of the users would use a downtown branch rather than one located at the harbor, at page 23.

Fifth. The Commissioner of Customs, in his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee, indicated that if the plan to house customs in the harbor area and to house the users in a World Trade Center to be constructed in that area, was not accepted and implemented, he would not be in favor of proceeding with the harbor area plan.

Sixth. The users of customs located in the central area of Los Angeles have not accepted the plan, and are as much opposed to moving the customs offices to the harbor area as they were at the time of the hearings at Los Angeles before the Commissioner of Customs in 1961, when the Commissioner acknowledged (in his report of June 5, 1961, page 10), that the 90 percent of users of customs in the downtown area made an overwhelming case against the harbor area site.

Seventh. The 40 customs brokerage firms in the downtown area alone, account for about 500 employees who would be forced to leave the downtown area or seek other employment. Many of the employees have indicated an unwillingness to work in the harbor area. This would cause grave personnel problems to these firms, as these employees require special training and are difficult to replace.

Eighth. Many of these firms feel that it would be necessary for them to maintain offices in the harbor area and downtown, to properly service their customers, which would add substantially to the cost of customs clearance of imported merchandise at the ports in our customs district. Increased costs of customs clearance could well adversely affect the continued growth of international trade through our port.

Ninth. Removal of these firms from the downtown area would result in loss of business by restaurants, department stores, and other establishments now patronized by these firms and their employees.

Tenth. Moving the customshouse to the harbor area would not result in any substantial saving in operating costs to the customs service. Cost of transporting packages for examination to the appraiser's stores is based on handling, not on mileage carried. In any event, examinations are made at the dock in many cases, by personnel already stationed at the docks. However, travel of customs officials to importers' premises would be greatly increased, since importers' premises are located throughout the metropolitan area in a 40-mile radius from the present downtown location of customs.

Eleventh. Customs operates very efficiently from its present location; the cost of administration in the Los Angeles Customs District is only 2.7 cents per dollar of revenue collected, one of the lowest figures shown by any customs district.

Twelfth. Removal of the customs offices from downtown Los Angeles will inconvenience 90 percent of the users and is not required for adequate service to the harbor area, where customs offices have been maintained, since 1911, to handle work arising there. These offices (now in the harbor area) include the entire Marine Division, which handles the entry and clearance of vessels, and enforcement and inspectional personnel required at the harbor area. Export documents can be filed at the harbor or downtown, but the greater number are filed downtown, by far, as indicated in the Commissioner's report, page 9, giving the following statistics for the first 4 months of 1961: 74,381 export declarations filed downtown, and 5,844 at San Pedro.

Thirteen. The customs offices in Los Angeles offer better service to the importing public from their present locations than would be available if the downtown offices were removed to the harbor area. Our complex metropolitan area, served by air, sea, and rail, requires facilities at the harbor, at the airport, and in the downtown area where most of the persons using the customs offices are located. Facilities were established at the International Airport several years ago, to properly process air importations, and will be maintained there; there is no plan to close the airport office in order to consolidate customs offices in the Los Angeles Customs District under one roof.

Fourteen. The proposed plans for a world trade center in the harbor area have not materialized, for construction on Terminal Island, and most of the users in the downtown area do not want to move, even if such facilities were available, because of the many inconveniences of a harbor area location.

Fifteen. The Bureau of Customs recently authorized the collector of customs at Houston to move his offices from the Civic Center area of downtown Houston to another building in downtown Houston closer to the customs brokers and steamship companies. The reason stated was that the move was "in the best interests of the brokers, importers, and other users of customs who will have more ready access to the customs offices with which they deal and that customs will attain better public relations."

This was accomplished through the efforts and assistance of Congressman ALBERT THOMAS, of Houston.

Sixteen. The same objectives should be sought at Los Angeles, as indicated in the letter of Ken Hamanaka, customhouse broker of Los Angeles, in his letter of July 13, 1964, to the Commissioner of Customs, copy attached. Mr. Hamanaka's views are typical of the views of the customs brokers and other users of customs in Los Angeles.

Seventeen. While the reply received by Hamanaka from the Bureau of Customs stated that the situation at Houston was not regarded as comparable to that at Los Angeles, it is apparent that the relocation of the collector of customs office in Houston was for the convenience of the brokers, importers, and other users of customs, and that the facilities were not removed from the downtown area of Houston solely to combine them under one roof in another custom building at the ship channel 15 miles from downtown Houston, where other customs personnel are stationed.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1964

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

Rev. H. S. Hill, minister, Wesleyan Methodist Church, Herrickville, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Lord, God of our fathers, who under Thy guidance formed this great Nation, we approach Thee with careful thoughts and according to Thy word, in the name of Thy only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. We humbly confess our sins as a nation, and plead for Thy forgiveness.

We thank Thee for national peace in this trouble-torn world. May our influence, at home and abroad, be for the help and uplift of Thy master creation. Breathe again into our nostrils the breath of life.

Bless Mr. Johnson, our President; help us to hold up his hands in all that is right and correct. Bless each officer and Member of the Senate, the Cabinet, and our Ambassadors who act for us in the nations of this world.

Bless the afterglow of the lives of our great men—George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, and others. May their lives, so well lived, assist us as a nation and as individuals. May we not miss the plan Thou hast made for our lives.

We ask these favors in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 1, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1531) to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7348) for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3060) to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas).

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAHON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. MULTER, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. HORAN, Mr. BOW, and Mr. LAIRD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 358. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 5,000 additional copies of "Immigration Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Parts 1, 2, and 3";

H. Con. Res. 364. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of an additional 1,000 copies of the document entitled "Study of Population and Immigration Problems; Population of the United States"; and

H. Con. Res. 370. Concurrent resolution relating to the enrollment of the bill H.R. 5871.

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 MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EIGHTY-SEVENTH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR HAYDEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the present time the President pro tempore, as always, is actively engaged in the affairs of the Senate and is presiding over the Appropriations Committee conference and therefore is not in the Chamber.

However, I feel that on this most auspicious occasion I should take this opportunity to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the dean of this body, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], is 87 years old today.

He has the longest term of service of any Member of either House. Until the admission of Hawaii into the Union, he was the only man who came to Washington to represent a State from its inception.

Senator HAYDEN has performed magnificently down through the years. He has always been courteous, kind, tolerant, and considerate to Senators on both sides of the aisle.

On this occasion, I express the hope that, although this is a celebration of his first 87 years, he will still be with us 87 years from now.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is an honor for me to join the leader of the majority in the Senate in a brief tribute to one of America's most beloved citizens and the "first Senator."

CARL HAYDEN brings to this legislative Chamber a long lifetime of dedicated and abundant experience in American government, and in inborn and unique ability to legislate and achieve progress.

He is far more than the titular dean of the Senate, far more than simply the senior Senator from Arizona. He is a highly successful Senator for the United States of America, and all her people.

Every man and woman in this Chamber will be eternally indebted to CARL HAYDEN for the unselfish, generous, and constant assistance which he has freely given to each of us on many occasions.

I have often said that my own State of California, over the years, has really had three Senators—for on many occasions CARL HAYDEN has helped his colleagues from California to achieve legislative progress for our people.

California is not unique. CARL HAYDEN has done the same for the State of Montana, and for every other State in the Union.

So, with a heart full of affection and great respect, I am most glad to say to the dean of the Senate "Many happy returns of the day." We pray for him many more constructive, fruitful, and healthful years in the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I join Senators who are paying tribute to CARL HAYDEN on his 87th birthday anniversary, although I wish he did not have so many of them.

I have always found Senator HAYDEN cooperative and willing to help Senators in need, regardless of the side of the aisle on which they were sitting.

I wish him many more birthdays. I wish we could turn the clock back, but so long as that cannot be done, I sincerely appreciate what he has done for me—and for other Senators.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am happy to have the opportunity today to join Senators in paying tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. HAYDEN] on his 87th birthday anniversary.

Few people in this world have had an opportunity to achieve so many years on earth; but in addition, few people have had the opportunity to render so much public service in the span of years which the Lord has allotted them.

I have personally had the pleasure of serving on the Appropriations Committee with CARL HAYDEN since 1959. It would be difficult for me to express the deep appreciation I feel for his constant counsel and guidance in this difficult and complex field.

Upon no occasion, when assistance was needed, or when explanation was needed, has he ever spared any effort to see that I and all other members of the committee were completely informed, and that we were kept informed and advised as to the progress of the various programs considered by the Appropriations Committee.

There are few persons who understand Senators the way he does. Few Senators have ever been as continuously kind, courteous, and responsive as the senior Senator from Arizona has been.

For these reasons and many others, I am most happy to join my colleagues today in wishing him a happy birthday and paying tribute to his service to our country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit, for printing in the RECORD, a tribute by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] to Senator CARL HAYDEN.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

I wish to join my colleagues in extending heartfelt best wishes to my close friend and fellow Arizonan, Senator CARL HAYDEN.

For the past 12 years it has been my honor to represent—with him—the people of Arizona. I cherish his friendship. My admiration for him is profound. All our words of tribute to him are indeed deserved. He has the very best wishes of all of us; and on the occasion of his 87th birthday, we wish him many, many more.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois; Russell B. Long, U.S. Senator from the State of Louisiana; Frank Carlson, U.S. Senator from the State of Kansas; William C. Foster, of the District of Columbia; and Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York; to be Representatives of the United States of America to the 19th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

Charles W. Yost, of New York; Franklin H. Williams, of California; Mrs. Gladys A. Tillett, of North Carolina; Richard N. Gardner, of the District of Columbia; and Charles P.

Noyes, of New York; to be Alternate Representatives of the United States of America to the 19th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, of New York, to be the Representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations; and

John W. Bowling, of Texas, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service.

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

Eugene C. Patterson, of Georgia, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights;

James F. Delaney, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; and

Charlotte Paul Groshell, of Washington, to be a member of the Board of Parole.

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

Jon O. Newman, of Connecticut, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Connecticut.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raul H. Castro, of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, do I read this name correctly? Is it Raul Castro, to be Ambassador to El Salvador?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there are many reasons why, before the Senate acts on the nomination of a man named Raul Castro for Ambassador of the United States to El Salvador, we should have a clear and precise description of exactly who this Raul Castro is. I would like to get some assurance from the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs as to this nomination.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that Judge Castro, who is the nominee, is not related in any degree whatsoever to the Castros of Cuba.

Judge Castro is a distinguished judge in the State of Arizona. Some years ago, he was a member of the Foreign Service in the State Department. In my opinion, based upon his knowledge of Latin America, he is one of the most able persons that could be selected for an ambassadorship in Latin America. He speaks Spanish fluently. He knows Latin America. Seldom have I been as enthusiastic about the appointment of an Ambassador for Latin America as I am concerning that of Judge Castro.

I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that the country is fortunate in having such an able person selected to represent us in the diplomatic corps in Latin America.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. It is easy to imagine what could be said about the nomination of a man with such a name unless there were a clear record of this kind made on the floor of the Senate at the time this body confirms him.

I ask the Senator from Oregon whether, when this nomination was reported, a quorum of the committee was present.

Mr. MORSE. I do not believe there was a quorum present at the time that we examined Judge Castro. But, I am satisfied that a quorum passed judgment finally on his nomination.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

The reason I make the point is that an appointment to a Federal judgeship in Wisconsin has been pending before the Committee on the Judiciary since September 1963. The judge was nominated by President Kennedy. At President Kennedy's last press conference, in answer to a question, he said that he was in enthusiastic support of David Rabinovitz for circuit judge. Rabinovitz was the nominee to serve as judge in the western district of Wisconsin.

That nomination has not been approved by the Committee on the Judiciary. It was not approved in 1963. President Johnson gave Judge Rabinovitz a recess appointment last January 7th. That recess appointment will expire when we adjourn sine die. Both Senators from Wisconsin have approved this nomination. Two Presidents have nominated him. I am convinced after talks with members of the Judiciary Committee that a majority of the Judiciary Committee favor his nomination.

It is a tragedy for Judge Rabinovitz, a misfortune for our State and a serious injustice that we have a situation in which it is virtually impossible to get a quorum of the Committee on the Judiciary. And without a quorum we simply cannot get action. On the basis of that technicality, this man is disqualified. Both Senators from Wisconsin are in favor of his appointment. And yet he is not going to be approved and take office during this session.

As I understand the technical situation, if the Senate adjourns sine die, Judge Rabinovitz's appointment will automatically end as of that moment.

There has been no action by the Committee on the Judiciary against this nominee. He has the support of all of the interested parties, to the best of my knowledge. But I must concede this is indeed a controversial appointment.

The Library of Congress is unable to show any precedent for turning down a President in his nomination of a judge to serve within a State who has been approved by both Senators from that State. Mr. President, I hope a way—some way—can be found to win Judge Rabinovitz' eventual confirmation.

I withdraw any objection to the nomination of Raul Castro.

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

AIR FORCE AND ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force and Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations confirmed today.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, 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:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES AT PLUM BROOK STATION, SANDUSKY, OHIO

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of facilities at Plum Brook Station, Sandusky, Ohio; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON ON GUARANTEES OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS

A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the issuance by that Bank on September 22, 1964, of guarantees with respect to certain transactions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANY AMENDMENTS OF 1964

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of savings and loan holding companies and subsidiary companies (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SUBSECTION (d) OF SECTION 5 OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933, AND SECTION 407 OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subsection (d) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, and section 407 of the National Housing Act, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the procurement of defective torpedo tubes from the Youngstown Welding & Engineering Co., Youngstown, Ohio, Department of the Navy, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

of cargo transporters, Department of the Army, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive prices negotiated by the defense fuel supply center for storage of petroleum in a commercial facility at Grand Forks, N. Dak., Department of Defense, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on uneconomical leasing of motor vehicles for use in assembly and checkout operations at Minuteman missile launch sites and avoidance of congressional controls relating to acquisition of motor vehicles, Department of the Air Force, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the purchase of automatic flight control systems for A–4 series aircraft, Department of the Navy, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ENTITLED "JUVENILE DELINQUENCY"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1608)

Mr. DODD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate resolution 63, 88th Congress, 1st session, submitted a report entitled "Juvenile Delinquency," which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 3238. A bill for the relief of Luigi Filippo LoCicero, Michael Anthony LoCicero, and Domenic Louis LoCicero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 3239. A bill for the relief of Anna Ungvari; and

S. 3240. A bill for the relief of Gabor Siska and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for Mr. KEATING):

S. 3241. A bill for the relief of Vasil Laci; and

S. 3242. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theresa Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 3243. A bill to amend subsection (d) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, and section 407 of the National Housing Act, as amended; and

S. 3244. A bill to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of savings and loan holding companies and subsidiary companies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 3245. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the furnishing of additional information by tax-exempt labor organizations and to require the disclosure of such information to the members of such organizations and to the public; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3246. A bill to provide for the inclusion in the charter or bylaws of labor organizations of provisions requiring officers of such organizations to respond to certain questions concerning their qualifications asked in proceedings before tribunals empowered to elicit testimony; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HART:

S. 3247. A bill for the relief of Samy Antoun Kassab, Geliana Antoun Kassab, Bader Antoun Kassab, Julet Antoun Kassab, and Adel Antoun Kassab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 3248. A bill for the relief of Suzanne Mallalieu Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 2, 1964, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1531. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana;

S. 1640. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad;

S. 2180. An act to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; and

S. 3174. An act to amend section 5 of the Employment Act of 1946.

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

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. HUMPHREY):

Statement by Senator HUMPHREY on need to increase exports, and opportunities for small business in that regard.

By Mr. BIBLE (for Mr. CANNON):

Statement by Senator CANNON on senior citizens voting, and letter from Housing Authority of City of Las Vegas.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Excerpt from speech on legislative apportionment, delivered by him at Charlottesville, Va., on August 30, 1960.

OUTSTANDING RECORD OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the outstanding record of the Senate Committee on Armed Services during the 2d session of the 88th Congress, under the brilliant chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

RECORD OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, 2D SESSION, 88TH CONGRESS

LEGISLATION

Public Law 88–288, authorizing appropriations during fiscal year 1965 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces: Authorizes appropriations for these purposes in the amount of $16,976,620,000.

Public Law 88–390, military construction authorization: Authorizes military construction and provides authorization for housing construction and maintenance in the amount of $1,534,994,000.

Public Law 88–422, military pay increase: Provides a 2½-percent increase in the rates of basic pay for all officers and enlisted members of the uniformed services with over 2 years of service and an 8½-percent increase in the rates of basic pay for all officers with under 2 years of service. The increases total $207,519,000 over a full fiscal year.

Public Law 88–276, increasing cadet strength at Military and Air Force Academies: Increases the authorized cadet strength of the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy from 2,529 to 4,417, the strength of the U.S. Naval Academy. Also makes uniform the statutory provisions relating to the nomination and appointment of cadets and midshipmen to the service academies and extends the period of obligated service for academy graduates from 3 to 5 years.

S. 2272, Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964: Revises and consolidates the laws relating to stockpile management and permits orderly disposal of stockpile excesses.

H.R. 9124, ROTC legislation: Revises laws relating to the ROTC program for the purposes of expanding the junior ROTC program and attracting more applicants for the advanced course of the senior ROTC program.

H.R. 8427, CIA retirement: Provides improved retirement system for certain employees of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Considered and favorably reported 25 other measures on miscellaneous subjects relating to national defense.

NOMINATIONS

Considered 49,258 nominations. Five committee meetings required for consideration of civilian and military officials to statutory offices traditionally involving personal appearances by nominees before committee.

SUBCOMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee: Monitored implementation of nuclear test ban safeguards and prepared two classified reports on this subject, conducted hearings on military situation in South Vietnam, issued report on award of X–22 (VSTOL) development contract, held hearings on explosions of ATLAS–F missiles and conducted staff studies on missile reliability, naval shipyards, Army weapons programs, and air defense facilities.

Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee: Performed legislative oversight over Central Intelligence Agency and the policies and programs being carried out by that Agency under the National Security Act and the Central Intelligence Act of 1949.

National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves Subcommittee: Considered and favorably reported S. 2272, which would revise and consolidate the laws relating to stockpile management and would permit orderly disposal of stockpile excesses. Recommended separate bills and resolutions authorizing disposal from national stockpile of excess quantities of zinc, molybdenum, antinomy, cadmium, lead, sisal, and tin.

Status of Forces Subcommittee: Conducted hearings and issued report on that part of the NATO Status of Forces Treaty which relates to criminal jurisdiction that is not waived by host countries in which U.S. Forces are stationed.

Officer Grade Limitations Subcommittee: Considered reports submitted by military departments on officer grade distribution.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR METCALF ON WORK DONE ON BEHALF OF ELECTRIC CONSUMERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the night before last there was held in Bismarck, N. Dak., the conference of Western States Water & Power Consumers Conference.

I hope that I shall not embarrass the present Presiding Officer of the Senate; but, I wish to pay tribute to him. He was highly honored at this conference of the Western States Water & Power Consumers Conference.

I sent to that conference the following message:

SEPTEMBER 30, 1964.

Mr. LEONARD KENFIELD,
Chairman, Western States Water & Power Consumers Conference, Grand Pacific Hotel, Bismarck, N. Dak.:

My heartiest greetings to all attending the Western States Water & Power Consumers Conference this year. Regret that legislative duties in the Senate on the national defense education conference report prevented my being with you. Particularly regret that I will not have an opportunity to hear Senator LEE METCALF'S keynote address. LEE has been doing a tremendous job on behalf of electric consumers in his Senate speeches relating to the propaganda and lobbying activities of the so-called investor-owned utilities and I know he has a message of prime importance for your conference.

Am gratified that you plan to recognize LEE'S outstanding contributions by a special award, and that awards will also be presented to Mrs. Nancy Kefauver on behalf of her late husband, the dedicated and courageous Senator Estes Kefauver, and to Jim Patton, veteran friend of the farmer and president of the Farmers Union.

I was proud to count Estes Kefauver among my closest associates in the Senate and we joined together on many occasions in promoting what we believed to be legislation and action in the general public interest. Jim Patton is deserving of great tribute for his constant fight to preserve the family-sized farm and to conserve the natural resources of our Nation.

My Senate colleagues, Federal officials, and all of you who are attending the conference are my longtime friends. We have many common goals. I hope that we may go forward with renewed determination to achieve our objectives of comprehensive and full development of American water and power resources for the benefit of the American people.

My every good wish for a highly successful conference.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. President, I am sure that my colleagues in the Senate join me in extending to the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] our heartiest congratulations for the deserved award that was granted him at this conference of the Western States Water & Power Consumers Conference.

THE 88TH CONGRESS—THE "CONSERVATION CONGRESS"

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the 88th Congress has been characterized by many as the "Conservation Congress." This plaudit is a sign of greater public concern for conservation projects. The growing awareness of the needs in this field is heartening to those of us on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

While we are thankful for the response to the recent enactments regarding our natural resources, it is important that this interest not be allowed to die on the vine.

For this reason, the remarks of our colleague from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] upon the occasion of the Fontenelle Forest landmark dedication in Omaha were most welcome. Senator HRUSKA, in addition to pointing out the accomplishments of this Congress, makes this vital admonition:

If we fail to protect the dwindling areas of virgin forest and true prairie * * * then there will not be another opportunity.

Mr. President, it has been a source of great personal satisfaction to work with the Senator from Nebraska and my other colleagues in the preservation of our country's beauty.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of Senator HRUSKA'S remarks upon the occasion of the Fontenelle Forest landmark dedication.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR ROMAN L. HRUSKA, FONTENELLE FOREST LANDMARK DEDICATION, OMAHA, SEPTEMBER 13, 1964

Measured against such dramatic achievements as rockets to the moon or television transmissions halfway around the world, it may seem like a small thing we do here today in recognizing Fontenelle Forest as a natural history landmark.

