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the North Vernon (Ind.) Plain Dealer and Sun, May 28, 1964]

WE CAN'T "DIGEST" IT

It's scant moments of their precious time, you can bet, that the powers-that-be at Reader's Digest spend on worrying about whether or not there are enough jobs to go around for our people here in Jennings County. We, and the needs and goals of our community are an abstraction to them, that got flickering recognition in a kind of backhanded way in the May issue of this magazine.

North Vernon was mentioned in an article in this issue entitled "Is This the Way to Fight the War Against Poverty?" It was a hatchet job against the ARA. And, rather peculiarly, we thought, it contained some of the data that had previously appeared in another "wreck the ARA" article that was in the Indianapolis Star several months ago.

We, of course, have no way of knowing what goes on or has gone on in other communities that have received ARA help. But, we do know something about the work done here. The article in question was wrong in the data it did present about North Vernon, and it was "wronger" in what it chose not to say about the ARA accomplishments here.

In contrast to this magazine, the leaders of our community, many of them conservatives, do care deeply about the economic well-being of our community and have spent time and energy trying to increase the number of jobs available for our people. They have found that there were benefits that were gained through ARA that could not possibly have been achieved any other way. We, for one, deeply appreciate these leaders' efforts, and in fairness to all concerned—especially to those from the outside who helped Jennings in a time of need, we think the true and complete story should be told.

For one thing, the passing magazine reference to North Vernon was inaccurate. It referred to the forge fire and said that ARA lied about the number of employees at the North Vernon Processing Plant Co. here, the jobs of which were in serious jeopardy if the ARA hadn't come through with an emergency loan so quickly after the fire. The article said there are only 50 employed. Fifty jobs would be worth saving, don't you think? But the fact is that the employment is around 100. Or it was last Saturday when we checked the plants here.

Untold in the North Vernon story, even though they knew it, was the fact that WoodCarv is now in operation here in North Vernon, through an ARA loan. The payroll—again around 100. And while a hundred jobs, give or take, may be an abstraction in its editorial offices at Pleasantville, N.Y., the difference here is like the one between skim milk and cream.

It is a \$162,500 loan that ARA will make on it. In this community our two banks helped in this with a \$50,000 loan. The North Vernon Building Co. loaned \$25,000. This was not a case of our community sitting back and doing nothing. We did all that we could.

In addition, adding to our industrial potential, we got from ARA a \$128,000 grant to improve our water facilities. We locally matched this sum. And not only has this aided our industrial development, but we now find another golden economic door opening in Butlerville and Scipio asking us for water, which if it can be done, will result directly in great growth in two directions from our central city.

Add to this the work now in progress on the swimming pool at the park. Without ARA, and let us not kid ourselves, we wouldn't have had the pool. And if that swimming pool does not add to the many advantages of our community, then we don't know what would.

This is raw data. And has it worked? Well, let us turn a few gears and see what you think. Last year, North Vernon Division of Thompson Industries expanded. WoodCarv was so pleased with the results of its plant here, it doubled its size. Triad Steel doubled, thanks directly to the North Vernon Building Co., which incidentally never could have raised the money to finance this expansion, if it had had to ante up more for WoodCarv. Right now, work is underway on an expansion at Regal Rug. Again, with financing from the North Vernon Building Co. that would not have been there if they had had to up more money for WoodCarv.

Add them up. That's one, two, three, four plant expansions in less than a year's time. That, as you well know, doesn't leave too many plants here that have not expanded.

At the minimum, it can truly be said that ARA didn't hurt us. At the maximum, much more pleasant words can be said.

Errors can be found any place, if you look hard enough. Poverty, it seems to us, has some unexpected allies. Why is it somehow all right to spend American money abroad, but it is something awful when it is spent at home to help ourselves? Indeed, to us, this entire program seems to be merely the natural act of the neighborhood helping a neighbor who temporarily is down on its luck. If this isn't Americanism at its best, then we don't know what it is. If it doesn't work, then why are we witnessing in Jennings today so many undeniable signs of rich and robust good economic health?