But in a different light, what we do here today is most important. If we fail to reach the moon—as we have—we can try again another day—as we have.

But if we fail to protect the dwindling areas of virgin forest and true prairie, such as this forest, then there will not be another opportunity.

I am pleased to see in Nebraskans a reawakened interest in preserving our historic and scenic sites and areas. For too many years we ignored this part of our heritage. Perhaps it was because we were, by most standards, too young a State.

In recent years, however—and I hope the trend will accelerate as we prepare to observe the Nebraska Centennial 3 years hence—there have been encouraging signs of appreciation of the importance of preserving what otherwise would be lost forever.

Here in the Omaha area, we have the fine work which the Nebraska Historical Society and others have been doing at Fort Atkinson; in Nebraska City, downriver, we have Arbor Lodge, and below that, Brownville.

At Beatrice, we have the Daniel Freeman Homestead, now a national monument. Out west we have Fort Kearney, Willa Cather's home at Red Cloud, Chimney Rock at Bayard, and of course, Scotts Bluff National Monument.

More and more of our local committees are showing an interest in preserving our proud past. I think particularly of the House of Yesterday in Hastings and the Pioneer Village in Minden. There are, of course, many others.

Right now in the Congress we are working to establish still another national monument in Nebraska—the Agate Springs fossil beds north and west of Scottsbluff. We have had the enthusiastic cooperation of the Interior Department, for which we thank Secretary Carver and especially Lem Garrison and other officials of the National Park Service.

So briefly, Mr. Vance, I extend to you and the other members of the Fontenelle Forest Association, my warmest congratulations on this Federal recognition of the natural historical significance of this forest. All of us are in your debt.

EXTRACTS FROM THE REMARKS OF SENATOR ROMAN L. HRUSKA, OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE LUNCHEON, SEPTEMBER 13, 1964

It was Victor Hugo who counseled, "Let us, while waiting for new monuments, preserve the ancient monuments."

Today, in the dedication of Fontenelle Forest as a natural historical landmark, we are preserving an ancient monument. It is well that we do, for in our lifetimes there will be no new monuments to replace such natural beauty.

As our minds focus today on our stewardship of the priceless natural resources to which we have fallen heir, I thought you might welcome a report on some of the major conservation legislation enacted by the 88th Congress.

Some are already calling it the "Conservation Congress." This is because it has passed a number of significant bills, some of which have special importance for our State.

On September 1 the Congress sent to the President a bill establishing a land and water conservation fund to permit the States to plan, acquire and develop outdoor recreational facilities and to permit the Federal Government to acquire recreation areas.

The bill is based on a Federal-State partnership in the development of much-needed recreation facilities. Sixty percent of the money to be appropriated by the fund annually is earmarked exclusively for State planning. Participating States will match Federal funds on a 50–50 basis.

This measure will be of considerable assistance in developing some of our State's great outdoor recreation potential. We all know that we have the natural resources in Nebraska. This bill will give us the capital resources necessary to do a first-rate job.

I have had very encouraging correspondence from such groups in Nebraska as the Izaak Walton League. Our experience shows that such recreation areas will be fully used and one of the key provisions of this bill is that user fees will be plowed back into the fund so that it will become self-sustaining.

Another measure which passed the Senate last year, finally won approval in the House on July 31. It is the wilderness bill which establishes a National Wilderness Preservation System. Without this legislation, this country ran a real risk of losing forever to the bulldozer and commercial development areas of irreplaceable scenic beauty.

Also of interest to Nebraska are two bills which grew out of a study by a Senate Select Committee on National Water Supply. This study showed that within a generation, five areas of the country would face a critical shortage of water which would significantly hamper their economic and social progress. One of those areas is the one in which we live, the Upper Missouri Valley.

One of the bills establishes at land-grant colleges across the Nation water resource research centers which can concentrate on research peculiar to their particular areas.

The University of Nebraska is scheduled to be the site of one of these centers, perhaps at its field station at Mead.

The last bill I want to mention calls for the planning and development of basin-wide water plans. We had some difficulty with this one over the question of primacy of the State rights to water uses, but I am happy to say that we prevailed against those who would have given jurisdiction to the Federal Government. This measure has passed the Senate and prospects for action by the House appear good. I was pleased to have been a cosponsor of both the research center bill and the basin planning measure and to have played a part in their approval.

Each of the four bills I have mentioned were landmarks in the conservation field. While there were, of course, some disputes along the way, there was pretty general agreement on the eventual goals; our differences were in how to reach those goals.

Perhaps you are already familiar with a bill I introduced in the Senate to establish a national monument in northwestern Nebraska at the site of the world-famous Agate fossil beds. It is our expectation not only to preserve from destruction an irreplaceable natural scientific deposit of the richest source of fossil bones of extinct mammals on this continent, but also to establish a major tourist attraction.

The National Park Service, which would operate the monument, estimates that between 120,000 and 200,000 visitors annually may be expected, bringing more than half a million dollars a year into the area.

The Agate bill has passed the Senate and we still hope to win approval in the House. Even if we are caught in the adjournment rush, chances for passage next year are very bright.

On the whole, this Congress has measured up well to its responsibilities in the preservation of our resources. We provided adequate funds for soil conservation and reclamation projects, as well as the legislation I have mentioned.

We in the Congress, of course, can concern ourselves only with the broad national picture of conservation. The same kind of job needs to be done at the State and local levels.

By your commitment to Fontenelle Forest, the Omaha chamber shows that it is acutely conscious of its responsibility. You are heeding Hugo's advice to "preserve the ancient monuments."

McNAMARA'S WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, one of the most important things that is going on in the world at this time is McNamara's war in South Vietnam. For some reason or other, the news media seem fairly well able—speaking of the daily news media—to keep this swept under the rug and out of the view of the consciousness of the American people.

What is going on in South Vietnam today is one of the most serious things that has happened to America in the last 25 years—certainly since World War II.

I have in my hands an article published in the Air Force Space Digest by Mr. Claude Witze, the senior editor of that particular publication.

In the article the author discusses some of the practical facets of McNamara's war which is going on in South Vietnam, and which the American people are apparently being asked to forget about and not to consider. It is one of the greatest dilemmas—and confusions—in American foreign policy that we have ever had. Because of the specific facts and the specific items that Mr. Witze learned while he was in South Vietnam studying the subject, I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the RECORD.

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

A CRACK IN THE FACADE

(By Claude Witze)

HICKAM AIR FORCE BASE, HAWAII, August 17.—It may be that the turning point in the Vietnamese war was brought about 2 weeks ago when the Communists tried to sink two American destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin. If the incident did nothing else, it put a big crack in the facade created by U.S. insistence that we observe the terms of the 1954 Geneva accord.

En route home from Saigon, where jets stood on the public airport runway last month even though their presence was officially unacknowledged, this reporter bumped squarely into jet reinforcements en route to Vietnam. There was no blanket of secrecy at Hickam Air Force Base, home of the Pacific Air Forces (PACAF), as interceptors, fighter-bombers, and reconnaissance aircraft were mobilized. The first were RF–101's and RB–57's. Some of them came to Hawaii nonstop from Shaw AFB in South Carolina and were in Vietnam a day later. It was a demonstration of the speedy response that is possible only with airpower, properly used.

At PACAF headquarters there was a sleepless night. The aircraft were on their way on August 4, but the standing order remained that we would never tell the world we were moving modern equipment into the theater. Their arrival would be public knowledge at Hickam and again at places like Guam, the Philippines, and Saigon itself. It was not until the morning of August 5, Washington time, that Defense Secretary Robert McNamara announced the movement, with careful specifics. Interceptors—the F–102—and fighter-bombers were being moved into South Vietnam, fighter-bombers into Thailand, a neighboring haven. Other squadrons were en route to advance bases in the Pacific. The crack in the facade is widening.

Yet, as the alert approaches the 2-week mark, there is no indication that tactical air is being utilized in Vietnam in much more than token fashion. Reports from the front to this date (August 17) indicate that the ground situation continues to deteriorate as it did all during July. The Vietcong Reds continue to be successful in their ambush operations. Experience has shown that these can be curbed most effectively by providing Air Force convoys for movements along highways, railroads, or canals. The Vietcong continue to be elusive. Their intelligence network is excellent; it is estimated that the Communists know within a couple of hours after the decision has been made to rout them from a position. Yet, in one case last week, the defending forces mounted an assault with 96 helicopters and a Vietnamese regiment to go after an encampment of an estimated 2,000 to 3,000 Vietcong.

The concentration of Vietcong had been known for weeks, but there is no record that tactical airpower ever got serious consideration as the ideal tool to wipe it out. The business of massing 96 helicopters at the public Tan Son Nhut airfield must have made it obvious for days that a major assault was planned. According to press reports, both American and Vietnamese soldiers were surprised when the enemy could not be found.

Maj. Gen. Joseph H. Moore, Commander of the 2d Air Division at Saigon, already is quoted as having ruled out the use of the newly arrived jets in the war against the insurgents. His expressed reason is that the Geneva agreement makes this impossible. Another, of course, is that the South Vietnamese Air Force (VNAF) is not prepared to use them and the U.S. Air Force is in that country in an advisory role. Our pilots are teachers, not fighters. It may be that the crack in the facade will grow and that the U.S. Air Force's role will become as honest as that of the U.S. Army. The latter's pilots, attached to the support command under Brig. Gen. Delt M. Oden, are fighting in Vietnam, providing close air support from Army Huey helicopters and Mohawks.

Here at PACAF there is no official complaint about the restrictions on proper exploitation of airpower in Vietnam, but there is no joy, either. The Army's air operations in the theater are described as overt, as opposed to the U.S. Air Force's, which are covert, if and when circumstances force an American pilot to fight back. On the scene in Vietnam, where this reporter just spent 3 sweltering weeks, it is no secret that the U.S. Army has been using its position of dominance in the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam (MACV), to degrade airpower, and there is documentation to prove it. In the press this is put in print from time to time, but always in the frame of a "feud" between the U.S. services. But, at the working level, where the majors and captains are fighting the war in jungle or cockpit, this disagreement does not exist. Army men at this level say they appreciate airpower as much as they did in Korea—and more. When the assault mission is ready to take off, they want tactical air, and lots of it, to work over the perimeter of their designated landing areas. And napalm, which is disliked by the State Department leading to another inhibiting factor for airmen is the weapon that the Army believes most effective.

There are reports that what the newspapers call a "feud" is near its end. If this comes about, it will be a victory for the U.S. Air Force because the practical solution to the practical problem will be a shortening of the lines of communication. When the Vietnamese Corps commander wants air support he wants it quick. There has been a communications stumbling block that will disappear if the Army's key people are equipped with very-high-frequency radio; the shift is under consideration. More important, the request for air support must go through a chain of command involving too many bottlenecks and points where the request may be delayed or rejected. From the forward air controller, the chart shows a path through the air liaison officer for each regiment, division, and corps up to the air support operations center, then to the air operations center. It can take hours—it has taken as much as a full day—for a request to get through this maze. On a trial basis, the U.S. Air Force has been using its own direct communications setup, bypassing most of this predominantly Army machinery, where the requirements can get held up, canceled, or win a substitution—Army aircraft are sent out to do a job the Air Force is better equipped to do. The experiments have been successful.

One cannot come away from the theater without a basic awareness of the handicaps under which the U.S. Air Force operates in that theater. Emphasis is placed on the fact that so many of the artificial restraints on airpower are imposed by political and policy considerations that are entirely unrelated to the field of battle. The Geneva accord and the intellectual maneuverability involved in our alleged adherence to it already have been labored. And so have the State Department's worries about napalm.

There is another quirk: The Air Force cannot carry out a defoliation mission in Vietnam without specific authorization from the Ambassador. First, it should be made clear that defoliation is an important part of USAF's job in this tropical area. The Vietcong strike many of their most telling blows from jungle ambushes alongside highways, railroads, and canals. To help fight this menace, the 315th Troop Carrier Wing (Assault) based at Tan Son Nhut has three C–123 transports equipped with spray devices. These airplanes have suffered more battle damage than any other vehicles in South Vietnam. One of them was hit by machinegun fire 47 times in the month of May alone. At least one reason for this is that when permission for defoliation is given it is with the firm requirements that USAF drop leaflets and use airborne loudspeakers to tell everyone in the area that defoliation will take place and when it will take place. The result is that the Vietcong know when and where to post their machinegunners. The C–123, on this mission, flies over the treetops—500 feet up, at 130 knots. It is an inviting target. The only excuse offered for this perilous procedure is that if the warning were not given the Chicoms (Chinese Communists) would accuse the United States of resorting to germ warfare. The average USAF pilot, clothed in his bulletproof vest and risking his neck over the entire course of his sortie, understandably wishes he were getting a better run for his money. The risks taken in the name of diplomacy are more frustrating than those of open war.

Earlier in the Vietnamese war there were some in our Government who seriously questioned the use of any airpower in this conflict. They feared the multiplicity of border incidents, indiscriminate bombing, the hot pursuit that would lead to violations of the delicate political setup in relation to bordering North Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. But airpower has done its job within the ground rules. The figures used here at PACAF are almost identical with the ones reported in July from Saigon. Less than 5 percent of the total South Vietnam military force, enlisted in VNAF, is credited with 30 percent of all Vietcong casualties.

At PACAF there is available a tabulation of the air-war record for combined USAF/VNAF operations from January 1962 to January 1964. Here it is:

Combined operational sorties	29,500
Vietcong casualties (killed and wounded)	13,000
Structures damaged or destroyed	32,000
Sampans destroyed	2,800

The sampan item is one that should not be discounted. A sampan, in Indochina, is more than a funny little boat that houses a fisherman and his family. In this war, each one is equivalent to a boxcar loaded with supplies or ammunition.

Another aspect, seen more clearly from Honolulu than from Saigon, is the overall stake we have in southeast Asia and the air threat, such as it is, that the Communists pose. U.S. Army men in Vietnam are the first to admit that their use of this theater to help sell the concept of integral aviation units as part of the ground forces is possible only because there is no air opposition. It may be another USAF handicap in the theater, that there has been no requirement for interceptors and therefore no pressing requirement for early introduction of jet equipment.

But there is always talk, both at PACAF and at Tan Son Nhut, of what the North Vietnamese and the Chicoms may have in mind. Last month there were reports of Chicom air mobilization and even of Soviet helicopters operating just north of the 17th parallel. At Honolulu there is an estimate that the Communist bloc in the Pacific has available more than 5,000 tactical and tactical support aircraft. There are 1,800 in the Soviet Far East, 2,700 in Red China, and 500 in North Korea. The Chicoms put primary reliance on the manned bomber. They have 400 tactical and 300 strategic bombers. The Beagle light jet is based in North Korea and China and from those bases can strike at South Korea, Japan, Okinawa, Taiwan, and southeast Asia—which means Vietnam. The Russians have 300 heavy and medium bombers in the theater. The Bison can hit as far east as Hawaii. The Badger, with in-flight refueling, could attack Guam. That they have not, of course, is a tribute to our overall deterrent strength as well as the most recent manifestation of it.

If the war should escalate, it will be PACAF's responsibility, along with the Navy, to meet the threat. If there is a real confrontation it will be traced in the public prints back to late June. That marks the beginning of new Vietcong belligerency and success. It also is when Washington started to make noises about South Vietnam being worth a major war, sharply reversing the long series of optimistic reports brought home from Saigon by Robert McNamara. A North Vietnamese official has been quoted as saying:

"If they fail in the special war which they are testing in South Vietnam, they will also fail elsewhere. That is the international significance of the patriotic struggle of our compatriots in the south with regard to the national liberation struggle in the world."

Well, if we fail in the special war the major responsibility will shift from the Army, which runs MACV, to U.S. Air Force and the Navy, which have minimum representation in the MACV table of organization. U.S. Air Force and the Navy are the major custodians of deterrent power, the same power that reversed a terrifying situation in Cuba, as it did in Lebanon and Berlin.

The taks of winning in Vietnam without invoking deterrent power, particularly airpower, now seems to rest heavily on the shoulders of Maxwell D. Taylor. Ambassador Taylor was an Army general and also the major military adviser to President Kennedy when MACV was created. It is difficult to avoid the observation that when the crack appeared in the facade—starting with the attack on the destroyer *Maddox* on August 2—the name of the Ambassador did not appear in the news. If he was consulted or even notified that the United States was about to retaliate against the North Vietnamese Navy, there was no announcement of this fact. The same can be said for MACV and its Army commander, Lt. Gen. William C. Westmoreland, who only a few weeks earlier had rejected the suggestion that he should have an Air Force officer as his deputy.

Now Ambassador Taylor, who assumed his position barely a month ago, came to Saigon reiterating his 1961 thesis that military victory can be assured only by supporting the Government and building up the economy and society. He is, in short, determined to stir up a spirit of nationalism among the Vietnamese and to guide this spirit to ultimate victory.

A few days ago the Agency for International Development (AID) reiterated this goal, "to help the Vietnamese Government and people resist and defeat the Communist insurgents." And, it continued:

"The role of AID is to help the Vietnamese Government develop effective political, social, and economic programs. These are designed to give the people the incentives to defend their homes and villages."

Then, AID compiled some statistics to show what it, and the Ambassador, have to work with.

About 70 percent of the people in South Vietnam are illiterate. This compares with 25 percent in the Philippines and only 5 percent in Japan.

There is only 1 doctor for each 22,500 persons in South Vietnam. This compares with 1 for each 1,700 in the Philippines and 1 for each 925 in Japan.

The gross national product per capita in South Vietnam is $94. It is $128 in the Philippines and it is $556 per capita in Japan.

The job of creating a sense of nationalism in this kind of a country is a staggering task and one that could consume decades of effort. The idea that Peiping and Hanoi—or Moscow—will give us decades has little merit to the military men who have to help carry out the policy.

The suggestion that the policy now must be changed appears to have at least a root or two in Washington. The attack on North Vietnamese naval bases and our open mobilization of deterrent airpower—the crack in the facade—indicate this is true.

Whether the more basic, and important, policy changes come before the U.S. election or after is of small concern to American fighting men in Vietnam. It is common knowledge in Saigon that the Vietnamese Government's effort to improve its press notices was stepped up sharply about July 1.

It is difficult to see how these press notices will improve to any great degree unless the crack in the facade spreads. The pressure of military force, actual and potential, must be applied less subtly for it is clear that the diplomatic approach has not racked up many points. Within the past few days the Voice of America has been explaining our role in Vietnam with a broadcast by William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. Mr. Bundy has gone to great lengths to protest any implication that we plan to push the war into Communist territory north of the 17th parallel. On the other hand, he has said, "We are determined to use our strength."

The most accurate reading of this is that brinkmanship will be used, and our deterrent power demonstrated, in the case of such provocation as that offered in the Gulf of Tonkin.

It may be that the Reds, if they persist with new incidents, will smash the facade completely and force us to demolish a policy that has not worked. Ironically, it could just happen that way.

PROXMIRE PLEA FOR CHANCE FOR INDEPENDENT TO COMPETE WITH A.T. & T.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Atomic Energy Commission is attempting to slam the door on an independent Wisconsin telephone company's bid to compete with the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

The Department of Justice has written specifically advising the AEC in this particular case against shutting out independent business.

Justice told the AEC to "scrupulously avoid any action which might prejudice the opportunity of any potential purchaser to obtain the telephone facilities at Los Alamos."

The Small Business Administration also has told me that it disagrees with the AEC decision to exclude the Universal Telephone Co. of Milwaukee from the bid for the telephone facilities at Los Alamos.

The holding of the AEC that the Mountain States Telephone Co., a subsidiary of A.T. & T. is the only company

legally authorized to receive and operate these facilities not only contradicts the Department of Justice, the Government's legal expert, but guarantees monopoly.

This is not only an affront to independent business, it burdens the U.S. taxpayer because the Universal Telephone Co. of Milwaukee offered the Government far and away the best bargain for these facilities.

Here is a perfect case study in the massive difficulty of a small business competing with the greatest monopolistic power in America—A.T. & T.

The immense political power of this great financial monopoly has slammed the AEC into line in support of monopoly and against an independent business that deserves a world of credit for competing with and beating the bid of A.T. & T.

Mr. President, Universal Telephone of Milwaukee has done an excellent and responsible job of modernizing and improving telephone facilities in Wisconsin. Its reputation is superlative for responsibility, performance, and efficiency. I ask unanimous consent that letters, articles, and other documents supporting this position be presented in the RECORD.

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

INITIAL LETTER FROM UNIVERSAL TELEPHONE, INC., TO SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE

UNIVERSAL TELEPHONE, INC.,
Milwaukee, Wis., June 30, 1964.

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Universal Telephone, Inc., has its administrative offices in Milwaukee and owns operating independent telephone companies in several States, including the State of Wisconsin. I believe we have recently had the opportunity to furnish a number of directories for our Wisconsin exchanges, to you. One of our operations is also in the State of New Mexico.

Two years ago, the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) advised that they intended to dispose of telephone facilities owned by the Government located at Los Alamos, N. Mex. Since we had operations already in the State, we contacted the AEC as a possible purchaser. At that time, we were advised that Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co., a subsidiary of A.T. & T., had been providing service under a maintenance contract with the AEC. At various times, we have subsequently been advised that Mountain States either owns the property or had a right to the property under various legal arguments. In fact, it has always been Mountain States' contention that the property should be given to them without compensation, although since our company entered into the competition for the property, they have indicated some willingness to pay the Government something for the system.