MARIO NOTO HONORED BY NEW JERSEY STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to one of Washington's distinguished citizens, Mario T. Noto. Mr. Noto, Associate Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, was recently honored by the New Jersey State Bar Association, and was selected as the recipient of the 1964 Amerigo Vespucci Award for "distinguished community service by Americans of Italian descent."

I have known and worked with Mr. Noto for several years. He is an outstanding and dedicated public servant, and I am proud to add my congratulations to the many he has already received for his fine record of public service.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution by the New Jersey State Bar Association, honoring Mr. Noto, be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE NEW JERSEY STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Whereas the section on immigration and nationality law of the New Jersey State Bar Association, has a specific interest in the operation and procedures of immigration and nationality law; and

Whereas the members of this section have appeared before county bar associations' meetings as well as before patriotic and civic groups to discuss various phases of the law; and

Whereas the membership of this section participates actively in furthering the understanding of the immigration and nationality law among leading organizations in this State; and

Whereas the Honorable Mario T. Noto, Associate Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, has been invited to receive the 1964 Amerigo Vespucci Award for "Distinguished Community Service by Americans of Italian Descent"; and

Whereas this section regards this merited award with high favor in recognition of the dedicated public and community services rendered by the Honorable Mario T. Noto: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the section on immigration and nationality law of the New Jersey State Bar Association extends to Associate Commissioner Mario T. Noto, its congratulations and best wishes for continued success in all his endeavors.

Done at the city of Newark on the 27th day of April 1964.

AMERIGO D'AGOSTINO, *Chairman*.
I. ARTHUR LEVY, *Secretary*.

VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a column appearing in tonight's Evening Star by Max Freedman, entitled "Three Senators Agree on Vietnam."

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

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., July 1, 1964]

THREE SENATORS AGREE ON VIETNAM—FULBRIGHT, HUMPHREY, CHURCH BELIEVE U.N. SHOULD DEFER ANY INTERVENTION

(By Max Freedman)

In the Senate the other day Senator CHURCH started a debate that soon spread to a discussion of the United Nations and the war in Vietnam. He did not intend to provoke such a discussion; he really wanted to speak up in support of the United Nations and to protect it from attack by people like Senator GOLDWATER. But the mere mention of Vietnam was enough to stir a lively debate.

The first point to be noted about this discussion was that only Democrats took part in it. Senator GOLDWATER has tried to break the Republican Party into organized opposition to the way the Johnson administration has been behaving in Vietnam; but thus far his success has been negligible. The Republicans cannot shake out of their minds the warning by Ambassador Lodge that America's involvement in Vietnam dates back to the Eisenhower administration and since then has been supported by both parties. It is utterly unconvincing for Senator GOLDWATER to pretend now that he or any other Republican has a solution which is being willfully ignored by the folly of Washington.

As the debate showed, most Senators are not concerned with the morbid review of wrong turnings and past mistakes. They are more eager to prevent a bigger and more ruthless war, and nowhere is this anxiety stronger than in the Democratic Party.

That was the theme common to Senators CHURCH, FULBRIGHT, HUMPHREY, PELL, PROXMIER, and MORSE. An exception, however, must be made of Senator MORSE. He has advanced the grave charge that the American program in Vietnam "violates one international commitment after another." He commands no support for this view which is a libel on America advertised with all the authority that belongs to a senior Senator. Regardless of what else may have gone wrong, it is perverse and mischievous to regard the United States as the bandit nation in Vietnam. Senator MORSE should drop this argument before it sinks him incurably in the respect of the American people.

It is more useful to concentrate on Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator HUMPHREY. In Senator FULBRIGHT's judgment, the essential task now is to stabilize the military situation as the prelude to any political initiatives that may yet be taken. At present he sees no great role for the United Nations in putting an end to the struggle. But he does not exclude a possibility later. "If conditions should arise," Senator FULBRIGHT told the Senate, "in which it would be feasible for the United Nations to take over and maintain order, I would be in favor of that." Senator HUMPHREY, trying to put at rest all his fears of a larger war, said "I do not favor accelerating the war. I believe I can say this Government does not." He agreed with Senator FULBRIGHT that one day the influence of the United Nations might well be both timely and constructive.