For the past 2 years, we have been having a most difficult time attempting to convince the AEC that they should not give this property to Mountain States and, of course, we have had to expend considerable time and expense competing with Mountain States for the property. Numerous public meetings were held at Los Alamos and frequent conferences held in Washington, D.C., but we have had only token success in denting the power and strength of Mountain States, the Bell System company.

Enclosed is a recent news release from the AEC which was issued after about 15 months of deliberation by the general counsel of the AEC. The release, on its face, sets forth a conflicting story. On one hand, they have stated in paragraph 3 "that Mountain States is the only company at the present time that has legal authority to receive the Government's interest in and to operate the telephone system."

On the other hand, they are stating that they wish to afford all companies an opportunity to acquire the Government's interest in Los Alamos by inviting proposals for its acquisition. Obviously, if Mountain States has the only legal right, in the eyes of the AEC, then the solicitation of proposals will be of questionable value and may only amount to a little window dressing.

Actually, we must admit that, as recently as a few months ago, the AEC appeared to be ready to directly negotiate the sale with Mountain States. At that time, we asked the Small Business Administration (SBA) to look into the matter, since we felt that the disadvantage of our size was becoming fatal to our success. It is our opinion that the only reason there was not direct negotiations with Mountain States is because of the interest that was shown by the SBA and also the Justice Department. AEC, because of our insistence and the interest of the SBA, finally submitted the matter to the SBA on an informal basis. Unfortunately, the whole matter was never submitted to SBA on a formal basis and no formal opinion was requested of the SBA.

It is our further understanding that the SBA objected to the interpretation of New Mexico State law by the General Counsel of AEC, and more importantly, objected to the course that AEC was following in disposing of the property to Mountain States because of the violation of antitrust laws. The end result is that AEC has modified their previous approach in disposing of this property to Mountain States immediately and are now suggesting that independent telephone companies submit proposals for the property, even though their legal opinion states that no one else is entitled to own and operate the same telephone property.

Mr. Joseph Marker, chief, advocatory branch, has spent considerable time and effort investigating this matter. His department has arrived at certain decisions on the problem but has never been consulted formally to present them and it appears that his suggestions have not been followed. We would appreciate if your committee could formally inquire of the SBA concerning the following.

1. What were the actual activities and scope of the SBA's investigation of the Los Alamos telephone disposal matter?

2. What position did the SBA take regarding the disposal?

3. Did the SBA approve or disapprove of the SEC's action and opinion of their General Counsel?

I believe that the SBA would welcome an opportunity to formally express their viewpoints since they have not, to date, had such an opportunity. We certainly would appreciate getting the complete story out in the open. Our legal counsel from New Mexico, Attorney Sterling F. Black and myself have worked on this matter diligently and would be most willing to meet with you and your staff in Washington to further explain the many details that have developed in this matter. Certainly there are pros and cons on both sides, but we are convinced that our program is superior and in the best interest of the U.S. Government. All we ask is that we be given an opportunity to prove ourselves or at least have this property go to some other independent telephone company rather than being swallowed up by the gigantic Bell System which already operates approximately 86 percent of the telephones in the State of New Mexico.

We would sincerely appreciate your comments and any action you may take resulting from this letter.

Yours very truly,

ROLAND G. NEHRING,
Executive Vice President.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION SUMMARY OF OPINION GIVING A.T. & T. AFFILIATE SOLE AUTHORITY TO BID

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
LOS ALAMOS AREA OFFICE,
Los Alamos, N. Mex.

The Atomic Energy Commission announced today that it plans to request proposals from organizations interested in acquiring and operating the Los Alamos, N. Mex., community telephone system.

The Commission has been reviewing the transfer of the community telephone system in connection with the transfer of Government ownership of the Los Alamos community to private and municipal ownership. Statutory authority was granted to the Commission in 1962 to terminate Government ownership of this community which was established during World War II to support the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. Transfer of the community to private and municipal ownership and operation will not adversely affect the continuing AEC programs at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory.

In its consideration of the community telephone transfer, the Commission obtained the opinion of its General Counsel. The opinion discusses section 73a of the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, which requires that the transferee have the legal authority to receive and operate the system, applicable State law and the operations of the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co. in Los Alamos County, particularly in the White Rock area. The opinion concludes that Mountain States is the only company at the present time that has legal authority to receive the Government's interest in and to operate the telephone system.

The opinion notes, however, that changes may occur in the existing factual situation or in the status of Federal and State law, and that changed circumstances could lead to a different conclusion. In view of this possibility, and in order to afford all companies interested in acquiring the Government's interest in the Los Alamos community telephone system the maximum opportunity to do so consistent with the provision of the Community Act, the Commission intends to invite proposals for its acquisition from all interested companies and to select the transferee under section 73b of the Community Act. Prior to actual transfer, the transferee would be required to submit evidence satisfactory to the Commission that it has the legal authority to receive and operate the system.

REPORT FROM THE SBA, DATED JULY 25, AND A COPY OF THEIR FORMAL RECOMMENDATION TO AEC IN WHICH THEY ASK THAT THE AEC MODIFY ITS ANNOUNCEMENT TO PROVIDE THAT IT WILL SELECT THE BEST QUALIFIED TRANSFEREE WITHOUT ANY RESTRICTION FROM THE APPLICATION OF THE NEW MEXICO STATUTES

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1964.

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I am happy to reply to your request of July 6, 1964, for a report on the activities of the Small Business Administration in connection with the disposal of the interest of the Atomic Energy

Commission in the Los Alamos telephone system.

Some months ago, after our assistance was requested by Universal Telephone, Inc., Milwaukee, Wis., SBA informally advised the Commission of our interest and our preference for a disposal procedure which would provide an opportunity for possible acquisition by an independent telephone company. In April 1964, we received a copy of the draft opinion of the General Counsel of the AEC which concluded that Mountain States Telephone Co., the Bell System affiliate, was the only legally authorized transferee under certain New Mexico statutes. In informal conferences my staff indicated our disagreement with this legal conclusion. It is our understanding that the Commission made its decision after its members were advised of the informal positions of SBA and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. Incidentally, it was only after SBA urged the Antitrust Division to participate that it contacted the AEC in this matter.

We appreciate the acknowledgment by Universal Telephone that SBA was instrumental in modifying AEC's decision so that other companies will be invited to make acquisition proposals and to establish, prior to transfer, their legal authority to receive and operate the Los Alamos system. We recognize, however, that the release of the opinion of the AEC's General Counsel imposes an unequal burden on companies other than Mountain States. Therefore, in an effort to remove this inequality, we are making a formal recommendation to AEC and a copy is enclosed herewith.

I have welcomed this opportunity to inform you of this example of our interagency activities on behalf of independent small business.

Sincerely,

EUGENE P. FOLEY,
Administrator.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1964.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Small Business Administration was pleased by the announcement on June 24, 1964, that the Atomic Energy Commission plans to request proposals from any company interested in acquiring the Los Alamos community telephone system. Simultaneously, however, the Commission released and incorporated in its announcement the opinion by its General Counsel that Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co. was presently the only legally authorized transferee. We are concerned that the release of this opinion will adversely affect the acquisition opportunity of other telephone companies, especially of independent small business companies. We are not convinced that the legal conclusion in this released opinion was necessary or appropriate.

The conclusion in the released opinion is based upon the no-duplication statutes of New Mexico as interpreted in one opinion by the New Mexico Supreme Court (*Mountain States T. & T. Co.* v. *Suburban Telephone Co.*, 72 N.M. 411, 384 P. 2d 684 (1963)). In that case two telephone companies were competing in extending their lines from different directions, each charged duplication by the other, and each claimed priority. The trial court found that both parties were operating in the same field or territory, part of a county; this finding was affirmed on appeal. We do not believe that these facts are similar or applicable to the disposal of the Los Alamos telephone system by AEC.

We seriously question the applicability of the New Mexico no-duplication statutes to the present situation. We think that the language of these statutes clearly shows the intention to restrict the construction of second plant or equipment which would duplicate existing plant or equipment. There was no telephone plant or equipment in Los Alamos prior to that established by the Government. Mountain States' independent operations in the clearly delimited White Rock area began many years thereafter. The statutes provide a remedy only to the entity which first operated in the field or territory. Therefore, it is our opinion that Mountain States cannot use the no-duplication statutes to prevent a legal transfer by the AEC to any company other than Mountain States.

Even if the no-duplication statutes were applicable, we could not agree with the argument that Mountain States has priority in Los Alamos County because of its providing telephone services in the White Rock area. According to the released opinion the AEC community telephone system serves 4,600 telephones while Mountain States served 230 telephone stations at the end of February 1964.

The Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 established the policy of Congress for AEC to dispose of its community property to others wherever possible; it was specifically extended to include Los Alamos by the 1962 amendment. Within the spirit of this congressional mandate, the AEC sold, in about 1961, an area know as White Rock within Los Alamos County to private real estate developers. In White Rock the gas, electric, and telephone services are provided by private utilities. Pursuant to the disposal procedures under section 73b of the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, the AEC is transferring the gas and electric utility systems in Los Alamos County to the county government, except for the White Rock area where gas and electricity will continue to be provided by the private utilities. The restriction in the New Mexico statutes is for duplication within the municipality, field, or territory where similar plant or equipment is in operation. Accordingly, if Mountain States is entitled to any priority because of its recent operations in White Rock, we think the field or territory for such priority would be the White Rock area itself and not the surrounding Los Alamos County. We do not believe the Supreme Court of the United States would approve any broader interpretation of the New Mexico statutes which would thereby prevent the AEC from determining the best qualified transferee for the Los Alamos community telephone system within the criteria established by Congress in section 73b of the Community Act.

In view of the foregoing, it is our recommendation that the Commission modify its announcement to provide that it will select the best qualified transferee under section 73b of the Community Act without any restriction from the application of the New Mexico no-duplication statutes. SBA makes this proposal under our statutory responsibility in section 8(c) of the Small Business Act, as amended, to make recommendations to other Federal agencies for the adjustment of their programs to serve the needs of small business. Our act also provides that in order to preserve free competitive enterprise a fair proportion of the total sales of Government property shall be made to small business concerns, and that SBA shall make appropriate recommendations to other Federal agencies; see sections 2(a), 8(b)(11), and 15 of the Small Business Act, as amended.

I appreciate the opportunity afforded to my staff to informally advise your staff of our views after we received a copy of the draft of the opinion prepared by your General Counsel. While our informal representations may have contributed to the announcement that the AEC was inviting acquisition proposals from all interested companies, I think it is appropriate that SBA make this formal representation in an effort to remove the disadvantage to independent telephone companies resulting from the priority status of Mountain States under the announcement released by the Commission.

Sincerely,

EUGENE P. FOLEY,
Administrator.

[Article from the New Mexican of Santa Fe dated Aug. 16, 1964, reporting clash between Los Alamos commissioners and AEC over dispute of telephone facilities]

LOS ALAMOS COMMISSIONERS, AEC MAY CLASH ON TELEPHONE DISPOSAL—FRANCHISING PUT ON NEXT MEETING

LOS ALAMOS.—The Los Alamos County commissioners Saturday set themselves on an apparent crash course with the Atomic Energy Commission over the controversial disposal of the community telephone system here.

Commission Chairman Ellis Stout in letters to both Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co. and Universal Telephone Co. informed the two communications utilities that the commission at the next regular meeting, set for September 14, would take under consideration telephone franchising.

The letters came less than a week after the AEC in Washington announced there would be no early decision on disposing of the system. Earlier, the AEC had indicated the system might be sold to private enterprise as early as last spring.

County commissioners at their July meeting took the stand that they alone had the right to franchise a telephone utility in Los Alamos and they were outspoken at the time in declaring they intended that franchise would go to the company that could best serve the needs and the interests of the community.

FAVORS UNIVERSAL

This, on the basis of firm offers made so far, apparently puts Universal out in front as far as the county officials are concerned.

Legal opinion by AEC counsel has so far favored Mountain States and thus the possibility of a bitter dispute has arisen.

Universal has offered the AEC $750,000 for the system, despite the fact that AEC never has completely detailed how much of the system would be turned over to private utility control.

There has been speculation that AEC would possibly retain that part of the system within the technical area—upwards of 4,000 telephones. The entire system is now operated by the AEC with maintenance by Mountain States under contract.

Universal additionally has given the county commission a firm offer of a 4-percent franchise while Mountain States has offered only half that much.

Some county officials privately have expressed concern over delay in the disposal since the sooner the system is sold, the sooner the county, presently suffering from a low total evaluation, would start getting the franchise tax revenue.

ACTION PLANNED

Stout's letter to Earl R. Louthan, vice president and general manager for Mountain States at Albuquerque, indicated the county planned to move ahead fairly fast. Stout asked Mountain States to state in writing features of a franchise agreement that Mountain States would be willing to enter into if the county should grant a franchise in the next 3 months.

Many of the Mountain States' proposals have been verbal offers and Stout's letter stressed that the commissioners wanted them now in writing.

A letter to Roland G. Nehring, executive vice president for Universal, which now operates 12 independent telephone companies, noted that Universal had sent commissioners

written proposals and asked Nehring if these franchise offers still held good.

Nehring arrived in Los Alamos Wednesday night on the heels of the AEC notice that there would be no early decision. He conferred with local people with interests in Universal and with county officials before leaving Friday.

Nehring gave commissioners a verbal reassertion of the Universal proposals and told the New Mexican that a letter confirming this would be provided immediately.

Universal officials also have expressed some displeasure with the delays encountered since AEC announced decision to dispose of the utility company.

Universal entered the picture 19 months ago and almost at once became at odds with Mountain States which has asserted it had prior rights.

AEC counsel in June ruled that it was apparent that at the present time Mountain States was the only party that could legally, according to the AEC, acquire the system. But the decision said circumstances might change in the foreseeable future in order to allow Universal to purchase the system.

Most of Universal's holdings are in Wisconsin, Indiana, and Illinois with headquarters in Milwaukee. However, the company does operate a system south of Gallup, at Marvel, Colo., and on portions of the Indian reservations in Arizona.

Nehring said that if Universal is successful in obtaining the franchise that a local company would be formed with stock available and seats on the board of directors available to local people.

Nehring pointed out that the community would also benefit residents of the community since the rates Universal has offered were considerably lower than the proposal by Mountain States.

"We are glad the county commissioners have decided to take action now before their franchise rights completely eroded away," the Universal executive said.

Nehring said his company was willing to take its chances in open competition with any other telephone company. He said the company had stated as far back as April 1, 1963, that the company felt it had a good product to sell, a modern telephone service at the most reasonable rates.

Last year, he said, the county commission submitted a draft of a franchise to the company and "we accepted the draft."

"Our willingness to sign the county franchise remains," Nehring said. "But of course we will be reviewing the matter further to determine if any desirable modifications in light of developments since acceptance of the original draft.

"Overall, we have appreciated the acceptance we have received from the residents of Los Alamos," he declared, "and we would welcome the opportunity to become part of the community and to serve its citizens."

PRINCIPAL TERMS OF FRANCHISE OFFERED BY MOUNTAIN STATES, AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH SUBSIDIARY, ON SEPTEMBER 1, 1964

MOUNTAIN STATES TELEPHONE,
Albuquerque, N. Mex., September 1, 1964.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Los Alamos County, N. Mex.

GENTLEMEN: As requested in your letter of August 13, 1964, the following is an outline of the principal terms of the franchise ordinance which we hope will meet with the approval of the county commissioners.

We have been operating the telephone system in Los Alamos since 1943, and expect to continue to serve this area in the future. Our company would welcome a county franchise granted to us by the board of county commissioners if the franchise payments are comparable with those made elsewhere in New Mexico.

We offer a franchise payment of 2 percent on all local exchange revenues paid by the residents of Los Alamos County. Under this new offer there will now be included revenues, whether paid to the Atomic Energy Commission or our company, and also the revenues paid by the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, the Zia Co., and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Contingent upon the acceptance of this offer by January 1, 1965, the initial payment would be made retroactive to January 1, 1964. As a result, the company would begin receiving franchise payments at once of approximately $15,700 per year. This amount is based upon the local revenues from the present telephones at Los Alamos and includes White Rock.

Under this proposal, the county will receive payments in excess of $55,000 between now and the time the actual conversion is made to an exchange operation; namely, July 1, 1967. The first payment would be made for the year 1964 immediately upon the acceptance of a franchise and payments will be made quarterly thereafter on the basis as outlined above.

The supporting structures, consisting of poles and conduit, are now owned by the Government. In the future, they may be transferred to the county for its use in connection with its electric system. The Mountain States Telephone Co. is agreeable to entering into a joint-use agreement with the county in the event the title to these supporting structures is transferred to the county. This, of course, would provide the county with additional revenue in the form of annual pole attachment payments and underground conduit rentals. As an alternative, Mountain States is interested in acquiring the poles and conduit, either from the AEC or the county, or Mountain States would be willing to acquire a part interest in the structures, either with the county or the AEC so that a joint-use agreement could be entered into with each party owning approximately the same amount of plant at the start of the joint-use agreement. In these respects, we are agreeable to any reasonable plan that the AEC or the county may desire. All other telephone facilities; namely, cable, telephone sets, long-distance facilities, switchboards, motor vehicles, furniture, fixtures, and private branch exchange switchboards are now owned and always have been owned solely by the Mountain States Co.

The ad valorem taxes on this property for the year 1963 were $12,780. According to the records of the company, the gross amount of ad valorem taxes paid to the county from the time the county was first established to date, has amounted to $251,472 and our records show that ad valorem taxes have been paid on these facilities since the inception of our operation in Los Alamos in 1943. Unquestionably, there will be a substantial increase in these ad valorem taxes when a new exchange with the new electronic switching service is established.

Under our plans we would furnish extended area service between Los Alamos and Santa Fe. It would enable approximately 27,000 customers in these contiguous areas to share unlimited local calling privileges. The appropriate date to make this change would be coincident with the conversion of the telephone operations in Los Alamos to a standard form of operation.

Last year, in planning for the future telephone growth of Los Alamos, we constructed a microwave system between Los Alamos and Santa Fe. This microwave system will permit Mountain States to add facilities, as required, to adequately handle all long distance, in addition to the extended area service with Santa Fe. We also plan to provide nationwide direct-distance dialing at the time of the conversion to standard operation. The prompt granting of this franchise to Mountain States will allow adequate time to schedule the installation of the latest type of electronic switching equipment. The electronic switching system has many features not now available in the standard dial equipment and such an installation would be one of the first of this ultramodern equipment in the Mountain States territory. The attachment to this letter will give you some understanding of the many conveniences which will be available with an electronic switching office.

We will be glad to meet with you at your convenience in order to work out any details and in order that payments to the county may start without delay.

Very truly yours,

E. E. LOUTHAN,
Vice President and General Manager.

NEW SERVICE FEATURES AVAILABLE WITH ESS—FEATURE AND AVAILABILITY

(a) Compressed dialing is a feature which will permit the customer to dial any number of commonly called telephones by using an abbreviated number of three or four digits—now.

(b) Add-on conferencing permits adding other people to a conversation by either party dialing a special code and the number of the desired party to be added—now.

(c) Dial conferencing permits the customer to set up a conference call involving three other people, including one on the toll network if desired—now.

(d) Automatic transfer of calls will permit the customer to transfer calls to a predetermined number when he leaves his premises. Upon returning, he clears the calls back to his location by dialing a special code—now.

(e) Call waiting is a feature which processes a low level audible tone on a busy connection to indicate that someone is trying to reach the busy line. It is possible for the party being called to hold the existing connection while he establishes connection with the new caller—about 1967.

(f) Sequence calling—this feature will permit placing a series of calls in a predetermined sequence by dialing a simple code to start the sequence and merely hanging up while the next call is being originated—later.

PRINCIPAL TERMS OF FRANCHISE OFFERED BY UNIVERSAL TELEPHONE, INDEPENDENT MILWAUKEE, WIS., FIRM ON SEPTEMBER 17, 1964

SEPTEMBER 14, 1964.

Re franchise proposal of Los Alamos Telephone Co.

MR. ELLIS STOUT,
Chairman, Board of County Commissioners, Los Alamos County, Los Alamos, N. Mex.

DEAR MR. STOUT: By letter dated August 13, 1964, you requested that we restate our position on franchise matters. We replied by letter of August 26, 1964, to the effect that we remained willing to sign the franchise as drafted by Los Alamos County. In the August 26 letter we did not once again go into the voluminous details of our proposal commitment which had been previously submitted to the county.

Certain conditions have changed in the telephone disposal matter. Firstly, the County of Los Alamos has been awarded the electric and gas utilities. The county will undoubtedly be acquiring the electric poles in the transfer. When this transpires, Los Alamos Telephone Co. will be agreeable to negotiating a joint-use agreement with the county in payment of contact rental at the highest prevailing rate as established in the State of New Mexico. We would also consider any other pole use arrangement that the county might desire, such as payment to the county for part ownership of the electric poles. This contract could be resolved prior to the acquiring by the county of the electric utility, in anticipation of that event.

Secondly, since the submission of our August 26, 1964, letter, we have been advised that the local office of the AEC has decided to withdraw the telephone facilities from the disposal program until July 1967. Realizing that this would jeopardize the revenue program of the Los Alamos County government until 1967, we have decided and are happy to state that we hereby commit to payment of the 4-percent franchise fee immediately, upon issuance of the franchise to us, regardless of our physical possession of the townsite facilities.

The basis of the franchise fee computation will be the gross revenues of $402,098 as set forth in our pro forma statements previously submitted in May of 1963. The result is a franchise fee of $16,084 annually. This fee will be payable immediately to the county of Los Alamos upon granting of the franchise. It is further agreed that an amount of $16,084 would be payable to the county for calendar year 1964. The payment of an identical amount will also be paid for calendar years 1965, 1966, and 1967. Payments will be payable on January 1, 1965, 1966, and 1967 and will increase in amount as we assume operations of the telephone facilities and revenues exceed the sum of $402,098.

Similarly, we acknowldege the fact that the county of Los Alamos has not been responsible for the withdrawal of the technical site from the disposal program and should not be prejudiced because of this revenue producing area being so withdrawn. We hereby also commit ourselves to paying the regular 4-percent franchise fee on the pro forma amount of $461,036 which was also submitted in May 1963. This franchise fee would amount to an additional annual fee of $18,441. Since the disposal of the technical area has now become less definite the $18,441 would not be payable until and if Los Alamos Telephone Co. successfully acquires the technical area facilities. However, we hereby commit to paying the annual amount of $18,441, retroactively to January 1, 1964, and upon the granting of a franchise by Los Alamos County, we would establish an appropriate reserve account under bond, looking forward to the eventuality of disposal of the technical area telephone facilities.

We are willing to commit to the above franchise fee provisions for two reasons. Firstly, we have always stated that we had tailored our program to bring greatest benefit to the county because we recognized its revenue requirements would be great. We are therefore agreeable to making these proceeds available to the county government without any risk to them and we are willing to bear the risk. Secondly, we have always stated that Los Alamos is a highly desirable telephone revenue producing area, and very frankly, we are willing to make this investment to insure that we are succecssful in acquiring the operating opportunities to the area. This commitment will in no way increase the rates that we have already proposed.

We respectfully submit that the board of county commissioners render a favorable decision and grant a franchise at the earliest possible moment in order that we shall have that opportunity to serve the residents of Los Alamos.

Very truly yours,

ROLAND G. NEHRING,
Executive Vice President.

LETTER FROM DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE DATED AUGUST 17, 1964, IN WHICH THEY STRONGLY QUESTION THE LEGAL CORRECTNESS OF THE AEC OPINION

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., August 17, 1964.

HON. GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter pertains to the June 24 announcement by the Atomic Energy Commission concerning the proposed disposal of the telephone facilities which it currently owns and operates at Los Alamos, and the release of an opinion by your General Counsel on the applicability of certain New Mexico laws to the proposed disposal.

Prior to this action by the Commission, personnel of the Antitrust Division had conferred with representatives of the Commission on an informal basis regarding this proposed disposal of facilities, and had been shown a draft of a legal opinion on the latter subject which had been prepared within the Commission. The opinion, which has now been released in substantially the same form as the draft, concludes that Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co., a subsidiary of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., is the only "company with present legal authority to operate the telephone system at Los Alamos as a public utility."

In our discussions with AEC representatives we indicated that in our opinion the General Counsel's proposed advice did not necessarily present a correct interpretation of New Mexico law; that there is substantial doubt that the particular statute involved—the New Mexico "no-duplication" law—is applicable under the circumstances present at Los Alamos; and that we hoped that the Commission would scrupulously avoid any action which might prejudice the opportunity of any potential purchaser to obtain the telephone facilities at Los Alamos.

In our last conference on this matter, which was attended by Mr. Hennessey, we outlined a procedure which would be conducive to attainment of the various statutory requirements and governmental policies relating to sales of surplus property. We felt that this suggested procedure would result in full and free competition in the bidding for the facilities and would avoid any prejudgment by the Federal Government as to which firm or firms might ultimately "[have] the legal authority to receive and operate the utility." To meet the requirements of the Community Act we suggested that a provision be included in the invitation for bids which would require the successful bidder to provide prima facie evidence of its "legal authority" at the time of closing of the transaction. In the event of any question of the right under New Mexico law of the successful bidder to operate the facilities, this procedure would permit appropriate proceedings to be instituted by interested parties in the New Mexico courts. This procedure would also have avoided placing the Commission on record with an opinion the legal correctness of which had been strongly questioned by other Federal agencies, and issuance of which might prejudice the rights of any potential purchaser other than Mountain States.

Since Commission representatives expressed the view in our conferences that the Commission is not required to submit the disposal of the Los Alamos telephone facilities to the Attorney General for advice under 40 U.S.C. 488, we observe that, even if this were true, there is nothing in the circumstances here which would warrant the Commission in disposing of these facilities to ignore the general policies of maintaining and strengthening competition which are reflected in both 40 U.S.C. 488 and 42 U.S.C. 2011. Moreover, we feel obliged to inform you that, were the Commission to request our advice under 40 U.S.C. 488 on disposal of these facilities to Mountain States, it is doubtful that favorable antitrust advice could be rendered.

We would be pleased both to discuss this matter further with Commission representatives and to render formal antitrust advice upon request by the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. ORRICK, Jr.,
Assistant Attorney General,
Antitrust Division.

LETTER FROM SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1964, TO CHAIRMAN GLENN SEABORG OF THE AEC

SEPTEMBER 30, 1964.

HON. GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you in regard to the disposal of the Atomic Energy Commission telephone facilities at Los Alamos, N. Mex. As I understand it, both the Mountain States Telephone Co., a subsidiary of A.T. & T. and the Universal Telephone Co. of Milwaukee, a small business, are interested in bidding on this facility.

I have been advised that the General Counsel of the Commission has issued an opinion on June 24, 1964 stating that the Mountain States Telephone Co. is the only company at the present time which has legal authority to receive and operate these facilities. I have checked with the Small Business Administration and the Department of Justice and both agencies have advised me that they do not concur with the Commission's opinion. In fact, in the Department's letter to you of August 17, they have requested that the Commission "scrupulously avoid any action which might prejudice the opportunity of any potential purchaser to obtain the telephone facilities at Los Alamos."

I strongly feel that these facilities should go to the company which will best serve the needs and interests of the community of Los Alamos and which is willing to take its chances in fair and open competition. In view of the fact that Federal policy dictates that a fair proportion of the total sales of Government property shall be made to small business concerns, that more than 85 percent of the present telephone facilities in New Mexico belong to Mountain States, and that other Federal agencies have strongly questioned the legal correctness of the Commission's opinion, I feel that the Commission should make every effort to remove the disadvantage to independent telephone companies resulting from the priority status of Mountain States under the announcement released by the Commission in June.

I am looking forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE.

TRIFLING WITH TRUTH—SERMON BY DR. RUSSELL C. STROUP

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have recently been made aware of an interesting sermon delivered here in Washington several weeks ago by a distinguished churchman, Dr. Russell C. Stroup, at the Georgetown Presbyterian Church. Dr. Stroup had read the testimony of the noted writer and essayist, Marya Mannes, delivered quite some time ago before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. Her subject was the packaging of products sold in supermarkets, and the many ways in which the consumer is deceived and misled by some manufacturers.

This recalled to my mind the very excellent work done in this area by the Senator from Michigan, PHILIP A. HART. As chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee, Senator HART has conducted extensive investigations and hearings into this entire subject, on the basis of which he drew up a bill, S. 387, to set up minimum standards of packaging and labeling to protect the consumer. Senator HART is to be commended for his efforts to spotlight the abuses in the packaging field, and his attempts to correct them

by legislation which has received the enthusiastic support of many national organizations representing most of our citizenry, as well as some forward-looking manufacturers. Apparently, there is not enough time remaining in this Congress for action on S. 387, but the chances for passage in the next Congress are excellent.

Because Dr. Stroup's sermon expresses such an interesting point of view on this problem, I ask that it be included in the RECORD. The sermon, entitled, "Trifling With Truth," was delivered by Dr. Russell C. Stroup in the Georgetown Presbyterian Church on August 9, 1964.

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

TRIFLING WITH TRUTH

(Text: Micah 6: 6–16)

The type of sermon which I preach this morning is frowned upon by professors in theological seminaries and by recent graduates of these sacred institutions. It is what they call a topical sermon. A topical sermon is one that deals with war, or peace, or race relations, or automation, or training of children, or use of leisure time—any number of subjects which might be used, and some of which I have used. In theological circles this is contrasted with what is called the Biblical or expository sermon—a sermon in which you take a passage of scripture and try to reveal what is revealed in it, particularly such theological truth or spiritual truth as may be contained in that particular passage. But I have always felt it was odd to make a distinction between the topical and the Biblical. This because I find the Bible a very topical book, dealing with very practical matters relating to life—all of it—and relating to the daily concerns of men and women, of you and me.

This was brought home to me markedly—and the result is the sermon this morning—in reading some very interesting testimony given by Marya Mannes before a congressional committee. It had to do with the very plebian subject of the packaging of products in supermarkets. Having laid down her book, I was reading in the Bible and I came to that part of the scripture I read to you this morning. It is an excellent example of what I mean when I say that the Bible is a very practical, topical book.

There is in the scripture I read this morning the very high and lofty spiritual concept climaxing in the lovely lines, "He hath shown thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" But the prophet, unlike a lot of preachers, refuses to leave us soothed by these lovely phrases, these somewhat general statements. Out of the sanctuary he takes us into the supermarkets. God, he says, has a message for the city of commerce where men buy and sell, where goods are consumed and profits are conceived. From speaking of walking humbly with God, loving mercy and doing justly, he spells it out in terms of trade. For the prophet speaks of scant measure, of dishonest scales, of deceitful weights, which are an abomination to God. He condemns those who deceive by false advertising, who cheat consumers by the tricks of the trade. Now it's no good to tell me that God has no place in the supermarket. According to the Scriptures He is there. He is there examining the goods, looking over the shelves. He is concerned as we should be by the facts that He finds. He should discover as we may discover, for example, that a certain applesauce for babies is put out in a container which looks as though it holds as much as it used to hold. But the fact of the matter is that it holds less than it once held. That a package of cereal which once contained a certain number of biscuits now containes one less than it did before. The package looks the same, but the contents are different.

Now of course in ancient Israel there were no laws that compelled the merchant to mark on his package what it contained. We compel the merchants to do that. But one would have to go into the supermarket with a slide rule and a mathematician to discover from the package just what it is that it contains. Like false weights and scant measures, the packages are designed to make you think you are getting the same value in the same package at the same price when actually you are getting less and paying more.

Then there are those deceptive confusions of designations. "Giant" and "Jumbo," whatever that means. What is the difference between a quart and a "full quart," or the "big, big gallon?" Or the term "New," which is loved, or "Improved," or "Activated," or "Super," etc. Someone surely is being taken in, and one suspects that that someone is—me.

Now is all this foolish, unimportant? Am I wasting your time and my time with such seeming trivialities? Few surely are hoodwinked. Surely few care. A penny here and a penny there means millions to someone, but a small loss to us. We are a prosperous and careless people. The money comes and the money goes. Baby gets a little less applesauce, but baby is still healthy. Mom gets a little less for her money, but they still prosper.

Is it important? Well, Marya Mannes says, "It isn't a question of applesauce, it is a question of morality. Little deceptions of single consumers can add up to a mighty deception of a whole people." And so it is. Congress at least has been concerned, and the testimony that I read goes on to say, "Except for the relationship between man and wife, nothing is more intimate than the relationship between the buyer and the seller. And there would be neither marriage nor commerce if the fundamental basis of both were not trust. Without trust a civilized society cannot endure. When the people who are too smart to be good fool the people who are too good to be smart, then society begins to crumble." I would emphasize this last sentence. This is the thing that makes it all important to us and relevant to religion. Good faith is essential in all human relations. Without this, there is a moral and social anarchy. The tragedy of calculated deceit is that we lose our faith as well as our money. We are rich enough to afford the loss of money. We cannot afford the loss of faith. We become cynical and accept dishonesty as a part of life. This is the peril. We no longer expect the truth. We no longer require strict adherence to it. An atmosphere of indifference is created and what we expect of others we may come to accept in ourselves.

How callous we are in this matter I can testify out of my own experience. Many years ago I had a manufacturer in my church come to me. The Government had finally caught up with him, saying he had to change the wording on the package. He said "You know how to use words. I wonder if you could take this and change it so it would say the same thing and yet get by the Government regulation? I'll pay you well for it." That was a job I didn't accept. He was amazed at my reluctance to enter into what he considered a perfectly legitimate business endeavor.

Our manufacturers, merchants, and advertisers have served us well in many ways. They have given us an abundance of goods of acceptable quality, usually, and reasonable prices. We applaud them for their accomplishments. But we have a right to ask, I think, that their honesty match their efficiency. This is true not only in packaging but in advertising as well. The advertiser comes into our homes. No one talks to us as much as they do. They are apt to be more intimate with your children than you are, spend more time with them, say more to them than you do. If this is true, then we have a right to demand that those who come into our homes so intimately do not deceive us and our children with half-truths and doubletalk. I would like to put over every TV set a verse from Ephesians, "Let no man deceive you with vain words." And I would like to send to every TV advertiser another verse from Ephesians, "Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying that it may minister grace to the hearers." I would suggest that not all advertising does minister grace unto the hearers, nor is it edifying. Paul said that "Evil communications corrupt good manners." They also corrupt good minds. And evil communications have no right in my home or in yours.

Incidentally, I think it is corrupting in a different way to make our children salesmen for soup, soap, and cereal. In a recent survey 94 percent of the mothers interviewed said that their children demanded and got what they were told to ask for. And as someone has remarked, "It is creating a race of demanding, nagging, overindulged, overpampered kids, and a race of beat-down, spineless parents who take their orders." I heard recently of a brave rebellion of a mother in a supermarket who said "I don't care what Howdy Doody says, you can't have it." I applaud this independence.

My deep concern is that in marketing our merchandise we present a false set of values and an unreal concept of life. Of course advertising must deal with the material. It must and should stress consumption. The business of advertising is to get us to buy, and it is a proper business. But in pursuit of this legitimate end is it necessary to appeal to all the baser emotions of man? His vanity, cupidity, envy, fear, stupidity—all these are appealed to. There are better reasons for buying cars than to gain the envy of your neighbor. Love is not lost or gained by reason of your hair tint. And success is not secured through mouthwashes. The world, the real world, is not as advertisers would suggest, made up exclusively of white, middle-class suburban families with the standard two cars, and the just as standard two children. A world of he-men and birdbrained women smoking filter cigarettes, drinking slenderizing beer, suffering chronic indigestion while they worry about telltale gray, bad breath, and 27-percent-fewer cavities.

All of this we know, or think we know. But the advertiser has studied you much more earnestly than you have studied yourself. And he seems to think that if this is not the real world it is the kind of world you would like to have. "The advertiser possesses the power to affect deeply and lastingly the nature, attitudes, and aspirations of 180 million Americans," someone has written. Not simply to buy certain things, but to live, think, aspire in certain ways.

But if we escape this danger, if we are not taken in, if we are too wise to be deceived we are nonetheless in peril. We are either saps or cynics, and both are bad. The exaggerated claim, the doubletalk, the false emphasis, all play havoc with our faith in the written and spoken word. False communications cause us to question all communications. This is disastrous, as all human relations depend on communications. Just as the fabric of our society is held together by faith, so all human relations demand honest communication and a faith in communication, the written and spoken word. And when we tend to reject all as false and phony, the very fabric falls apart. The words of the teacher, the words of the politician, the words of the preacher, may be

treated with the same suspicion as the words of the huckster. And often they should be, I may say, because there is a terrible tendency on the part of all of us to become a part of the society of which we are a part, and when everyone is speaking very loudly we raise our voices. When people are using certain methods we tend to use those methods also.

I am not proud of the fact that the Presbyterian Church has pioneered in the broadcasting of catchy little jingles to sell religion as you might sell soap. This we have done, hiring such gentlemen as the one who composed this little gem: "Doesn't it get a little lonely sometime out on a limb without Him?" Now this is done by our church and I presume it is done, alas, by other churches. Someone suggested sardonically certain possible jingles. "Try prayer, it purifies the air." "Take belief for fast, fast, fast relief." "Left in the lurch? No help from Birch? Why not try church?"

How easy it is for all communications to become vulgarized, commercialized, falsified. This is what concerns us. Jesus said, "Let your communications be Yea, Yea, and Nay, Nay." Let them be straightforward and truthful and plain. Paul said, "For we are not like so many peddlers of God's word. But as men of sincerity as commissioned by God, in the sight of God we speak in Christ." God save us from being peddlers of God's word. Let us hold to the simplicity, clarity, sincerity which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. In all of our communications let us be true to the truth.

The peril of our supermarket civilization is first of all that we may lose faith in man. Second that we lose faith in the world. This is no small matter. It matters but little if you lose your money, as I say, in buying goods. It matters much if you lose your faith. And the only way we may regain our respect for truth is to demand of ourselves and others that they be true to the truth.

PRAYER

Our Heavenly Father, we pray that among us who worship Thee there may be the worship of truth. Grant us that integrity, sincerity, and simplicity which is of Christ. We ask it in His name. Amen.

YOUTH OPPORTUNITY CENTERS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the junior Senator from California [Mr. SALINGER] has made a significant and important statement on youth opportunity centers, which I commend to the attention of all Senators. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

YOUTH OPPORTUNITY CENTERS

(Remarks by Senator PIERRE SALINGER, of California)

One of the most worthwhile activities in the President's far-reaching war on poverty will be the work of the proposed youth opportunity centers. We in California already know something of what can be done by such centers. In Los Angeles County, the youth opportunity board, a joint powers organization formed by the State, the county of Los Angeles, the city of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles County School Board, and the Los Angeles City School Board, has been doing a vitally important job in serving the disadvantaged youth of the Mexican-American and Negro communities through youth opportunity centers on the East Side and in the south-central areas of Los Angeles. Although underway for only a relatively short time, these centers have already assisted hundreds of young people to secure jobs, to secure job training, or to continue in school. The work which is being done here must be continued and expanded. The State of California and its local governmental units throughout the State are eager and willing to cooperate in this program.

The functions of the centers would be to screen, counsel, and refer youth to appropriate skill development centers to prepare for employment, to search out suitable job opportunities for youth and to place youth in regular employment. One of the universities engaged this past summer in training counselor aids and youth advisers for these centers was our outstanding University of California at Berkeley. It is typical of California to be among those participating in such progressive programs as this.

California wants to help battle the problems of disadvantaged youth, who have little schooling or skills and therefore have little to bring to today's competitive job market. In California we have the brainpower, the will and the resources to work on this problem—to help these youths—and so we hope to continue the work begun with the youth opportunity board in Los Angeles and move on in this important work.

DISCRIMINATORY, UNFAIR IMMIGRATION POLICIES MUST BE CHANGED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, there are few areas in our laws which more urgently demand reform than our unfair and discriminatory system of selecting immigrants to be allowed to enter our country. No provision of any national law is more distasteful to millions of Americans or to the peoples of many nations of the world than the concept of judging a man's worth for immigration on the basis of his place of birth or the ancestry of his parents.

Five successive Presidents—Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and President Johnson—have all asked for a revision in the present method of choosing immigrants on the basis of their nationality. President Truman said that the idea behind this discrimination was, to put it boldly, that Americans with English or Irish or German names made better citizens than Americans with Italian, Greek, or Polish names. This concept is contrary to our traditions and ideals. As a people we are morally committed to seek a national policy which will make real the simple truth of the words of St. Paul:

> God * * * hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth.

Under the present system, no matter how skilled, or badly needed a man or woman is, if born in the wrong country such person must wait years for admission, if lucky enough to be admitted at all, while others less qualified come almost at will. An Italian scientist or Greek craftsman or Polish engineer may bring more to our country than an unskilled worker from some northern European country. Nevertheless, under existing law the unskilled worker would come first.

Present immigration statutes judge men and women not on the basis of their worth, but on their place of birth—in some cases on the place of birth of their ancestors. It is an affront to millions of Americans and to the people of many countries. Our immigration laws should be such that we ask the question, "What can you do for our country," not, "In what country were you born?"

Although most Presidents since Woodrow Wilson have called upon the Congress to take corrective action, this administration's proposal to abolish the national origins quota system is the first time that a specific bill has been proposed to the Congress by a President. The law he seeks would squarely meet national needs and also be pleasing to foreign nationals. It recognizes that each immigrant has a special worth because of his potential contribution to the total manpower of our country and that he should be judged on his individual ability. The bill will provide flexibility in refugee policy, remove offensive Asiatic restrictions, and increase basic quotas for many new nations.

Over a 5-year period it would eliminate all quotas based on national origin. Each year the old quotas would be diminished by 20 percent. Then, the limit for any one country would be 10 percent of the entire immigration quota for 1 year. The total annual quota would be raised only slightly from the present 154,000 to approximately 164,000.

People would be admitted on the basis of their skills, education, and training. Another governing factor would be the reunification of families now separated by our outmoded immigration laws.

Mr. President, along with many of my colleagues I am cosponsor of the pending legislation proposed to carry out the recommendations of President Kennedy and President Johnson.

I strongly urge that the administration immigration bill be given top priority for consideration when the next Congress convenes. We must right this wrong that stains our national conscience and blurs our image as the greatest democracy in the world. Let us remember at all times, we are the Nation which chiseled on our Statue of Liberty:

> Give me your tired, your poor,
> Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free;
> Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me;
> I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Mr. President, at the time of his death the late great President, John F. Kennedy, was at work on revising a booklet on immigration which he had published in 1958. He hoped this would further familiarize Americans with the tremendous role that immigrants have played in our Nation's history. We should never lose sight of the fact that all of us are descendants of immigrants who came to these shores seeking freedom and a better way of life.