Quite plainly Senator CHURCH had impressed his colleagues by his warning against any new policy that would commit the United States to military attacks on Vietnam and military decisions that might also provoke

a clash with China. No one dissented from his warning that we must ponder our next steps very carefully "if we are to avoid a tragic trail of casualties in Asia out of all proportion to the vital interests of the United States."

Some weeks ago great interest was taken in the announcement that Harlan Cleveland, who is in charge of United Nations affairs for the State Department, would attend the Honolulu Conference to review the problems of Vietnam and southeast Asia. It was generally felt that his presence in Honolulu would focus attention on what the United Nations could do to end the danger of a spreading war.

As it turned out Mr. Cleveland was unable to leave Washington because sudden anxieties over Cyprus kept him here. But that does not mean that he and his officials are avoiding the close and continuous study of what the United Nations can do, at the right time, to promote stability and peace in this whole restless area.

Mr. MORSE. I shall proceed to answer that column by Mr. Freedman in respect to its references to the senior Senator from Oregon. In the course of the column Mr. Freedman says:

As the debate showed, most Senators are not concerned with the morbid review of wrong turnings and past mistakes. They are more eager to prevent a bigger and more ruthless war, and nowhere is this anxiety stronger than in the Democratic Party.

That was the theme common to Senators CHURCH, FULBRIGHT, HUMPHREY, PELL, PROXMIER and MORSE. An exception, however, must be made of Senator MORSE. He has advanced the grave charge that the American program in Vietnam "violates one international commitment after another." He commands no support for this view which is a libel on America advertised with all the authority that belongs to a senior Senator. Regardless of what else may have gone wrong, it is perverse and mischievous to regard the United States as the bandit nation in Vietnam. Senator MORSE should drop this argument before it sinks him incurably in the respect of the American people.

Mr. President, Mr. Freedman should get out to the hustings. Mr. Freedman should acquaint himself with American public opinion. For the benefit of Mr. Freedman, I incorporate by reference now every criticism that I have made of American foreign policy in southeast Asia, including the criticism to which he takes exception.

In his column today in the Washington Star Max Freedman undoes all the sound commentary he offered the American people last week when he warned:

Not even in his worst moments was John Foster Dulles ever guilty of such a crude and reckless act of brinkmanship as the one in which the Johnson administration has now stumbled.

Of course, he published that column in the Washington Evening Star, which contained the editorial paying its disrespect to the senior Senator from Oregon. I answered it some days ago on the floor of the Senate. In my reply to the editor of the Washington Star, I said that he should have read the column by Max Freedman published in the same issue that contained its editorial attacking the senior Senator from Oregon.

It is interesting to note this complete change of journalistic coloring on the part of Mr. Freedman in so short a time.

I wonder why. Could it be that his editors did not like the fact that in that column he took the position of the senior Senator from Oregon? As I pointed out, in that column Freedman laid down the major thesis of the criticism by the senior Senator from Oregon of shocking American policy in southeast Asia which, I repeat, in all probability, if it is not reversed, will lead us into a major war in Asia.

Today Mr. Freedman sounds frightened of his own analysis of our foreign policy in South Vietnam, which he published only a few days ago. On June 25 he pointed out that the threat of war made by administration officials against China "is more likely to divide and worry American opinion than it is to frighten Peiping or to serve the cause of peace." But that is the only logical end to a policy we are now following in southeast Asia. Our policy of military buildup and overwhelming economic aid to South Vietnam has failed to halt rebels successes. The next step was to threaten expansion of the war if the Communists did not voluntarily retreat.

The Government of the United States is threatening war in Asia. Let those who believe it is not stand up and deny it, for we cannot read the statements of this Government, from the President on down, and fail to recognize that those statements add up to a threat to war prosecuted by the United States in Asia unless Red China, Laos, North Vietnam and other areas do the bidding of the United States.

Having made the threat, we will have no choice but make good on it when the Communists decline to retreat. This entire policy depends upon Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung backing down before a threat that if they do not, their territory will be attacked by the United States.

One may as well expect the United States to leave Vietnam upon threat of dire consequences if we do not.

Mr. Freedman is also frightened of the concept that the United States is itself violating international agreements in southeast Asia. And we are. He does not deny that we are. He does not try to show that our actions are in conformity with the Geneva accords of 1954, or 1962, or with the United Nations Charter, because that is impossible. He merely puts a nasty label on anyone who does point out the bitter truth of the U.S. illegal action in southeast Asia—illegal action in southeast Asia that violates the United Nations Charter in articles 33, 36, 37, and 51—to mention only four specific instances of our violation.

Let Mr. Freedman or anyone else deny it. They cannot deny it if they can read the English language. The language is perfectly clear as to the obligation of any signatory to that Charter and the course of procedural action that should follow whenever peace is threatened anywhere in the world. Peace is seriously threatened in southeast Asia, and the responsibility of the United States is clear. We should take the threat to the United Nations, and not set ourselves up as the policeman of the world,

self-appointed, to enforce our interpretation of existing treaties such as the Geneva accords.

Mr. Freedman may as well try to prove that the United States has the legal right to enforce a treaty between Russia and China as to prove that we have a unilateral right to enforce the Geneva accords of 1954, when we are not a party to them.

Who are we to set ourselves up as the enforcement country of the Geneva accords of 1954 when we did not even sign the accords, and when John Foster Dulles used his influence to prevent South Vietnam from signing them?

When we recognize that a violation of a treaty is threatening the peace of the world, this country has a clear duty to file charges before the United Nations. That the United States has not done. I wonder why. I wonder if it might be that if the United Nations took jurisdiction it would find plenty of illegality on the part of the conduct of the United States to date in the course of action it has been following in southeast Asia?

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I will confess I was also surprised at the abrupt about-face change in the attitude of Mr. Freedman from his previous article, in which he supported the view that the senior Senator from Oregon and I have been advocating, that we should stop our participation in the war in southeast Asia and try to wage peace; that it was a war we could not win militarily; that it was a war in which we should not have engaged in the first place; and that we should go to the United Nations and try to find a solution there.

Mr. Freedman published a column earlier, which either the senior Senator from Oregon or I put in the RECORD, to that effect. I am interested in the sudden change. What happened in between the publication of the two articles?

Mr. MORSE. We have our suspicions.

Mr. GRUENING. I can think of various explanations.

Mr. MORSE. But they would not rebound to the credit of Mr. Freedman.

Mr. GRUENING. I do not know that I can comment on that; but, in any event, I think it is a regrettable change of attitude and an inconsistency that it would be useful for the columnist to explain to his readers.

Mr. MORSE. For the edification of Mr. Freedman, I repeat again that the United States is violating one international agreement after another by our policy in southeast Asia. We have already violated the 1954 Geneva agreement, and have been found in violation by the International Control Commission. We have admitted to violations of the Geneva accords of 1962, with the excuse that some one else violated them first.

This country has even sent into Laos armed military planes that have dropped bombs, which constitutes an act of war and aggression. It is a clear violation of the Geneva accord of 1962, which this country signed, and which I believe

thereby constitutes an even more serious reflection on the United States. We have freely admitted to these violations, pointing out only that North Vietnam violated them first.

Our violations of the United Nations Charter, as I have pointed out time and time again in the past several weeks, have been many, and they are continuing up to the moment I speak.

The very assumption of Freedman and those he quotes that someday, sometime, somehow, and under some other circumstances, the United States will seek United Nations action is evidence that all of them know the issue is one of U.N. jurisdiction.

What they are all saying is only that they do not think that to adhere to the U.N. Charter now would serve American interests.

Are we to take the position that this country is being a peace-abiding nation; that we are going to resort to its obligations under treaties and international law only when we think to do so would serve our interests? If every country takes that position, that is the end of international law. International law then ceases to be of any force or effect in maintaining peace in the world, and becomes nothing but a sham and a shibboleth.

But when, under that type of international expediency, would this country ever take such a matter to the United Nations? Would we do it when war has engulfed North Vietnam? Do we think that when China is faced with the same situation she was faced with in Korea she will do what we have refused to do, and take the issue to the United Nations?

If we set such an example, we set the precedent for other nations to defy their obligations under international law.