My grandmother was born in the "old country." She came to this country in 1848, following the revolution in Germany. She had a shawl on her head and a bundle under her arm with her few worldly possessions, but she had the love of liberty in her heart. I do not think that her coming here was bad for the United States.

In his introduction to his brother's book, Robert F. Kennedy made the following statement:

I know of no cause which President Kennedy championed more warmly than the improvement of our immigration policies. In 1958, while the fight for the 1957 amendments was still fresh, he published a booklet designed to provide those who were unfamiliar with this aspect of our history with an appreciation of the enormous contributions to American life made by immigrants. When President Kennedy sent his historic message to Congress in 1963 calling for a complete revision of the immigration law, he decided it was also time to revise the book for use as a weapon of enlightenment in the coming legislative battle.

He was working on the book at the time of the assassination. It was decided that it should be published posthumously. This legacy should not be denied those committed to the battle for immigration reform.

Mr. President, a part of this posthumous book has been printed in the October 3, 1964, edition of the Saturday Evening Post under the title, "With Clean Hands and a Clear Conscience." John F. Kennedy, the great-grandson of immigrant Americans himself, states posthumously, far more eloquently than I can, the overriding arguments for reform in our immigration laws. I commend this article to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

WITH CLEAN HANDS AND A CLEAR CONSCIENCE

(By John F. Kennedy)

(NOTE.—At the time of his death President Kennedy was at work on the book from which these pages are taken. It is a plan of action for the American people and a last testament to a cause the late President cherished.)

In 1797 a Member of Congress argued that, while a liberal immigration policy was fine when the country was new and unsettled, now that America had reached its maturity and was fully populated, immigration should stop—an argument which has been repeated at regular intervals throughout American history. A more serious warning of things to come was sounded in 1897 when Congress for the first time provided a literacy test for adult immigrants. President Cleveland vetoed the measure. Presidents Taft and Wilson vetoed similar bills on the ground that literacy was a test only of educational opportunity and not of a person's ability or his potential worth as a citizen. In 1917, with tension high because of the war, Congress overrode President Wilson's veto and the literacy test became law.

The 20-year fight over the literacy test can now be seen as a significant turning point in immigration policy. Indeed, many saw it as such at that time. Finley Peter Dunne, creator of the immoral Dr. Dooley, devoted one of Mr. Dooley's dissertations in 1902 to the subject of the test and immigration. With magnificent irony the Irish bartender says, "As a pilgrim father that missed the first boat, I must raise me claryon voice again' the invasion iv this fair land be th' paupers an' arnychists in Europe. Ye bet I must—because I'm here first * * * In thim days America was th' refuge iv th' oppressed in all th' wurruld * * * But as I tell ye, 'tis diff'rent now. 'Tis time we put our back again' th' open dure an' keep out th' savege horde."

Anti-immigration sentiment was heightened by World War I, and the disillusionment and strong wave of isolationism that marked its aftermath. It was in this climate, in 1921, that Congress passed and the President signed the first major law in our country's history severely limiting new immigration by establishing an emergency quota system. An era in American history had ended; we were committed to a radically new policy toward the peopling of the Nation.

The permanent system, which went into force in 1929, includes essentially all the elements of immigration policy that are in our law today. The immigration statutes now establish a system of annual quotas to govern immigration from each country. Under this system 156,987 quota immigrants are permitted to enter the United States each year. The quotas from each country are based upon the national origins of the population of the United States in 1920.

Because of the composition of our population in 1920, the system is heavily weighted in favor of immigration from northern Europe and severely limits immigration from southern and eastern Europe and from other parts of the world.

To cite some recent examples: Great Britain has an annual quota of 65,361 immigration visas and used 28,291 of them. Germany has a quota of 25,814 and uses about that number, but one-third of these are for wives of servicemen who may enter on a nonquota basis. Ireland's quota is 17,756 and only 6,054 Irish availed themselves of it. On the other hand, Poland is permitted 6,488, and there is a backlog of 61,293 Poles wishing to enter the United States. Italy is permitted 5,666 and has a backlog of 132,435. Greece's quota is 308; her backlog is 96,538. Thus a Greek citizen desiring to emigrate to this country has little chance of coming here. And an American citizen with a Greek father or mother must wait at least 18 months to bring his parents here to join him. A citizen whose married son or daughter, or brother or sister, is Italian cannot obtain a quota number for them for 2 years or more. Meanwhile, many thousands of quota numbers are wasted because they are not wanted or needed by nationals of the countries to which they are assigned.

In short, a qualified person born in England or Ireland who wants to emigrate to the United States can do so at any time. A person born in Italy, Hungary, Poland, or the Baltic States may have to wait many years before his turn is reached. This system is based upon the assumption that there is some reason for keeping the origins of our population in exactly the same proportions as they existed in 1920. Such an idea is at complete variance with the American traditions and principles that the qualifications of an immigrant do not depend upon his country of birth, and violates the spirit expressed in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal."

Furthermore, the national origins quota system has strong overtones of an indefensible racial preference. It is strongly weighted toward so-called Anglo-Saxons, a phrase which one writer calls "a term of art" encompassing almost anyone from northern and western Europe. Sinclair Lewis described his hero, Martin Arrowsmith, this way: "a typical pure-bred-Anglo-Saxon American—which means that he was a union of German, French, Scotch-Irish, perhaps a little Spanish, conceivably of the strains lumped together as Jewish, and a great deal of English, which is itself a combination of primitive Briton, Celt, Phoenician, Roman, German, Dane and Swede."

Yet, however much our present policy may be deplored, it still remains our national policy. As President Truman said when he vetoed the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (only to have that veto overridden): "The idea behind this discriminatory policy was, to put it boldly, that Americans with English or Irish names were better people and better citizens than Americans with Italian or Greek or Polish names. Such a concept is utterly unworthy of our traditions and our ideals."

Another measure of the inadequacy of the Immigration and Nationality Act has been the huge volume of private immigration bills introduced in Congress. These are bills to deal with individual hardship cases for which the general law fails to provide. In the 87th Congress over 3,500 such bills were introduced. Private immigration bills make up about half of our legislation today.

It is not hard to see why. A poor European college girl was convicted three times for putting slugs in a pay telephone, and 15 years later, married to an American teacher abroad, she was denied entrance to our country because of three separate convictions for a crime involving moral turpitude. Or another case: An Italian immigrant living in Massachusetts with his small children could not bring his wife to the United States because she had been convicted on two counts involving moral turpitude. Her crimes? In 1913 and 1939 she had stolen bundles of sticks to build a fire. It took acts of Congress to reunite both these families.

There is, of course, a legitimate argument for some limitation upon immigration. We no longer need settlers for virgin lands, and our economy is expanding more slowly than in the 19th and early 20th centuries. A superficial analysis of the heated arguments over immigration policy which have taken place since 1952 might give the impression that there was an irreconcilable conflict, as if one side wanted to go back to the policy of our Founding Fathers, of unrestricted immigration, and the other side wanted to stop all further immigration. In fact, there are only a few basic differences between the most liberal bill offered in recent years, sponsored by former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, and the supporters of the status quo. The present law admits 156,700 quota immigrants annually. The Lehman bill (like a bill introduced by Senator PHILIP A. HART and cosponsored by over one-third of the Members of the Senate) would admit 250,000.

The clash of opinion arises not over the number of immigrants to be admitted, but over the test for admission—the national origins quota system. Instead of using the discriminatory test of where the immigrant was born, the reform proposals would base admission on the immigrant's possession of skills our country needs and on the humanitarian ground of reuniting families. Such legislation does not seek to make over the face of America. Immigrants would still be given tests for health, intelligence, morality, and security.

It is not only the initial assignment of quota numbers which is arbitrary and unjust; additional inequity results from the failure of the law to permit full utilization of the authorized quota numbers. The tiny principality of Andorra in the Pyrenees Mountains, with 6,500 Spanish-speaking inhabitants, has an American immigration quota of 100, while Spain, with 30 million people, has a quota of only 250. While American citizens wait for years for their relatives to receive a quota, approximately 60,000 numbers are wasted each year because the countries to which they are assigned have far more numbers allocated to them than they have emigrants seeking to move to the United States. There is no way at present in which these numbers can be reassigned to nations where immense backlogs of applicants for admission to the United States have accumulated. This deficiency in the law should be corrected.

A special discriminatory formula is now applied to the immigration of persons who are attributable by their ancestry to an area called the Asia-Pacific triangle. This area embraces all countries from Pakistan to Japan and the Pacific islands north of Australia and New Zealand. Usually, the quota under which a prospective immigrant must enter is determined by his place of birth. However, if as much as one-half of an immigrant's ancestors came from nations in the Asia-Pacific triangle, he must rely upon the small quota assigned to the country of his ancestry, regardless of where he was born. This provision of the law should be repealed.

The Presidential message to Congress of July 23, 1963, recommended that the national origins system be replaced by a formula governing immigration to the United States which takes into account: (1) the skills of the immigrant and their relationships to our needs; (2) the family relationship between immigrants and persons already here, so that the reuniting of families is encouraged; and (3) the priority of registration. Present law grants a preference to immigrants with special skills, education, or training. It also grants a preference to various relatives of U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens. But it does so only within a national origins quota. It should be modified so that those with the greatest ability to add to the national welfare, no matter where they are born, are granted the highest priority. The next priority should go to those who seek to be reunited with their relatives. For applicants with equal claims, the earliest registrant should be the first admitted.

In order to remove other existing barriers to the reuniting of families, two additional improvements in the law are needed.

First, parents of American citizens, who now have a preferred quota status, should be accorded nonquota status.

Second, parents of aliens resident in the United States, who now have no preference, should be accorded a preference after skilled specialists and other relatives of citizens and alien residents.

These changes will have little effect on the number of immigrants admitted. They will have a major effect insofar as they relieve the hardship many of our citizens and residents now face in being separated from their parents.

We must avoid what the Irish poet John Boyle O'Reilly once called:

"Organized charity, scrimped and iced,
In the name of a cautious, statistical Christ."

Immigration policy should be generous; it should be flexible. With such a policy we can turn to the world, and to our own past, with clean hands and a clear conscience. Such a policy would be but a reaffirmation of old principles. It would be an expression of our agreement with George Washington that "The bosom of America is open to receive not only the opulent and respectable stranger, but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions; whom we shall welcome to a participation of all our rights and privileges, if by decency and propriety of conduct they appear to merit the enjoyment."

Mr. HART subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] commented on the leading article in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post, written by the late beloved John F. Kennedy. The points made in that article and the comment made thereon by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] I believe reflect accurately the good conscience of Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be printed the leading editorial in the issue of the Saturday Evening Post for October 3 entitled "Our Immigrant Heritage."

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

OUR IMMIGRANT HERITAGE

"We are all immigrants," President Franklin D. Roosevelt once told the lineage-proud Daughters of the American Revolution. That truth is a source of national strength, for in the crossbreeding of a score of strains the phenomenon known as "hybrid vigor" has made the typical American larger than the sum of his parts. He can well say, as in "Ballad for Americans": "Am I an American? I'm just an Irish, Negro, Jewish, Italian, French and English, Spanish, Russian, Chinese, Polish, Scotch, Hungarian, Litvak, Swedish, Finnish, Canadian, Greek, and Turk, and Czech, and double Czech American."

It is fitting that this American should welcome the stranger. Our very survival may well have depended on this hospitality. For we have only luck and the grace of God to thank that the Nazis, who beat us to the jet plane and to the ballistic missile, did not beat us to the nuclear bomb as well. They had the edge, for the very discovery which led to the bomb—the fission of uranium—was performed by Germans Otto Hahn and Lise Meitner on the very eve of the war. It was in Berlin that many of the great scientists who first saw the fearful potentials—Einstein, Szilard, Wigner—met and knew each other. It was our great luck that Hitler's obsession with racial "purity" caused him to drive these brilliant minds into exile, and that Mussolini's Fascist oppression caused Enrico Fermi to flee. The great Dane, Niels Bohr, joined the fugitives. America provided the asylum, the real estate, and the all-essential wealth ($2 billion) which unlocked the atom, but the brilliant men who did it were, for the most part, immigrants and fugitives. Fermi's collaborator's phone call from Chicago to Harvard that the first atomic pile had fissioned had a curious fitness to it: The Italian navigator has reached the "New World" and found the natives "very friendly."

We are put in mind of all this by the article on page 21 taken from third-generation-immigrant John F. Kennedy's posthumous book, "A Nation of Immigrants." It is an eloquent argument for adjusting the inequities of the present quota system, to allow the unused quotas of nations whose people are not particularly eager to emigrate to be used by those nations whose people must now wait for years for a visa. What Kennedy sought is embodied in the administration bill, now pending in committee, to drop nationality quotas, ease immigration for persons whose skills are needed, and allow a modest increase of some 7,000 immigrants next year. Republican Vice-Presidential Candidate WILLIAM E. MILLER has denounced the bill as an attempt to "open the floodgates for virtually any and all who would wish to come and find work in this country," and he used the occasion of Labor Day to tell an audience in South Bend, Ind., that cheap foreign labor would take over their jobs. MILLER, whose immigrant antecedents are German and Irish, and who has found America so mobile that a janitor's son may aspire to the Nation's second highest office, is moved only to echo (without his tongue-in-cheek humor) Mr. Dooley as quoted by Kennedy: "I must raise me claryon voice again' the invasion iv this fair land be th' paupers an' arnychists in Europe. Ye bet I must—because I'm here first." It's a good thing MILLER's brand of immigrants are fairly late arrivals, and weren't around to shut the golden door to the likes of Carl Schurz or Nikola Tesla. Schurz, a German who settled in Wisconsin in 1856, was a pioneer Republican whose famous speech on "true Americanism" cleared the new party of the charge that it was "pro nativism" and helped elect Lincoln President. Tesla, a Croatian who immigrated to these shores in 1884, conceived the principle of the rotary electromagnetic field used in the very Niagara Falls power generators that are so vital to MILLER's home district. We can't risk letting such radicals in again, now that MILLER's here.

SECOND THOUGHTS ABOUT POLITICIANS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Frank McGee, a respected and thoughtful commentator, made an excellent statement on September 28, entitled "Second Thoughts About Politicians."

It is so rare that a commentator or journalist displays a sympathetic attitude toward politicians that I think his words should be enshrined in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of his broadcast be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

SECOND THOUGHTS ABOUT POLITICIANS

(By Frank McGee)

A knowledgeable old lobbyist once told me: "Congress is a collection of very mediocre men a long way from home." Far from being a vicious remarks, this was a sympathetic observation by a man who understood—and liked—politicians.

They are a strange lot, politicians, who understand the voters far better than the voters understand them. I doubt if anyone really understands a politician except another politician.

Who, but a politician, knows and approves the fact that his colleague is pursuing a career, not just serving a term in office? Who, but a politician, knows and approves the fact that concern for his career as much as (and often more than) the merits of a proposition determines the position his colleague will take?

The public does not expect a singer to sing a certain song, or an actor to play a certain part that either knew would damage, or perhaps, end his career. Yet the public does expect this suicidal action from a politician.

The politician understands that the public expects this from him, yet he does not expect the public to understand why he will not do it. Aside from adult members of his own family, there is no one from whom he can expect understanding except another politician.

This gulf between the politician and the public is created at the very beginning of his career. Those entering another profession, say medicine, do so with every intention of making it their life's work and usually with the freely confessed ambition of rising rapidly to the top.

But suppose a young man conducting his first political campaign revealed to the voters that he intended to remain in politics all his life and nourished an ambition to be President of the United States. While the young doctor's attitude is so widely approved that those who deviate from it seem abnormal, the young politician would be ridiculed, scorned and rejected by the voters. From the beginning, hypocrisy is forced upon the politician and he must practice it at every stage of his career, pretending that each successively higher office he seeks is the height of his ambition.

The young doctor, licensed once, never has to return to be licensed again. The politician, on the other hand, must return every 2, 4, or 6 years (depending on the office he holds) to ask that he be licensed again.

Suppose that a doctor specialized in some obscure field of medicine and achieves a significant success. His stature is increased many times over among his colleagues and with the public. But a politician, genuinely expert in all the intricacies of economic, social, and political problems of southeast Asia will be rejected by his constituents if a local defense plant closes or money is not approved for a river-widening project.

And while there are organizations to plead the cause of doctors and every other profession or calling, there is none for politicians and the politician himself never pleads for public understanding of his peculiar problems. He knows the public doesn't care.

A badly mangled metaphor might best illustrate what the public expects of a politician: that he keep his ear to the ground, his nose to the wind, his fingers upon the public pulse and—withal—his eyes upon the stars.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, last month the Polish Legion of American Veterans held its 17th biannual convention in Milwaukee.

The PLAV is an organization in the great American tradition—an organization which combines service to its own members with a broad concern for the welfare of all Americans and the preservation and expansion of democracy at home and around the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions adopted by the Polish Legion of American Veterans be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS IN ITS 17TH BIANNUAL CONVENTION, AT THE HOTEL SCHROEDER, MILWAUKEE, WIS., SEPTEMBER 6, 1964

1. The city of Milwaukee, its public officials and its citizens have spared no efforts to make our convention a tremendous success, and to provide for our physical comfort and spiritual well-being: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the PLAV hereby expresses its sincere gratitude to the citizens and public officials of Milwaukee for their generous hospitality.

POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

2. We enjoin both candidates for the office of President of the United States to avoid any political promise of a war to liberate Poland from Communist domination, unless the candidate is prepared to commit the United States to full, all-out armed conflict, with Soviet imperialism and to accept the consequences of a nuclear war, which would wipe out Poland and which would probably destroy most of the United States and kill or maim most American citizens.

We urge that the campaign be kept free of false promises, the inspiration of false hopes, and that no group be made a political pawn for the gain of public office.

Poland's future and freedom will be gained at a conference table attended by all major powers.

NUCLEAR WAR

3. The PLAV counts in its ranks veterans of both World Wars and the Korean conflict. Our memory is only too full of the horrors of armed conflict with its great toll in human lives and wanton destruction of property. Our Blue and Gold Star Mothers know equally well the consequences of armed aggression. We are not anxious that our sons wear the Purple Heart or that they receive the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously.

All of the foregoing considerations lead us to an expression of high praise for those leaders of the United States who succeeded in securing enactment of the nuclear test ban treaty and for their continued efforts to bring about true disarmament.

In the same context our disarmament must not reduce our military posture to a point where we will lay prostrate before the Chinese Communists, or where Soviet imperialists will beat us to death with ax handles. America must always remain strong enough to keep the peace everywhere.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

4. We urge the Veterans' Administration, our Representatives in Congress, and the President of the United States to use their offices in order that the PLAV becomes a nationally recognized veterans' organization. Denial of this privilege means a denial of adequate representation to the thousands of our members, who because of a language barrier, cannot communicate with VA officers except through a bilingual PLAV service officer.

We also urge that full medical and hospital benefits be extended to veterans of allied forces who are now U.S. citizens.

Whenever available, counterpart funds should be used to care for the graves of Polish soldiers in Italy and other foreign countries. The Communist regimes in Warsaw has neglected the cemeteries of these brave men until they have become shambles.

We do not seek to have veterans set apart as a specially favored group of citizens; but we do insist that the sacrifice we made for the defense of this country be not forgotten. Those captains of industry and finance who oppose any extension of veterans' benefits should be reminded that we kept their empire intact.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY ASSASSINATION

The assassination of John F. Kennedy evoked a tremendous emotional demonstration throughout the entire world. It brought tears to eyes of strong men and withered their spines. Therefore, let us pledge ourselves to make his martyrdom an inspiration for us to rededicate ourselves to those principles and ideals for which he lived and died.

These include such ideals as dignity for all men, regardless of race, religion, or national origin; the abolition of poverty and want everywhere; the building of a great America for future generations; and true peace for mankind. These goals can be implemented by our support of the Alliance for Progress, the mutual security program, the food-for-peace program, the Peace Corps, and other similar undertakings.

FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM

6. We urge the continuation of strong steps to halt the spread of communism and pledge ourselves to the support of our Government in this field. Diplomacy, rather than armed intervention, removed Red missiles from Cuba. But we must not hesitate to us armed force, as in southeast Asia, to prevent the spread of communism.

We urge continued use of surplus foods as a tool for the spread of democracy. The sale and gift of wheat and other foodstuffs to Poland and other Eastern European countries must be continued; the alternative is to force the citizens of those countries to continuously rely on Communist Russia for their survival. It is because America is the only bright light remaining for these people that we must not let them down in their hour of need. We must continue the foreign aid program.

DOMESTIC PROBLEMS

7. We have expressed ourselves on international matters and foreign policy in the foregoing resolutions. But we must not forget the problems of domestic housekeeping. Therefore, the PLAV resolves to cooperate and implement programs designed to make America a better place to live. We pledge our support for:

1. Job-retraining programs for veterans and nonveterans alike;

2. A reduction in Government spending, with further tax cuts resulting;

3. The use of all of our facilities to curb juvenile delinquency and reduce its incidence.

The PLAV has already instituted a plan of youth activities for this purpose on a State level; this program will be continued with greater emphasis and with more funds.

4. Conservation of natural resources and support of the Wilderness Preservation Program.

5. The enactment of a comprehensive medical care for the aged program, using the best features of both the Social Security Administration and private insurance organizations.

6. The prevention of erosion of our cities by supporting urban renewal and urban conservation programs.

7. The up-grading of all our citizens to end the vast waste of human resources in our country, whether by aids to education, greater social security benefits, or any other means consistent with human decency.

As Veterans of the Armed Forces, of the U.S.A., we pledge ourselves to the principles set forth herein, and as good citizens, we resolve to abide by both the letter and spirit of these resolutions.

UNITED NATIONS

8. We pledge our continued support of the United Nations and urge that its offices be used to pursue the peace everywhere; that it be used as a vehicle to move the Iron Curtain out of Europe; that our Government and the other powers act through the United Nations to foster Democracy in the entire world.

IMMIGRATION

9. We urge that Congress enact a humane immigration policy based on the economic and social needs of our country, and that the archaic quota system be done away with.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

10. We solicit Congress to reopen the national veterans' life insurance program for those veterans who failed to avail themselves of it upon separation from military service; we urge an expended program of medical and domiciliary care for World War I veterans which will not reduce them to paupers, but rather will give them the decent care which their military service demands. The system of pensions for World War I veterans should be revised in line with the increased cost of living.

POLONIA AFFAIRS

11. All organizations of Americans of Polish descent must cooperate together for the accomplishment of our common objectives. These include the perpetuation of our Polish culture and its dissemination among Americans.

All Americans of Polish descent must work together to restore democracy and freedom to Poland and move out the Communist intruders.

We must combine our efforts to remind the world that this is Poland's millenium; that Poland was a Christian nation 1,000 years ago, and she introduced culture to eastern Europe.

It is recommended that the secretary of this convention distribute copies of these resolutions to:

(a) Local press, radio, and television;

(b) All Polish newspapers and Polish radio programs in the United States;

(c) To the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe;

(d) To the Members of Congress from States having PLAV posts;

(e) To the President of the United States and the Republican and Democratic National Committees;

(f) To the Library of Congress;

(g) Such other persons as the national commander directs.

Respectfully submitted by committee on resolutions.

Judge BENJAMIN C. STANCZYK,
Chairman,

EDWARD L. BIELAGA,
HENRY GROMAK,
MATTHEW ZAMORSKI,
LEONARD J. WOLODZKO,
JOSEPH C. ZALUD.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MRS. SHYAM KUMARI KHAN, MEMBER OF INDIAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that we have a very distinguished visitor in the person of Mrs. Shyam Kumari Khan, who is a member of the Council of States, the upper house of the Indian Parliament. Mrs. Khan has devoted her life to the welfare of women and children of India. Among her numerous positions are: General Secretary of the Indian Council of Child Welfare, Vice President of the Indian Village Women's Association, and member of the Planning Commission Working Group for Social Welfare, which is preparing India's fourth 5-year plan. She is a cousin of the distinguished Indian Ambassador, whom we know so well, His Excellency Mr. B. K. Nehru, and of the late beloved Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru.

I take great pleasure in presenting Mrs. Khan to the Senate. [Applause, Senators rising.]

"THE FRUITS OF SOUND TRADE POLICIES"—ADDRESS BEFORE FINNISH-AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the absence of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an address entitled, "The Fruits of Sound Trade Policies." The address was delivered by Samuel F. Pryor, vice president of Pan American World Airways.

Senator HUMPHREY has for many years been deeply interested fostering sound Finnish-American relations. This address outlines the many remarkable accomplishments which have been achieved in this area.

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

THE FRUITS OF SOUND TRADE POLICIES
(By Samuel F. Pryor)

Mr. President of the Finnish-American Chamber of Commerce, Your Excellency Ambassador Seppala, Mr. Consul General, ladies and gentlemen, when I received your president's invitation to appear here today, I accepted with a great deal of appreciation for three reasons:

The first was personal because Mrs. Pryor and I have been for many years close friends of Ambassador and Mrs. Seppala—two of the finest persons we have ever had the privilege of knowing. Through them we had the honor of meeting President and Mrs. Kekkonen on their visit to the United States in 1961, and the pleasure of arranging the presidential trip across the United States to the 50th State of Hawaii, where I have a home. I shall never forget one moment, in particular. Our party was on the beach at Maui—in the most peaceful surroundings. Suddenly, there came a telephone call from Helsinki. It was to advise the President that a Soviet message had just been delivered to him, asking for military talks with Finland. I told the President that I had a small plane standing by for his use in case of emergency. I shall never forget his quiet reply. He said: "Mr. Pryor, we will continue with the plans you have made. That is why we have Foreign Ministers." His Foreign Minister left for Helsinki, not the President. President Kekkonen's calmness in time of stress made an impression on all of us, aside from all of his other splendid qualities.

The second reason for having my special pleasure in taking part in this meeting is because of the company for which I work. Pan American has had long and cordial ties with Finland. In 1947, American Overseas began flights to and from Finland. In 1961, Pan Am, having acquired American Overseas, inaugurated the first jet service between our two countries. We work closely with the two Finnish airlines—Finnair and Karair. Finnair routes connect with ours at London, Paris, Copenhagen, Oslo, Amsterdam, Hamburg, Frankfurt, and Barcelona. Incidentally, Finnair, one of the world's oldest airlines, started with one 4-passenger hydroplane, flying at 85 miles-per-hour between Helsinki and Stockholm. Today, its fleet consists of 17 aircraft, including the most modern medium-range jets.

In a country which has as many lakes as Finland, air travel and transport are obviously of great importance. The Finnish airlines tie together all cities of that country and most of the towns, including those of the far north. Their air routes reach to nearly all the capitals of free Europe, as well as to Moscow and Leningrad. We in Pan American are proud to work with them as teammates.

Third, I am here as a businessman. Every businessman must be interested in everything that advances trade, especially on the international level.

One need not be an economist or in government to realize that international trade is increasingly vital to all the peoples of the world. Nations now are in the same geographic proximity to one another that towns within a nation formerly were. International trade is on the threshold of an expansion thought impossible less than a decade ago. To prepare for this Pan Am has invested $110 million in all-cargo jet aircraft. Mr. Trippe stated recently that he expects oversea air freight to increase at a more rapid rate than passenger traffic. In a few years air cargo volume will have doubled, leading to the day when revenue from oversea air freight equals revenue from passengers.

The supersonic age is almost here. Think of Helsinki, for example, as the center of a vast circle. When our first supersonic passenger planes go into service in the early 1970's, Finland will be a next-door neighbor. New York will be only 3¼ hours from the Finnish capital. Rome will be only 1½ hours from Helsinki and Sydney, Australia, only 11½ hours away.

I understand that the purpose of today's program is to present information gathered by the U.S. trade mission to Finland last May. From what I have heard so far of the mission's work, it is very impressive—not only for its immediate results but for the vigor with which the U.S. Department of Commerce is now promoting foreign trade. They deserve great praise—even in an election year.

I won't be presumptuous enough to talk here, before so many experts, of the many tangible values of doing business with one another. Enough to say this: Trade has always opened up new worlds since time began. And where trade goes, so go ideas. And, in the realm of ideas lies the future of mankind—for better or for worse. Like our friends from Finland, we in the United States seek the better world.

All human activities are motivated by the desire to satisfy some human need. Where the activity is business, its primary purpose is to provide material goods and physical services. The main motivation obviously is profit. But may I submit that this is not the only goal. For centuries, the trader, in going from region to region, has carried not only merchandise but ideas, techniques, and ideals. He has not only crossed physical boundaries but has broken through mental boundaries, opening new vistas of science and art. The trader has been an instrument of cultural cross-fertilization—an active agent of progress.

This is an aspect of commerce which many businessmen are often too busy to consider. Businessmen, including myself, do not necessarily tend to philosophic speculation about collateral values. But, whether or not the average businessman is actively aware of the nonmaterial byproducts of his work, those byproducts do exist and are most important.

The intellectual, psychological, and political results of commerce and trade, these days, are more effective than ever in the past. The simple reason is that, now, more businessmen have many more accessible points of contact than earlier generations ever dreamed of.

Nonetheless, these byproducts of trade and commerce mark the advance of civilization—of the better way of life for one's children—and for their children. Civilization truly goes hand in hand with trade.

This fact has been true throughout the history of mankind. For example, when the Phoenicians voyaged to the British Isles for tin several centuries before Christ, they brought out only tangible goods to trade, but also new notions of astronomy and of that astonishing tool which they had invented—the alphabet.

Marco Polo brought from the Far East to 13th-century Europe not only such things as coal and spaghetti, but also information about the Great Khan's postal service and of his regime's care for orphans and for the aged. In addition, Marco Polo's written account of his travels became a lasting work of literature from which men today still draw entertainment and instruction.

A century or two later, the growth of trade and the rise of a merchant class were among the liberalizing influences that broke the shackles of feudalism. Still later, the War of American Independence was motivated in no small degree by the colonists' commercial aspirations, on one hand, and, on the other hand, by the restrictive trade regulations of England.

What has changed, beyond the wildest imaginations of our forebears, is our manner of travel—the speed of travel—the present proximity of every land to the other. In effect, today everyone lives next door to everyone else.

Less than a century ago, in 1873, Jules Verne, using the license of fiction, described a world measuring 80 days around. Sixteen

years later, Nelly Bly, the American newspaper woman, actually made the circuit in a little over 72 days as an almost incredible journalist stunt. In 1924, the U.S. Air Force performed the first aerial circumnavigation in 14½ days actual flying time. People couldn't believe it. By 1947, Pan Am made the world only 7 days wide. And recently an American businessman, using a regularly scheduled Pan Am flight circled the world in 52 hours.

Today, for example, Pan Am links some 86 lands of the world with jet planes. If one defines distance in terms of time, Boston is nearer to Paris by jet clipper than to Philadelphia by train. San Francisco is only half as far from Honolulu as from Los Angeles by the fastest land travel. If spare U.S.-built machine parts are needed in Finland, they can be jet flown and be made available overnight. Likewise, if a U.S. department store urgently needs to fill its bare shelves with some of Finland's exquisite fashions, they, too, can be supplied within hours for each of our passenger jets carry up to 10 tons of cargo.

The girth of the globe will soon be cut even more by the supersonic aircraft now under construction for Pan Am. When these aircraft go into service, the size of the earth, in actual flying time, will be only 24 hours and 15 minutes.

In these circumstances of a shrinking globe, of expanding international trade, and of the intellectual and political ramifications of international business, is there anything special that should be said of Finland?

Emphatically yes. Finland has displayed exceptional skill in devising successful trade policies and often under conditions of extraordinary difficulty. This relatively small country provides an example which can be instructive to all others. To some, Finland may be a pygmy in size. But, to me, Finland is a giant in what counts most—a giant in honor and a giant in ideas.

There is not a school textbook in the United States nor an encyclopedia which does not carry at least this brief item: "Finland was the only European country to honor its debts to the United States in the years between the two World Wars."

Everyone here knows that—but it cannot be repeated too often.

And we shall never forget that great Finn, Nurmi, who was the true symbol of his people when he emerged as the world's greatest athlete at the Olympic Games. There have been others, as well; President Kekkonen was a Finnish champion.

But let me interpose one other point which the United States and Finland have in common—something of which few people may remember: Prohibition was placed in effect in Finland in 1919. It was repealed in Finland in 1931. They beat us on that repeal by 2 years.

Even though I think deeply and emotionally about all that Finland has gone through over the many years of its history and in more recent years, I do not propose to go into that history. The facts are known to all of us.

Nonetheless, notwithstanding a burden of reparations and tribute that would have forced many a larger and richer nation to its knees, in only 8 years—that is, by 1952—that heavy burden had been discharged. Since then, Finland has been able to enlarge domestic consumption greatly and to engage again in normal foreign trade. Finland's gross national product has nearly tripled—from the equivalent of about $2 billion to nearly $6 billion. It is worth more than casual mention, also, that Finland has never asked for—nor has received Marshall plan or any other foreign aid.

The policies which made possible Finland's dramatic developments are a combination of firm determination, courage, foresight, and political realism.

Our friends, the Finns, have accommodated to all of the realistic facts of life with notable adroitness and skill. By concentrating on high quality of materials and workmanship in manufacture, on excellence of design, both functionally and esthetically, on plain hard work, they have achieved a continuing economic expansion. This has enabled Finland to trade with both East and West while maintaining always its traditional trade with the West. Last year, four-fifths of Finland's foreign trade was with Western nations.

Impressive as are the figures of the rise in Finland's gross national product, her exports and her per capita income, an even more impressive fact is that it is the only nation in Europe, with a common boundary with Soviet Russia, to have avoided political capture.

Despite recurrent pressures, Finland has remained a free republic. Her powerful neighbors, in recent years, have exposed her to the forces of both fascism and communism—to say nothing of some homegrown disciples of both extremes—just as all of us have. But Finland has not fallen victim to either disaster.

Finally, may I say that this achievement has been due basically to her ability to resolve domestic differences by democratic debate; to her integrity in meeting obligations; to what is called, in the Finnish tongue "sisu"—which some Americans might term "rugged individualism" or, perhaps, just plain "guts."

Finland knows that political freedom for her citizens cannot exist without a large measure of economic freedom. She has seen clearly that the business systems of the West are, and have been, the most compatible with the freedom of small countries.

By acting according to these lights, Finland has maintained democracy even on the doorstep of despotism and has built progressively higher standards of living for her people. I know it is the wish of all Americans that she continue to prosper and to live in liberty.

MISMANAGED NEWS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the Kennebec Journal of Augusta, Maine, whose editorial excellence is widely acknowledged, in its September 28, 1964, issue has produced another typically penetrating and cogent editorial. It is entitled "Mismanaged News" and I commend it and recommend it as must reading. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

MISMANAGED NEWS

It is not yet clear if the recent engagement between two destroyers of the U.S. Navy and four unidentified boats in the Gulf of Tonkin was a tactical blunder. But what is clearly evident is that both the White House and the Defense Department are engaged in the tactics of news management again.

It all began with the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, who gave out the first sparse information on the incident. The facts were not many, nor did they provide the basis for reaching any conclusion.

The story was simply that four vessels, believed to be PT boats of the North Vietnamese Government, had made threatening maneuvers in the area of the U.S. ships. After they failed to heed warning shots, the destroyers fired upon them with radar guidance.

McNamara's answer to demands for further information was to say that he would answer no more questions. It was a terse rejection.

The next report came from Moscow, alleging that the American destroyers had attacked nonmilitary vessels engaged in peaceful activity and that three of them were sunk.

True or false, the fact is that the President did not order any retaliatory strikes by the Navy—which he did several weeks ago when North Vietnamese PT boats launched a direct shooting attack at two American destroyers.

With this further development, the question was referred to the White House. But here also further news was refused, on the ground that all the known facts had already been disclosed, and, therefore, the President could give out no other information.

If the President had stated that it would be unwise or improper, at this point, to say anything more in the interests of national security, it might be difficult to take issue with him. But his statement that there was no more information is difficult to believe.

First of all, there was such obvious information as the names of the ships involved. How could the Defense Department communicate with the vessels or recall them from patrol if it could not identify them?

More important, U.S. air reconnaissance, as well as the massive intelligence organization maintained in southeast Asia, must have provided further facts. To believe otherwise is to accept an extravagant charge of incompetence against the U.S. military and intelligence establishments.

The need for secrecy seems to provide no support for silence or for efforts to divert further inquiry. By this time, surely, Hanoi must be fully aware of the disposition of U.S. forces in the area, the nature of their own naval involvement, and the casualties suffered, if any.

To tell the American people the facts now would be no gain for the Communists.

The conclusion is inescapable that the only gain the administration hopes to garner from the silence in Washington is to avoid unfavorable news becoming a part of the electoral picture. This hardly justifies withholding from the public information that may be vital in reaching an opinion on one of the most important issues that needs to be decided on November 3.

THE STATE OF HAWAII

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the State of Hawaii is a most blessed land, cradled in the blue Pacific with the finest climate that nature can bestow.

Many talented people are drawn to this land where the skies are daily arced with rainbows, and many remain forever. One of our most distinguished residents is Mr. Fred Sparks, a freelance writer whose warm and witty articles have graced the pages of many of America's leading magazines.

Fred Sparks candidly explains why he is in love with the 50th State in an article in the October issue of Reader's Digest. Since this will be seen in 14 million American homes, I am confident that Hawaii will soon have more visitors who will come to stay.

If there are no objections, I wish to share Mr. Sparks' romance with Hawaii with my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

I'M IN LOVE WITH THE 50TH STATE—"LET ME TELL YOU WHY"

(By Fred Sparks)

I live in Hawaii at the end of a rainbow. Each day, in the late afternoon, it showers on Diamond Head and then, in an explosion of color, a saucy rainbow dances toward my cottage. Often I invite friends to "come for cocktails at the hour of the rainbow." It never fails.

I found my dream house 7 years ago when I visited Oahu, supposedly for a fortnight. Late one afternoon I walked along the shore past the great hotels, lavish villas and decaying wartime pillboxes, and scaled Black Point, a lava peninsula. On the other side I was transfixed by a sweep of rolling ocean, green to the reef, purple outside.

In the distance, haloed by cotton clouds, towered the twin mountains of Koko Head, like two camel humps. The beach was unsoiled, not a hamburger stand, poster, carton or can was visible. The only sounds were the rustle of coconut palms and the swish of marbled surf washing the white sand. But for a few houses, camouflaged by shrubbery, it would have been a familiar sight to Robinson Crusoe.

Everyone has one moment, I imagine, when he reviews his life and decides what he really wants to do. This moment was mine. I had always dreamt of a tropical island on which to pursue my true pleasures—writing, reading, and the outdoors. I was not a beachcomber, however; I also wanted America's creature comforts, her peoples, her libraries.

But could I now, in my 40's, cast away a journalistic career and economic security for a misty dream and the trials of free-lance writing? Uncertain, I returned to my beach the following morning. Behind a majestic banyan tree, older than the United States, I saw a tiny cottage bearing a "For Rent Furnished" sign. Before the evening rainbow I had taken occupancy and dispatched my resignation. Thank heaven for impulse. I've never regretted mine and I'm still in love with the 50th State. Let me tell you why.

The varied races of the five islands are infected with the aloha spirit, as contagious as laughter. All Hawaii is a welcome wagon. The evening I moved in, my neighbors, as if summoned by a town crier, turned my porch into a fruit stand with greetings from their gardens—artichokes, papayas, mangos, bananas, avocados. They lingered to chat; ukeleles and guitars materialized, and soon a party was roaring. A Japanese neighbor supplied the drinks, a Korean the food, a Chinese the ice. When I asked an officer from Pearl Harbor what I could supply, he said: "You supplied the reason."

My bedroom had become a nursery, with five babies on the bed, two on the chaise lounge, and almond-eyed twins sleeping on a folded bathrobe in the bottom bureau drawer. A stunning Hawaiian lady did a gentle hula, hands and hips swaying light as wisps of smoke. Then, in surprising unity, there commenced a community sing.

What a contrast with the aloof formality of city or suburban living. During 6 years in a New York apartment I had exchanged only nods with the other family on my floor. In Hawaii everyone drops in, and children spill over the neighborhood like a brook at spring thaw. Returning one afternoon, I found a small-fry football game raging on my lawn, my porch a crowded grandstand. A boy said: "It's OK, mister. We live around here." That explained everything.

Nothing ever seems to get lost in the islands, not even children. A couple I know came home one night and found a strange child in their daughter's bedroom. Awakened, their daughter said, "That's Barbara. She lives around here." Barbara identified herself more fully. Anxious to relieve what he was sure were hysterical parents, the man immediately phoned. "Barbara is safe at my house," he said. "I'll bring her right over."

"S'all right," said a sleepy voice. She'll probably come home in the morning."

Neighbors are expected to stick together. One evening a man rang my bell and asked me to vote for his friend for a State office. When I said I supported the opposite party, he asked, "What's that got to do with it? My friend lives around here."

Because the islands are without industrial smoke, they are sootless and smogless. The trade winds sweep away what little dust there is, and my window sills are seldom dirty. Perhaps because they are so pampered by nature, Hawaiians have learned to respect it. There are no outdoor advertisements, and because it's unthinkable for anyone to drop trash, there are no antilittering signs. "Compared to the mainland," said one lady who moved here from Cleveland, "Hawaii is cellophane wrapped."

Hawaii seems to be on a continuous holiday. Besides traditional American holidays, we celebrate Hawaiian, Japanese, Filipino, Chinese, and Korean festivals. One week the streets will shimmy as flower-bedecked maidens hula on the birthday of King Kamehameha, Hawaii's "George Washington." A week later great gongs and somber muffled drums will accompany exotically robed, shaven monks in a Buddhist procession, a living scene from "The King and I."

Our Oriental-American families are very close. For instance, my neighbor doesn't call it just any mechanic when her car breaks down; she calls her brother. If the pipes leak, there's her niece's husband, a plumber. She gets her linens wholesale at an uncle's store. One morning, when I went to the dentist, his anteroom was jammed. When my turn came I joked: "Doctor, you must be getting richer than Rockefeller."

"On the contrary," he replied. "You're my first patient today."

"But all those people outside?"

"Relatives."

Hawaii has none of the mainland's restless, nervous, go-go-go and perhaps the only way to have an ulcer here is bring it with you. A major police problem is to keep traffic moving fast enough, particularly at sunsets and full moons. Everyone crawls along enjoying nature's show. Last May 27 a motorcycle cop caught me making an illegal turn. He studied my license, started to write out a ticket, then changed his mind and tore up the ticket. "I see it's your birthday," he said. "But please don't do it again."