Do we think that Red China will be willing to go to the U.N. or to the bargaining table when the war goes against her, although we refused to do so under the same circumstances?

What a folly! What a poor, lame, pathetic excuse for a war in Asia! "Now is not the time to negotiate; wait until we dominate the battlefield and then we will negotiate." If countries follow that course of action, there will be no sense in talking about resorting to the rule of law for settlement of issues that threaten the peace of the world. We shall then prove that our objective is to return to the jungle law of American military might.

I can see the United States going to the United Nations or the conference table had Russia come to dominate the Caribbean in 1962.

Mr. President, if we are going to take the position that the time to negotiate does not exist until we dominate the battlefield, then when we dominate the battlefield of southeast Asia, Red China will throw all she has into southeast Asia.

Remember this about our policy in Asia: A nation does not have to commit the first violation in order to be in violation of the Geneva accords. And it does not have to commit aggression in order to be in violation of the United Nations Charter; and all the journalistic squirming and weaseling by the Freed-

mans cannot change that ugly fact and that sad indictment against the United States.

We have violated these accords and the United Nations Charter time and time again. We are pursuing neither law nor peace in Asia. We are not even pursuing freedom. We are maintaining a military, tyrannical dictatorship over the South Vietnamese, headed by an American puppet to whom we give the orders, and who moves only under our orders.

Mr. President, whoever fights a war without taking the matter to the United Nations, is in violation of the charter, whether that party started the war or not.

The United States cannot hide itself behind the alibi that we are not the only ones who are violating the Geneva accords and the United Nations Charter. Of course we are not. The Communists in Asia are violating international law, too; but since when can the United States justify an act of illegality because someone else is committing an act of illegality? The fact that North Vietnam and the Communists in Laos and Red China are also threatening the peace in Asia does not justify our walking out on our international obligations. To the contrary, it makes it more important that we lay the charges before the United Nations, or go to a 14-nation Conference, or seek to get SEATO to come in and exercise peacekeeping policies until the United Nations can take over jurisdiction.

That has been the thesis of the Senator from Oregon for weeks. It will continue to be my thesis so long as my country follows its course of outlawry in southeast Asia. "Outlawry," I remind Max Freedman, means outside the law, and our policy in Asia today is outside the law.

Mr. Freedman's column today somehow carries all the overtones and pathos of the diplomats and generals who led their countries into World War I. It was always going to be the other side that was going to back down in the face of a magnificent navy or army or military machine, and any treaty that was inconvenient to national interests became "just a scrap of paper."

I never thought the time would come when my country would treat existing treaties as scraps of paper. My country's violation of the Geneva accords, of the United Nations Charter, and the Constitution itself, reflect the attitude of treating international obligations and constitutional obligations as scraps of paper.

Some of us have liked to think that the championing of the League of Nations by Woodrow Wilson, and later our active sponsorship of the United Nations marked an American commitment to the rule of law in world affairs, including our own interests in world affairs.

What we are doing in Asia is setting the United States above all that. Once we have decided an American interest was at stake, we have ignored our treaty obligations and our obligations to the United Nations. We have cranked up the American military machine to move into Asia.

The apologists who piously deplore spreading the war, but who in the meantime want to continue it in South Vietnam and Laos, rather than negotiate, are scarcely different from those who want to expand it. The war in South Vietnam is not going to get better for us. Perhaps it will not get any worse but I see no chance that it will get better. And the longer it continues under those circumstances, the more certain it is that the war will be expanded.

If a nation wants to live up to its international commitments, it must live up to them and not find excuses for avoiding them. The only policy in the world I am advocating for the United States is that we live up to the Geneva Accords and the U.N. Charter.

For Mr. Freedman's benefit, I repeat the language to which he takes such exception: The United States is violating one international commitment after another.

So we are.

GEN. MAXWELL D. TAYLOR, U.S.
AMBASSADOR TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last point I wish to make deals with the action taken by the Senate today in confirming the nomination of General Taylor as American Ambassador to South Vietnam.