Our motto is: "More better you do it tomorrow." If the tailor promises your suit Thursday, come back Saturday. TV programs occasionally begin on schedule. "Hawaiian time," is 20 minutes late, sometimes more. The night after I had some people in for drinks, a couple knocked. "Sorry we couldn't come yesterday," they said, making themselves comfortable.

One rush hour I was aboard a Honolulu-bound bus when a lady flagged it, handed the driver a tureen and said, "This is for Mrs. Okamoto. She's sick." A few miles later the driver left the bus. When he returned a disturbed tourist cried, "Young man, you've kept us waiting 10 minutes."

"Yes. Mama-san was in bed, so I put the soup on the stove."

In Hawaii, happiness is so easy to catch. You can dine under the stars almost every night, unpestered by hungry insects. Cookouts are so common that recently, for variety, friends invited me to a cook-in. With sea, streams, and mountains a few minutes from every place on this 44-by-30-mile island, the best things in life are free. To enjoy them we live by the sun. I no longer bury my head in a newspaper's global woes at breakfast. Coffee in hand, I watch the sun rise slowly behind Koko Head and listen as chirping mynah birds harry each other in a lush flame tree.

Everyone's astir by 6, and schools and offices open between 7 and 8. By 4:30 p.m. the business district is a ghost town; Hawaii is at play. My neighbor wears quick-drying swim trunks instead of underwear. If things lag at the office, he walks a few blocks to the Ala Maffina Beach, strips down to his suit and dives in. A brief sunbath and he's back refreshed at his desk within minutes.

Radio stations hourly broadcast surf-condition bulletins. If the waves are high, many junior employees claim that beloved relatives have been taken suddenly ill; excused, the boys head for the beach. Surfing here is heaviest when mainland colleges are recessed for the summer. By August a cast is a status symbol in Waikiki, and as many people are in traction as in New Hampshire during the skiing season.

A while back my accountant rejected a Minnesota firm's offer almost doubling his income. The firm asked him what he did want. He responded: "Your figure is generous. Can you also guarantee wild orchids in my garden, golf 365 days a year, and perpetually healthy kids? Hawaii can."

This accountant and his wife, both from Chicago, have a ritual every time they think of returning. They simply open the guest closet and look at their old galoshes.

In Hawaii we are smug about our weather. Our thermometer always says summer, but it always feels like spring. If I'm momentarily distraught, I rise from my worktable on the porch, take exactly 75 steps and purge my depression with the tonic of the Pacific. Or I drive a few miles high up to the top of the Pali and drink in one of the most breathtaking panoramas on this earth. Below are the green plains of Kaneohe, framed by steep gray slopes, palm-fringed beaches, and the endless sea with white fishing boats yawning in the gentle swells. Man's puny problems dissolve before such an eternal vista.

Last year a poll listed Hawaii as the first place most Americans want to visit. Those who do will, I'm sure, remember these as "the happy islands." Certainly I have found happiness in Hawaii, at the end of a rainbow.

CASPER, WYO., NEWSPAPERS ENDORSE SENATOR GOLDWATER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, among the many States that will be carried by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER this November is the State that this Senator is very proud to represent—the State of Wyoming. Republicans and Democrats may disagree on the percentages and the total votes predicted for this November; but in the candor of their private councils, they agree that Senator GOLDWATER is going to do as well as or better than Richard Nixon, who carried the State by 14,120 votes in 1960.

I am pleased to report to my colleagues and to the gentlemen of the fourth estate that Wyoming's largest newspaper, the Casper Star-Tribune, has endorsed Senator GOLDWATER. Casper is a centrally located city of nearly 40,000 people. Its geographic position makes it what might be called the crossroads of opinion in the Equality State, and its endorsement of a candidate is considered a very favorable index of political thought throughout the State. In a lengthy, dispassionate, and superbly reasoned editorial, it states:

The Casper Tribune endorses Senator GOLDWATER [for President] not as a Sir Galahad or a St. George, killer of dragons, but as a man whose commonsense approach to the prob-

lems of his country might well put a brake on those trends which submerge the interests of the individual and must ultimately destroy his freedom.

Taking this view, we see the man from Arizona, not as an advocate of extremism, but as a guardian of constitutional government, who can brake the slide to complete federalism, leaving to the States some of the rights originally intended by the founders of our Nation.

The editorial endorsement by the Casper newspapers is made without rancor or vituperation. It is a positive endorsement. With the most objective of criticisms directed toward the present administration, the Casper Star-Tribune notes:

Peace and prosperity are the central themes; but it is a shaky peace, and the prosperity is so closely linked with a philosophy of deficit spending that it gives rise to grave doubts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial endorsement of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER by the Casper Star-Tribune of September 27, 1964, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with my remarks.

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

TO HALT A TREND

In the intense partisanship of a political campaign, the endorsement of one candidate or another quite often carries with it expressions of denunciation of the opposing contender.

As a responsible newspaper, we cannot bring ourselves to go along with the concept that one party is particularly virtuous or the other particularly villainous. In Natrona County in Wyoming, for instance, at this stage of the campaign, there appears to be a rather even division of Republicans and Democrats, with an unknown quantity of several thousand votes to be counted on to decide the issue in the final reckoning. We believe the Nation, like our own community and State, is made up of pretty good people generally and we have no desire to cast aspersions either on their integrity or their intelligence in affairs political.

With an awareness of the right of every citizen to make up his own mind both on the candidates and the issues, we endorse Senator BARRY M. GOLDWATER for President. This decision is made with consideration of all the various arguments involved and it is made also because of a sense of responsibility to Star-Tribune readers who have a right to know where we stand in this important debate. Although the presentation of our views on this question is made with moderation and a due respect for the sincerity and the abilities of the Democratic Party and its standard bearer, it would be a misinterpretation to confuse this moderation with any sense of reluctance.

For several decades now, the American people have been going down the pleasant road to State socialism. If that is the kind of political system the people want, they shall surely have it in the years to come, and they will advance it measurably by the election of Lyndon P. Johnson and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY in November. The Star-Tribune does not believe that this is the goal desired by the majority or that it would be the part of wisdom to continue blindly along that path. Some day there must be a reckoning, and although it may be uncomfortable at any time in our national history, the sooner the realities are faced, the better for the future of America.

When the Republican Party chose BARRY GOLDWATER and WILLIAM E. MILLER as its nominees, it was not without a considerable voice of dissent from those in the party who favored a different approach to the problems of the country. There was, however, no question that the GOLDWATER nomination was the will of the majority and that it represented the thinking of the party as such. Although there are dissident voices still fighting the battle of the Cow Palace, that is over and done with, and GOLDWATER is carrying the fight not as an individual but as the standard bearer of his party. The same situation prevails in the Democratic Party, where a number of influential leaders disagree on certain basic principles with President Johnson. Some of these, as already is evident, will bring their influence to bear in favor of a Republican victory, just as certain elements of the Republican Party will work openly or secretively for Mr. Johnson's election. These crosscurrents are not to be ignored, and it is neither unnatural nor dishonest for the benefiting party to take advantage of them. By and large, however, the attention of the voters will be focused on the "mainstream," and that is where the major decision will be made.

In any discussion of the presidential campaign, there are certain fundamental principles involved but these are so often confused with the personalities of the candidates that they are frequently beclouded. Whether Mr. Johnson picks up his beagles by the ears, or turns out the lights in the White House, or whether Mr. GOLDWATER does not always make his meaning clear and falls into verbal traps that prove embarrassing, or that as a U.S. Senator he has failed to sponsor major legislation, are not paramount. Neither is the relative wealth of the Johnson and Goldwater families or, for that matter, the military records of the two nominees.

Senator GOLDWATER himself has expounded the basic issues, which he views as fourfold and which he briefly describes as Republican principles "which proclaim that peace in the world is preserved through our strength, that moral leadership is a clear duty of high office, that fiscal soundness is an obligation government owes to the taxpayer, and that our private enterprise system should be encouraged and not impeded."

Mr. Johnson emphasizes national unity and an administration for all the people. As the incumbent President, he is in a favorable position to follow this high-level course, leaving to his running mate and others the gut fighting that is part of any vigorous campaign. Peace and prosperity are the central themes, but it is a shaky peace, and the prosperity is so closely linked with a philosophy of deficit spending that it gives rise to grave doubts.

Senator GOLDWATER might have added a fifth principle to his basic summary—a principle which is implied but not expressly stated. That is the relationship of the individual to the government and the government to the individual. It is an old axiom that those are governed best who are governed least, and there is no reason to assume that, despite the complexities of modern civilization, this axiom does not hold today. The "creeping socialism" which has caused so much concern can result only in greater and greater interference by government in the personal lives of the citizens. Somewhere along the line, there is a point of no return and when the string has been played out a nation must inevitably wind up either in anarchy or despotism.

We endorse Senator GOLDWATER not as a Sir Galahad or a St. George, killer of dragons, but as a man whose commonsense approach to the problems of his country might well put a brake on those trends which submerge the interests of the individual and must ultimately destroy his freedom.

Taking this view, we see the man from Arizona not as an advocate of extremism but as a guardian of constitutional government, who can brake the slide to complete federalism, leaving to the States some of the rights originally intended by the founders of our Nation.

EDITORIAL COMMENTS ON SENATOR THURMOND'S SWITCH TO THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on September 16, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] made a courageous and virtually unprecedented decision. In a nationally televised appearance before the people of his home State, Senator THURMOND announced that he was becoming a Republican.

Since that moment, the Senator's office has been flooded with telegrams and phone calls, running, I am told, several hundred to one in endorsing his forthrightness and his courage.

Since coming to the Republican side of the Senate, my longtime friend and neighbor in the New Senate Office Building has been traveling the country, setting the record straight on Republican truth squads and telling the Nation why on the eve of a presidential election he joined the Grand Old Party.

Senator THURMOND is today speaking in Wyoming. At this moment he is in Fremont County addressing a rally in Lander. Later today he moves to Riverton; and later to Natrona County, for a speech before several thousand Wyomingites at Casper.

It is fitting, therefore, that I ask permission to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of editorials from newspapers and radio-TV stations bearing on his switch to the Republican Party or on related events.

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

[From the Valley Morning Star, Harlingen, Tex., Sept. 24, 1964]

THURMOND RAPS DEMOS AS HE MOVES TO GOP

Those who have known and admired Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, for years are not surprised at the step he took when he announced his departure from the Democratic Party and his support for BARRY GOLDWATER.

THURMOND for years has been a Jeffersonian Democrat, one who has voted consistently against expansion of the Federal Government, and for allowing the people to be self-responsible and not reliant on the bureaucrats.

Mr. THURMOND said he realizes he is taking a political risk by switching from Democrat to Republican in a Southern State and that "my chances for reelection might, because of this step, go down into oblivion." But he says for him, "there is no other course."

Too many politicians think more about retaining a lucrative position than to stand for what they think is right. But THURMOND has stood for what he regarded as right in the face of possible loss of votes and influence. It is interesting that THURMOND has been rated 100-percent conservative by the Conservative Society of America; 90 to 100 percent by the Americans for Constitutional Action, and zero by the big-Government-promoting Americans for Democratic Action. His voting records with those three organizations are a great deal similar to those of GOLDWATER.

As Senator THURMOND bowed out of the Democratic Party, he gave a bill of particulars—an indictment—against that party. Here is what he told the people of South Carolina:

"I have no choice but to speak openly, frankly, and fully to the people of South Carolina on the crisis that confronts us.

"The Democratic Party has abandoned the people. It has turned its back on the spiritual values and political principles which have brought us the blessings of freedom under God and a bountiful prosperity. It has breached the trust reposed in it by the people. It is leading the evolution of our Nation to a socialistic dictatorship.

"The Democratic Party has forsaken the people to become the party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big businessmen looking for Government contracts and favors.

"The Democratic Party has encouraged lawlessness, civil unrest, and mob actions.

"The Democratic Party has violated its trust by using the power of Government to suppress information on scandals and corruption of its leaders in Government and party offices.

"The Democratic Party has succored and assisted our Communist enemies through trade and aid at the expense of the American people.

"The Democratic Party has established and pursued for our Government a no-win foreign policy of weakness, indecision, accommodation, and appeasement.

"The Democratic Party has demonstrated a callous disregard for sound fiscal policies and practices.

"The Democratic Party, while hiding behind the deceitful gimmick of a darkened White House, has increased deficit spending and squandered, at home and abroad, billions of hard-earned dollars taken from the American people.

"The Democratic Party has utterly disregarded the disastrous effects of the resulting inflation on people with fixed incomes, such as retirees, pensioners, social security beneficiaries, and those who have their savings invested in insurance.

"The Democratic Party has nominated for Vice President a key leader of the Americans for Democratic Action—the most influential socialist group in our Nation.

"The Democratic Party has encouraged, supported, and protected the Supreme Court in a reign of judicial tyranny, and in the Court's effort to wipe out local, self-government, effective law enforcement, internal security, the rights of the people and the States, and even the structure of the State governments."

Some people believe Mr. THURMOND's move may lead to a long predicted realinement of political parties, with conservative Democrats becoming Republicans and liberal Republicans switching to the Democratic Party, giving people a real choice between the parties as well as between candidates. It will be interesting to see.

But regardless of whether that happens, individuals who believe principles are important will salute STROM THURMOND as a courageous man of principle and convictions.

May his tribe increase.

EDITORIAL OPINION FROM WJMX–TRA, SEPT. 17, 1964

At this season an oft-quoted phrase is "There comes a time in the life of every man." Just such a moment of truth came to light yesterday as Senator STROM THURMOND announced his leaving of the Democratic Party and his advocacy of the Senator from Arizona for the Presidency of the United States. In making this move, STROM THURMOND has placed himself in the position of so many South Carolinians who have made the same move or who plan to make such a move. Many have the same feeling—that the Democratic Party today does not, in any way, represent the Democratic Party of our forefathers. There is nothing of the principles of Jefferson, of Jackson left, not even a shred—not an iota, evidenced by the National Democratic Party today. The principles which our grandfathers and great-grandfathers so valiantly supported and stanchly defended in the Democratic Party have long evaporated from the national party which now openly embraces the theories of socialism and it aimlessly wanders down the path—toward the inevitable financial ruin of this country. "Peace and prosperity" offers a wonderful slogan—one hard to improve upon—but when mathematics deny the prosperity to be real—and that "peace" means instead, "accommodation" to the atheistic principle of communism which today threatens every free land in the world, then "peace and prosperity" is a figment of imagination that isn't real, but a bait for votes. This is part of what Senator THURMOND declares that he can no longer support, in his speech of the transition, THURMOND said, "The future of freedom and constitutional government is at stake." And, "to my friends who have conscientiously advised me against this step, I can only say that I fully realize the political risk which may be involved in this step and that my chances for reelection might, because of this step, go down into oblivion." Senator THURMOND continues, "But in the final analysis, I can only follow the course which, in my heart and conscience, I believe to be the best course, I believe to be in the best interest of our State, our country and the freedom of our people. I have chosen this course because I cannot consider any risks in a cause which I am convinced is right." (Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, as he renounced the Democratic Party to join the Republican Party.)

These then are the words of a man of courage. True, in 1966 that this move might cost him his political office. We cannot believe that the people of South Carolina will be able to ignore this move on the part of Senator STROM THURMOND—and for those who scorn his action for what he believes to be right, surely there are thousands of South Carolinians who will salute this act which THURMOND believes to be in their interest and in the interest of our State of South Carolina. True, he conceivably could be divested of his title of Senator—but because of his action this title can never be taken away from him. "A man of deep conviction—mighty courage—with the interests of his people and his State uppermost in his heart and mind."

Thank you.

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press, Sept. 17, 1964]

COURAGE OF CONVICTION

We would have a better Congress and a better country if we had more men with the strength of conviction that Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, has shown.

It is not necessary or desirable that all men have the same convictions—but it is most laudatory when men reach honorable convictions and stand by them, regardless of personal cost.

STROM THURMOND became known nationally in 1948 when his conviction that the Constitution needed a champion led him to a presidential candidacy as a States' Rights Democrat.

A South Carolina Democrat with a record of distinction for many years, STROM THURMOND yesterday declared not only that he is for Senator BARRY GOLDWATER for President but also that he is changing to the Republican Party.

He could easily have supported Senator GOLDWATER and remained in his regular party, and there would have been nothing wrong with that. But he went all the way.

The kind of conviction shown by this great American is in sharp contrast with the opportunistic, Constitution-ignoring, hypocritical, wheeling-dealing, get-elected-at-any-cost leadership that now controls the once honored party that left Senator THURMOND and that Senator THURMOND has now left.

Senator THURMOND's example is a challenge to men of conviction everywhere, though their ideas and convictions may differ. Senator THURMOND has set an example of morality and courage that this Nation should applaud.

[From the Lafayette (Ind.) Leader, Sept. 24, 1964]

THE BIG SWITCH

One of the big stories of the past week was the switch of Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, from the Democratic to Republican Party. Senator THURMOND has had a long political career as a Democrat and is recognized as a wheelhorse in southern political circles.

Senator THURMOND is one of those southern Democrats who are unhappy with the leadership of their party at the national level. They have demonstrated their displeasure in many ways, but it takes a rugged type of courage for a man of THURMOND's standing to renounce his political affiliation and transfer his party allegiance to the minority party in his State.

The switch will mean that the Senator will lose his legislative seniority in Washington, and since Republicanism is a minority point of view in South Carolina, he will be handicapped accordingly at the polls.

Many and varied have been the opinions expressed at Senator THURMOND's unusual decision. He has been praised and criticized, admired, and castigated. Whatever else may be said of the Senator, he must be admired for his courage and forthrightness. He has probably sacrificed a brilliant political career for a principle—right or wrong.

Senator KEATING, of New York, is a different breed. He is supposed to be a Republican and running as such for reelection to the U.S. Senate. Yet, Senator KEATING will not support the GOP candidate for President because he does not approve of Senator GOLDWATER's views. In our opinion Senator KEATING is a political hypocrite. If he is affiliated with the Republican Party to the extent of holding a high national office through the efforts of the party's membership, then he owes the organization his full support, including support of its presidential candidate.

These two U.S. Senators hold different political viewpoints, and it is quite evident they are made of different stuff. In our opinion STROM THURMOND stands the tallest.

[From the Bluefield (W. Va.) Daily Telegraph, Sept. 19, 1964]

A COURAGEOUS STEP

The real personal and political courage required of Senator J. STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, in leaving the Democratic and joining the Republican Party will not be comprehended readily by many Americans unfamiliar with the seniority system in the U.S. Congress and the stern political code of the South.

THURMOND, who has been in the Senate since 1954, had built up 10 years of precious seniority on which all Senate privileges, most especially those of committee and subcommittee chairmanships, are based. In becoming a Republican, he loses every shred of these privileges unless the Senate Republican leadership should decide to give him seniority credit for his Democratic service. THUR-

MOND presumably has not asked for any such allowance, but quite possibly he will receive some such reward.

But even more important to THURMOND is the reaction of his constituents in South Carolina, where for nearly 100 years "Republican" has been a term of opprobrium roughly similar to "damyankee." Of course in recent years South Carolinians have been registering Republican opinions at the polls, but State candidates have continued to cling to the Democratic label.

THURMOND has put an end to this hypocrisy. He has recognized that the Democratic Party no longer has any connection with the conservative principles long favored in the South and he has joined the party which does represent these principles.

In so doing, THURMOND has courageously put into action the theory that in our two-party system we must have a clear choice between the conservative and the liberal-socialist approach. We do not have that choice now, because both parties still contain within themselves advocates of both theories.

This confusion could and should be eliminated, and it would be a fine and admirable development if other Southern conservatives would follow THURMOND's lead. At the same time the Republican Party can easily spare the likes of the Messrs. Rockefeller, JAVITS, KEATING, and others who continue to masquerade as Republicans while embracing virtually every Democratic attitude.

If such a massive exchange could be arranged, the whole political picture would be considerably simplified and voters would truly have a choice between two great national parties, each with a sharply differing approach to the problems of this Nation.

Republicans would have nothing to fear from such a confrontation, either. This is a conservative Nation, and President Johnson has recognized that fact by his insistence on clinging to the fiction that he too has conservative leanings. Of course he insists he is "liberal" too, but such political schizophrenia cannot really be tolerated.

The nomination of BARRY GOLDWATER as the Republican presidential nominee was a major step toward bringing the Republican Party back onto the true conservative path. The Democratic Party left that path long ago and its leadership is completely dedicated to the radical socialist approach.

Thoughtful Americans would do well to study the searing indictment of the Democratic Party as it now is constituted which was delivered by ex-member THURMOND. Major excerpts appear in David Lawrence's column on this page today. And those who are conservative Democrats should ponder the question of whether they, like THURMOND, have any business in registering an allegiance to that party.

[From the San Diego Union, Sept. 18, 1964]

NOT IN POLITICS BUT IN COURAGE—THURMOND SPEAKS AS PATRIOT

It was the moment of truth for Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, when he put a life of party affiliation behind him, and all the prerogatives of congressional seniority, and reregistered as a Republican.

He accused the leadership of the Democratic Party of abandoning constitutional government and taking the country down the road toward a Socialist dictatorship.

So respected is he in the U.S. Senate that he has been spared the usual personal political attacks. In their hearts—as Senator BARRY GOLDWATER himself has said of his own campaign—most of the Senators, on both sides of the political aisle, know that he is right.

But like Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, the Democratic candidate for Vice President, who has dampened his fiery liberalism, not because of a shift in convictions, but out of what he conceived as political necessity, many in Congress feel that the hour is not right for a national political realinement.

They prefer, for the time, to work within the party which has given them position and power.