When the Senate took that action—and I understand there were only a few Senators on the floor when it took place—I was downstairs in the Committee on Foreign Relations presenting an argument against a shocking waste of taxpayer funds in a foreign aid program that is in need of drastic revision.

I was not aware that the Taylor nomination was to be brought up at that time. It was well known that I voted against the confirmation of the Taylor nomination in committee. I wish briefly to say for the record that I think nominating General Taylor as American Ambassador to South Vietnam was a most unfortunate mistake, and for the following reasons:

First, it is known around the world that General Taylor was one of the architects, along with McNamara and Rusk, of the war plans of the United States in Vietnam.

It is unfortunate that we should send as our Ambassador to South Vietnam a military leader—and a very able military leader he is, too—when all the world has its eyes turned to the hope for peace. The appointment of General Taylor as Ambassador to South Vietnam increases the possibility of our going into a full scale war in Asia if the Red Chinese and the North Vietnamese do not back down under American threats.

I am also satisfied that General Taylor will not hesitate to advocate the escalating of that war into North Vietnam and into Red China and into Laos if the Red Chinese do not quiver and quake and retreat.

I have great regard for General Taylor as a military leader. If we get into a war, I believe we shall find that most military experts in this country will agree with the observation I now make,

namely, that we probably have a no more able potential theater commander for that war than General Taylor. But he has no place behind the desk of an Ambassador.

There is a growing trend in this Republic for the military to take over more and more policy determinations. I had hoped that we would make it more clear than it has been made to date that under our constitutional system it is not for the military to determine policy, but to carry out orders; and that American foreign policy should be determined by the civilian branch of the Government—by the President, his chief agent, the Secretary of State, and the Congress.

The symbolism of putting this general behind an Ambassador's desk in South Vietnam is uncalled for and unfortunate. It will be subject to great misunderstanding, and will accrue to the great disadvantage of the standing of the United States in many parts of the world, particularly in the so-called underdeveloped nations. I am satisfied that great fear is developing toward the United States in the underdeveloped nations. They are beginning to see great differences between our preachments and our practices, and are beginning to raise questions about the hypocrisy of the United States in the field of foreign policy.

Furthermore, I have heard General Taylor as a witness before the Foreign Relations Committee over a period of years. He has demonstrated his great ability, his wide knowledge, and his expertness in the field of military affairs. But he has never instilled any confidence in his ability in the field of foreign policy.

How well I remember the stunning shock that I suffered at the time of the Berlin crisis when, listening to General Taylor and General White, I came to realize that I was listening to two American military leaders who would not hesitate to drop the nuclear bomb, as though that would settle any issue involving the peace of the world.

General Taylor is among those in the Pentagon who have itchy trigger fingers when it comes to the use of nuclear power in case we are challenged and our bluff is called. I want to avoid those challenges. I think one of the best ways to avoid those challenges is to have the United States stop bluffing, because we may have our bluff called.

The sad thing is that if we do, a nuclear war will be on, and there will be no victory. I have no confidence whatever in General Taylor in the field of American foreign policy. Taking his uniform off and putting him behind an Ambassador's desk will not change the fact that his orientation is the orientation of the military, not the orientation of civilian foreign policy.

The symbolism of his appointment is most unfortunate. My President should have selected someone such as the man he selected as Deputy Ambassador, Mr. Alexis Johnson, or some other outstanding career officer in the Foreign Service of the State Department, rather than to dip into the Pentagon and take a military general to direct American foreign policy in southeast Asia.

As I said to Mr. Lodge in person yesterday, when he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations, it is unfortunate that a former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the former Ambassador of the United States to South Vietnam, should return to the United States and tell the American people, in effect, that the time is not propitious for us to take the southeast Asia crisis to the United Nations. I shall never be able to understand how a former Ambassador to the United Nations could demonstrate such a complete failure to uphold our obligations under the United Nations Charter. If it were not so tragic, it would be amusing, when one considers the answer he has given to the proposal to go to a 14-nation conference, as recommended by the President of France, Mr. de Gaulle. What are we afraid of? No one is suggesting that while we are at that 14-nation Conference we should abandon southeast Asia. No one is suggesting that while the Security Council and, if necessary, the General Assembly consider the United Nations jurisdiction, we remove ourselves from southeast Asia, although I wish we would desist from our warmaking in southeast Asia and start a policy of peace keeping.

I would, as I have said so many times, while the matter is before a 14-nation Conference, as recommended by De Gaulle, or before the Security Council or before the General Assembly, call upon our alleged—and I underline the word "alleged"—SEATO allies to join us with a sufficient body of men to patrol the area, to keep the adversaries separate, and to stop the killing and warmaking until the procedures of the United Nations can be brought to work upon the threat to the peace of Asia and, potentially, the peace of the world.

The position taken by Henry Cabot Lodge cannot be reconciled to any degree with the clear international obligations of the United States under the United Nations Charter.

I did not expect that the stature of the President of France for peace keeping would rise above the stature of the President of the United States; but at this hour, that is exactly what is happening. The President of France is becoming recognized in many areas of the world as more determined and dedicated to the cause of peace than the President of the United States, because the President of France is calling for negotiation. The President of France is calling for the conference table. The President of France is calling for the application of the rule of law to the threat of peace in Asia.

The President of the United States is rattling the saber and telling the world that we are willing to risk war with Red China unless Asia accepts American policy in southeast Asia.

I cannot understand why my Government cannot see, before it is too late, that that kind of warmaking policy on the part of the United States spells trouble. Let me make it clear, as I close, that there is no question that we are joined in our outlawry by South Vietnam, by North Vietnam, by the

Pathet Lao Communists in Laos, and by Red China.

Does that justify our outlawry? Does that justify the policy of expediency applied to international affairs which best describes American policy tonight in Asia? Does the end-justifies-the-means principle square with American precepts of foreign policy?

Since when do two wrongs make a right?

Never before has that been our policy. I pray again that my country will see the horrendous mistake it is making in Asia as a matter of policy, before it is too late.

I close by saying, for the benefit of those who do not like my speeches and for the benefit of such journalists as Mr. Freedman, "You had better check it with the American people."

I am satisfied that millions of fellow Americans, as they begin to understand the issue at stake in southeast Asia, will support my position.

I can now say, along with the Senator from Alaska, that my mail is running better than 100 to 1 in support of my position. My mail is coming in from coast to coast, as Senators will see from some samples placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from time to time. I placed a large quantity in the RECORD today. It is coming from the leaders of many communities in this country.

I wish to state to President Johnson that I am satisfied that the American people do not approve of America's warmaking policy in Asia, and that the American people wish the President of the United States to join with the President of France and other advocates of negotiation, that we go to the conference table and seek to apply the rule of law to the crisis which exists in Asia.

I say most respectfully to my President, whom I shall continue to support on most issues, that I oppose him on this issue only because I owe a greater trust to my country than I owe to him.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, announces the appointment as members on the part of the Senate of the National Commission on Food Marketing, created by Senate Joint Resolution 71, the following Senators, namely, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is in the Chamber; and we have discussed the problem presented to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Judiciary Committee in meeting tomorrow, in view of the time set for

the beginning of the session of the Senate.

We have cleared this with those involved, and I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, not only is there no objection, but I also concur in the request of the Senator from Michigan and wish to confirm that there has been clearance on this matter with the minority leader.

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

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

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:

S. 6. An act to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10433. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. HART by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2972) for the relief of Dr. David J. Sencer, U.S. Public Health Service, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE submitted two amendments (Nos. 1089 and 1090), 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 were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted an amendment (No. 1091), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11049, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS) submitted an amendment (No. 1092), intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 11049, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ELLENDER submitted amendment (No. 1093), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11049, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO IMPOSE A TAX ON ACQUISITIONS OF CERTAIN FOREIGN SECURITIES—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 1094

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8000) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities in order to equalize costs of longer term financing in the United States and in markets abroad, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1095

Mr. JAVITS also submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him,

to House bill 8000, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 11 A.M.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, July 2, 1964, at 11 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 1, 1964:

AMBASSADORS

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, U.S. Army, retired, of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary

and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Vietnam.

Sam P. Gilstrap, of Oklahoma, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Malawi.

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, to be promoted from the class of career minister to the class indicated. Career Ambassador.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Walter Ely, of California, to be U.S. circuit judge, ninth circuit.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

Spottswood W. Robinson III, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia.

Edmund Port, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of New York.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Leonard L. Sells, of Virginia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 9, 1964.

Leonard L. Sells, of Virginia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 5 years, expiring August 9, 1969.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Iron Imports Continue To Feed the Fire of Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, pig iron and cast iron soil pipe imports continue to feed the fire of unemployment and ever-decreasing workloads in one of our basic American industries. Many of our plants in iron and steel areas are now working far below capacity. It just does not make sense for us to allow pig iron and cast iron soil pipe imports to come flooding in when so many of our hard-hit areas are suffering from lack of orders.

This situation in the first quarter of this year has become increasingly worse as compared with the first quarter of 1963. To support this contention and to further point out the factors contributing to this already deplorable situation, I submit herewith substantiating figures derived from U.S. Department of Commerce statistics:

Pig iron imports by customs district	1st quarter, 1964	1st quarter, 1963	Change, 1964 versus 1963
Atlantic coast.....	33,414	17,684	+88.9
Gulf coast.....	32,217	10,259	+214.0
West coast.....	2,718	7,032	-61.3
Canadian border and inland.....	16,200	11,464	+41.3
Offshore.....	346	248	+39.5
Total pig iron imports.....	84,895	46,439	+82.8

Mr. Speaker, the dollar value of pig iron imports for the first quarter of 1964

totaled \$3,352,618 versus \$1,942,561 for the same period in 1963, or an increase of 73 percent, or \$1,410,057. Pig iron exports for the same period totaled \$421,461 in 1964 versus \$1,191,510 for 1963, or a decrease of 65 percent, or \$770,049 in 1964. The total outflow of dollars for pig iron imports and the decrease in dollars for exports represent an increase in dollar loss to the United States of \$2,180,106 for the first quarter of 1964 over 1963.

Cast iron soil pipe imports, by customs district	1st quarter, 1964	1st quarter, 1963	Change, 1964 versus 1963
Atlantic coast.....	2,502	3,323	-24.7
Gulf coast.....	527	87	+505.7
West coast.....	6,910	4,225	+63.5
Offshore.....	120	320	-62.5
Total cast iron soil pipe imports.....	10,059	7,955	+26.4

Mr. Speaker, in 1964 the dollar value of the above pipe imports was \$1,114,978; in 1963, \$821,243, or an increase of 36 percent. As a matter of information, cast iron pressure pipe imports are no longer identified.

Burundi Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, Burundi today celebrates the second anniversary of her independence. We take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to

His Majesty King Wmambutsa IV; and to His Excellency the Burundi Ambassador to the United States, Leon Ndenzako.

Burundi is a small kingdom situated in the mountains and plateaus which separate the Nile and Congo River Basins. Its many rivers, two of which are the southernmost sources of the Nile, rise in these mountains to begin their long twisting journey to the sea. The capital, Usumbura, which is a bustling city of 50,000 inhabitants, overlooks Lake Tanganyika, the longest fresh-water lake in the world. Most of the trade between this landlocked country and the outside world travels down this body of water to be taken either to Atlantic or Indian Ocean ports.

Three different ethnic groups in Burundi live harmoniously together. A small number of pygmies remain, while the overwhelming number are Hutus, who form 85 percent of the population. These industrious people have traditionally been farmers, an occupation that most in Burundi still follow. Since the fifteenth century, their overlords have been the Tutsi, a nomadic, pastoral people of Hamitic origins who migrated to this area from Ethiopia.

European influence came late to this land which is nestled far from the oceans. Visits by the great explorers, Speke, Stanley and Livingstone, were soon followed by those of Germans and in the 1880's Germany was given control of Burundi. This rule lasted until World War I when Belgian troops occupied the country for the Allies. Under their rule, health measures, schools and new crops were introduced, as well as other improvements.

With Belgian preparations for independence, Burundi has enjoyed a stable government since its independence. The Mwami, or leader of the Tutsi, heads the government, while a national assembly is elected by direct universal suffrage