But there comes a point of no return, when a political leader must at last balance the possibility of some political achievement against conscience.

Senator THURMOND reached that point. And America is the better for it.

He joined Senator GOLDWATER, not only in politics, but in courage. Before the Republican convention, and when his nomination was still a matter of question, Senator GOLDWATER went against the tide of sentiment and the leaders of his own party to vote against the civil rights bill on constitutional grounds.

Here was no surrender to expediency. Here, too, the country was richer by casting up into national life a man who placed his own principles and the Constitution above party and power.

There is a reluctance throughout the land to openly and frankly discuss the profound change that is taking place in American life.

There is a tendency to keep our attention concentrated on each specific issue of Government service and not on their cumulative effect. The war is ignored while we watch the little battles of the fringe of fateful change.

Deeply moved, as a man must be to leave his own party behind him, Senator THURMOND said that it has repudiated the Constitution of the United States, and "has forsaken the people to become a party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big business men looking for Government contracts and favors."

He believes that unless Senator GOLDWATER is elected Americans will "face regulation, control, coercion, intimidation, and subservience to a power elite who shall rule from Washington."

The Democrats want the election to turn on how much more they can do for the people—with their own money, of course.

The Senator Goldwaters and the Senator Thurmonds want to debate the future of America—and the cause of freedom. But the administration has a hundred billion dollars at its disposal—and a cynical willingness to promise everything for everybody.

[From the Augusta Herald, Sept. 18, 1964]

A MAN OF INTEGRITY ACTS

Senator STROM THURMOND'S renunciation of the Democratic Party for Goldwater republicanism may prove to be one of the most significant developments of the current presidential campaign.

This possibility lies not so much in the physical fact of THURMOND's having switched allegiances as it does in pointing up the divisive struggle now splitting the Democratic ranks.

After all, Senator THURMOND has been seen for years as, at best, a maverick Democrat. And though having led a splinter party effort in 1948, until now he has stopped short of actually bolting the Democratic camp.

The emergence of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER as the GOP presidential candidate and party head obviously provided the necessary final impetus. In the light of Senator THURMOND's well-known views, it hardly needs arguing that his realinement with the conservative Republicans was a logical move.

More important are the reasons the South Carolina gamecock gave for his belated breach.

The text of his renunciation address, which was reminiscent of the Declaration of Independence, was one of the most articulate and damning indictments of the Democratic Party we have seen.

He made quite clear who he deems to be the deserter, saying that "the Democratic Party has abandoned the people." Adding that it would amount to dereliction of his duty to remain silent, he asserted flatly that the Democratic Party "is leading the evolution of our Nation (toward) a socialistic dictatorship."

He also left no doubt that he sees the candidacy of Senator GOLDWATER as perhaps the last chance for the American people to retain freedom and constitutional government.

He began his departure address by echoing the classic warning that "for evil to triumph, it is only necessary that good men do nothing." Despite the obvious political hazards of his action, he stated with ominous brevity:

"For me, there is no alternative."

There will be those who will deprecate and ridicule Senator THURMOND's decision and who will seek to exact of him a dear price for having listened to his conscience rather than to opportunity.

But from where we sit, win, lose or draw, Senator STROM THURMOND is a credit to South Carolina and the Nation. Most of all, he is a man of rare integrity.

[From the Roanoke World-News, Sept. 18, 1964]

AND NOW IT IS SENATOR THURMOND, REPUBLICAN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

What the Republican Party could not accomplish in South Carolina, Senator STROM THURMOND accomplished by a single decision Senator THURMOND, a lifelong Democrat, has embraced what he terms the "Goldwater Republican Party." Thus he gives his State a Republican Senator.

The Senator could have announced his support of Senator GOLDWATER for President without leaving his party but he chose to go all the way. Even those of opposite political conviction must admire Senator THURMOND for his forthrightness.

There does not seem to be much question about Senator GOLDWATER's strong support in the South. The Thurmond defection from the Democrats—secession might be a better description—is the most dramatic evidence of Goldwater strength in the States of the Old Confederacy.

This is not Senator THURMOND's first break with the national Democratic Party. It will be recalled that in 1948, when Harry Truman was elected President, THURMOND was the presidential nominee of the States Rights Democrats, carrying Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina for a total of 39 electoral votes. But this is the first time Senator THURMOND has broken completely with his party.

It is said that the South Carolina political situation played a part in his decision, that the Democratic Party there has become too moderate to suit him. Governor Russell has permitted desegregation to proceed peacefully in South Carolina. Senator THURMOND and his colleague from South Carolina, Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, both voted against the civil rights bill but the latter was among those seconding the vice-presidential nomination of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, who helped guide the civil rights act to passage. In addition, there is the possibility South Carolina may go Republican in November.

But we prefer to believe that Senator THURMOND acted on the basis of strong conviction. He is convinced, as are many other southerners, that the Democratic Party has "repudiated the Constitution of the United States," that it "is leading the evolution of our Nation to a socialistic dictatorship," and that it has "become the party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big businessmen looking for Government contracts and favors."

Strong words, those. But there were others. The party, he charged, has disregarded sound fiscal policies and practices and has "encouraged, supported, and protected the Supreme Court in a reign of judicial tyranny." A special barb was reserved for the Humphrey nomination. The Senator pointed out that the vice-presidential nominee is "a key leader of the Americans for Democratic Action—the most influential Socialist group in our Nation."

So Senator THURMOND turns his back, forever, we presume, on the Democratic Party. His action required a great deal of courage. It contrasts sharply with those Democrats of similar bent who prefer to maintain "golden silence" in presidential election campaigns.

[From the Greenville News, Sept. 17, 1964]

STROM THURMOND TAKES HIS STAND

With characteristic forthrightness and courage, Senator STROM THURMOND last night laid his political future on the line in a gesture equally as dramatic as his write-in election to the U.S. Senate as an independent Democrat in 1954.

In a short, hard-hitting address widely broadcast on television, Senator THURMOND denounced the Democratic Party's present leadership and policies in harsh terms. He unreservedly pledged himself to support the presidential candidacy of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER and the policies of the Republican Party as he believes they will be if the Arizonan is elected.

The Senator could hardly have stated his decision and his reasons more strongly.

They boil down to a firm conviction that election of the Johnson-Humphrey ticket in November will establish a line of White House succession that will lead to a socialistic state and the loss of individual freedom; and that the election of Goldwater-Miller ticket is the only hope of avoiding international and domestic disaster to the Nation.

Perhaps it should not have, but Senator THURMOND's action came as a surprise to many of his friends and supporters. Included were some who were in the forefront of the fight to help him get elected in his unprecedented campaign against the State Democratic executive committee's nominee after the death of the late Senator Burnet R. Maybank.

How many of these will follow him, especially in view of how far he has gone, is a matter for conjecture which only future events will settle. He himself stated that he was going against the advice of many friends and he acknowledged a calculated risk to his political future.

The element of surprise, and the cause of some disappointment to persons who have been close to him, is the fact that Senator THURMOND may be going so far as to lose at least part of what has been for the last decade his greatest strength—his position of independence.

While, nominally a Democrat, seated as such amid some dissent in 1954 and running in party primaries since, the Senator has not been in any sense of the term a "party liner." He has gone against the party, especially in certain policies and proposed legislation during the last 4 years, as often as he has gone with it, if not more often.

He has taken each policy and each issue as it arose and dealt with it in the light of his own beliefs and those of the basically conservative majority of his constituents. How he has voted in presidential elections is a matter he has kept to himself, just as have many others of his fellow citizens.

This independence has strengthened his hand in the Senate and in national politics generally more often than it has weakened it. It also has been the primary source of his strength among the voters of the State.

His refusal to wear a political label at the cost of sacrificing principle has appealed strongly to South Carolinians during a time of political flux and shifting of partisan lines.

If he is now donning the strict Republican label, after shunning any other all this time, it may diminish his appeal and influence. It may hamper or defeat the obvious purpose of his maneuver, an attempt to help carry South Carolina for GOLDWATER.

THURMOND did not quite make his intentions on this point clear in his speech. He stated that he had necessarily worked within the framework of the Democratic Party in the past, while maintaining "independence of judgment" in the best interests of South Carolina. "To do this in the future," he said, "I must work within the framework of the Goldwater Republican Party."

Stating that for him, there was no alternative, that freedom and constitutional government were at stake and that he was compelled to work for the election of Senator GOLDWATER, he said: "This also requires that I join him in his fight, successful as of now, to make the Republican Party a party which supports freedom, justice, and constitutional government."

This, of course, will be enough to cause the Johnson-Humphrey forces in the Senate to attempt to read him out of the Democratic Party and deprive him of his committee positions, a threat already rumored against Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi. But anything less than all-out support probably would lead to the same development, if the Democratic ticket wins in November.

At this stage, we can only evaluate Senator THURMOND's action as a gamble involving his own political future and to a large extent the interests of his constituents. Its outcome depends on the vagaries of the fortunes of political war. STROM THURMOND says he has "chosen this course because I cannot consider any risks in a cause which I am convinced is right."

One can only admire a man who risks all for his convictions.

As for us, what a Senator stands for and does on the floor of the U.S. Senate and in its committees still transcends in importance any political label he may wear or personal loyalties he may hold.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Sept. 17, 1964]

SENATOR THURMOND'S DECISION

For STROM THURMOND to have supported the program and nominees of the National Democratic Party of 1964 would have required a reversal of principles of which he is incapable.

For the Senator to have stood by in silent, inactive, and politic tolerance of that party's course would have been an insufferable contradiction of the position he has uniformly held.

And it would have violated the very text of his statement of Wednesday: "For evil to triumph, it is only necessary that good men do nothing."

Senator THURMOND, being no hypocrite and being innately a man of action and strong convictions, found it impossible to adapt, to change, to present a false face—or even to stand by passively and impotently in the face of what he construes to be procedures of "evil."

His votes and pronouncements since going to the U.S. Senate, and even before, have been in strict conformity to his principles of government. He is not the accommodationist, the bender to prevailing party policy, the coattail swinger.

This being his nature and record, and the circumstances of the moment being precisely as he has stated them, he had no choice but to associate himself with what he has called the Goldwater Republican Party.

Clearly, the Senator arrived studiously at that designation. The party of today is not the party of the neo-Republicanism of the 1950's, or of those latter-day successors to that dilution of the erstwhile conservatism; it is the party, for the time being at least, conforming largely to the philosophy of STROM THURMOND.

In alining himself with the Republican Party of today, Mr. THURMOND joins with many of his fellow South Carolinians who have done likewise in their protestations of what they conceive to be Democratic error. But as a highly placed elected public officer, he carries the force of leadership which only such an official can bring to such a situation. There is that important and effective distinction between him and the private citizen similarly actuated and acting.

Senator THURMOND has really done nothing more than occupy a new house at the same location, that location being the firm ground where his fundamental precepts have always rested.

Yet the act of occupancy is historymaking and a reflection of unbroken consistency.

[From the Daily Press, Newport News, Va., Sept. 18, 1964]

A MAN OF RARE CONVICTIONS

For the first time in 16 years, a major political figure of the United States has rejected the practical application of his party's principles and has switched his personal allegiance to the opposition.

The action of Senator STROM THURMOND in withdrawing from the Democratic Party in favor of Republican principles calls to mind a similar situation in 1948 when Senator WAYNE MORSE, a liberal Republican, forsook his ties with the GOP after candidate Eisenhower adopted some of the conservative views of Senator Robert Taft. MORSE formally accepted the tenets of the liberal wing of the Democratic Party. There are other older examples of course.

The severance of Senator THURMOND follows by 16 years his acceptance of the candidacy of the States Rights Democratic splinter group for the Presidency, and his leadership of the conservative wing in 1948 resulted in support of more than a million people who respected his personal feelings that there was no choice between the candidates Truman and Dewey.

As Senator THURMOND becomes the lowest Republican in the Senate in terms of seniority, he is discarding for the moment two decades of political effort in his own behalf, yet his action, which is the logical follow-on to his candidacy in 1948, may see him emerge as the catalyst for something the American body politic has been trying to synthesize ever since World War II; the development of a realistic, two-party system polarized toward conservative and liberal elements. For 16 years Senator THURMOND moved within the limits of his own party to achieve his goals, and withal saw the National Democratic Party move further and further toward the left. Now it has passed him by, and as befits a man of rare and honest conviction, he has moved out from under its banner to develop as best he can the conservative doctrines espoused by the Goldwater group within the GOP. He put it this way:

"The Democratic Party has abandoned the people. It has turned its back on the spiritual values and political principles which have brought us the blessings of freedom under God and a bountiful prosperity. It has breached the trust reposed in it by the people. It has repudiated the Constitution of the United States. It is leading the evolution of our Nation to a socialistic dictatorship."

Lest many wonder why other stanch conservatives do not and have not made a similar decision, we would note that men such as BYRD and ROBERTSON have far more responsibilities in the Senate, and are in a far better position than Senator THURMOND to exercise their conservative judgment on matters pending before the Senate; Representa-

tive HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia's Eighth, holds similar responsibilities in the House.

Editor James Jackson Kilpatrick, of the Richmond News Leader, found that Woodrow Wilson had once been inclined to explain Mr. THURMOND'S action in comfortable words:

"The man who adheres to any party after it has ceased to avow the principles which to him are dear—the man who follows the leading of a party which seems to him to be going wrong—is acting a lie and has lost either his wit or his virtue."

History may record this decision by Senator THURMOND as the beginning of a new and realistic alinement of political philosophies.

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald, Sept. 17, 1964]

THURMOND'S DECISION THOROUGHLY IN TUNE

STROM THURMOND'S momentous decision to go over to the Republican Party is thoroughly in tune with his reputation of political independence and courage.

The Senator is the personification of political transition in the South, more specifically in South Carolina.

This State has traveled from unwavering party-label loyalty, through temporary defections and general independence, to a presently blossoming two-party movement.

Undoubtedly, THURMOND'S action—whatever its effect on him personally—will impel the Republican Party forward by a number of years. And this is a force that has been gaining dynamically in South Carolina already.

His forceful statement of Wednesday night might very well bring a chain reaction—perhaps right down to the local level. An untold number of elected South Carolinians are not comfortable within the ranks of the National Democratic Party.

They have been the captives of political transition, not having approached the point of decision. That point has now come to them.

STROM THURMOND'S choice has to be out of the deepest kind of personal conviction. He is laying his political future flat on the line—at a time when it was generally considered he was stronger in following than he had ever been.

The Senator has not shrunk from political danger when his principles were put to the test.

In 1940, he took the mantle of States rights leadership—after HUBERT HUMPHREY ("move out of the shadow of States rights into the sunshine of civil rights") had inspired the Democratic National Convention to repudiate the southern position in the party. Not many elected leaders, in this State or any other, were as willing to jeopardize their roles in party affairs for the cause of States rights.

Then in 1954, STROM THURMOND went against the massed power of South Carolina Democrats by refusing to accept the hierarchy's will that Edgar Brown was to be U.S. Senator to succeed the dead Burnet Maybank.

THURMOND took his plea to the people and became the only Member of Congress ever elected on a write-in ballot.

In 1957, southern Senators wished to compromise on the civil rights bill then proposed. THURMOND dissented and put on a one-man filibuster that set a new record. A few weeks later Little Rock erupted and the South Carolinian stood as a lone and eloquent example of forewarning.

In the events of the future there may be argument about whether STROM THURMOND'S place in South Carolina is more the result of the political tide, or the wave itself the product of his influence.

But of one thing there cannot be the slightest doubt: His example of personal independence and political courage has inspired a tremendous change in the complexion of South Carolina politics and public affairs.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 17, 1964]

ACT OF COURAGE

Senator STROM THURMOND of South Carolina left the Democratic Party yesterday in order to do everything within his power "to help BARRY GOLDWATER return our Nation to constitutional government through his election to the Presidency." Senator THURMOND'S address announcing his decision is printed in its entirety in our news pages. It is a striking, powerful, and truthful account of what has happened to the Democratic Party and is happening to the once-free Federal Republic. We urge every American to read the Senator's words and reflect on them with the greatest gravity.

Senator THURMOND has eloquently stated the difference between the party of Lyndon Johnson and the "power elite" which supports him and the devotion of BARRY GOLDWATER to constitutional government. Under the Democratic Party as it has evolved, the Senator says that "freedom as we have known it in this country is doomed." With GOLDWATER, the people themselves would "hold the reins of government and rule themselves."

Senator THURMOND has engaged in an act of great courage. He has put his own political career on the line. He will be damned as a segregationist, a right wing extremist, and every other epithet handy to the "liberals." But read what he says. You won't forget it.

[From the Danville (Va.) Register, Sept. 17, 1964]

THURMOND SWAPS PARTIES

It must be said that in changing from his affiliation with the Democratic Party to his affiliation with the Republican Party, Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, has not changed at all in his political, social, and economic viewpoints. He has been with Senator GOLDWATER most of the time and against Senator HUMPHREY nearly all the time.

THURMOND'S decision, even so, surely was not an easy one. He has cut many ties and he may have signaled the early end of a career of service to the people of South Carolina and to conservatives in all parts of the land.

By giving up his Democratic status, Senator THURMOND loses all his seniority on the Commerce Committee, where he stood fourth, and the Armed Services Committee, where he stood seventh on the Democratic side. He must now start at the bottom on the Republican side of new committee assignments, having seniority only over any Republicans who may be elected for the first time in November.

The hard choice made by THURMOND is one which has faced and still faces some Republicans and some other Democrats in both the Senate and in the House. Among Republicans who might be expected to jump the political fence at the least prodding, would be both Senators from New York and Senator KUCHEL, of California, the acting GOP leader. This trio is mighty unhappy with conservatives in the Republican ranks and the coming to their camp of Senator THURMOND will not cause any one of them to leap with joy or to shout any hosannas. Other southern Democrats are as unhappy with the trend of the national party captured by the ADA ultraliberals and the Negroes but find that they can best combat these influences while remaining within the framework of the party. Like Senator THURMOND has done, they vote their own convictions, usually, rather than follow the commands from the national party spokesmen.

Only current Member of Congress who has made the party swap is Senator MORSE, of Oregon, who grew so displeased with moderate Republicans that he quit Eisenhower to support Stevenson, and was reelected to the Senate as a Democrat.

The problem for Senator THURMOND will not be what happens in Washington so much as what happens in South Carolina this year and 2 years hence. He won his seat first by a remarkable write-in campaign. Whether he can win as a Republican has not yet been answered. The risk he has taken is not inconsiderable.

[From the Savannah Evening Press, Sept. 17, 1964]

STROM THURMOND'S DEED

Senator STROM THURMOND'S harsh repudiation of the national Democratic Party comes as no real surprise. The 61-year-old South Carolinian has cooled to the route his party has taken on numerous occasions in the past.

Probably the most reasoned comment on Senator THURMOND'S change of political affiliation comes from Democratic National Committeeman Joe Peeler in Tennessee. The party leader says that "every American is entitled to express his political beliefs every 4 years and Senator THURMOND should not be relegated to a second-class citizenship. He has the same right as every other citizen."

The average voter can switch his party loyalty from election to election with little or no ill effect. The position of the duly elected officeholder is another matter, however. He must weigh the effect that his action will have on his constituency as well as his personal standing as an individual.

Any elected representative would be derelict if he did not conscientiously strive to reflect the will and moods of a majority of those who elect him to office. Apparently, Senator THURMOND has concluded that further association with the Democratic Party would not be in keeping with the spirit of those who sent him to Washington.

There is more at stake than just a campaign endorsement for the candidacy of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. The matter of changing party principles and party direction obviously were big factors in Senator THURMOND'S decision.

In the matter of personal integrity and courage, the South Carolinian has earned a rating in profiles of courage in the same fashion as did the Senator from Arizona. It takes a surplus of guts to stand up and be counted when the stakes are high. Both of these Senators, now both Republicans, are to be commended for this admirable trait.

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, Sept. 18, 1964]

THURMOND'S PARTY SWITCH A RARE ACT OF COURAGE IN POLITICAL JUNGLE

(By Jack W. Gore)

Even though many of our professional politicians will tend to characterize Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, as a "traitor," his decision this week to leave the Democratic ranks and become a Republican is one that took a high degree of intestinal fortitude and unusual political courage.

There are many Democrats, particularly in the South, who share Senator THURMOND'S sentiments about the manner in which their party has been taken over by elements completely contemptuous of the traditional principles of Jeffersonian democracy.

But how many of these Democrats are willing to give up what Senator THURMOND gave up this week to avoid sacrificing their principles on the altar of political expediency?

There are not many, to be sure. While there are any number who believe just as strongly as Senator THURMOND that under the present leadership of the Democratic Party the Nation is being taken for a fast ride down the road that leads to a socialistic government, only Senator THURMOND has risked his own political future for what he considers to be the best interests of the people he represents and the Nation as a whole.

Senator THURMOND could just as easily have done what any number of high-ranking southern Democrats are doing today, which is more or less confined to paying lipservice to the conservative policies they espouse while they protect their political positions and their access to the congressional pork barrel.

But Senator THURMOND did not choose to take this hypocritical course. He forthrightly switched his political affiliation, thereby giving up his seniority in the U.S. Senate.

His attitude and his forthright action contrast sharply with any number of his fellow Senators in both parties who sharply disagree with the policies adopted and the candidates nominated at the recent national conventions.

As an example consider the positions of Senators KUCHEL, KEATING, JAVITS, and SCOTT of the Republican Party. These men are all avowed liberals who have nothing whatsoever in common with Senator BARRY GOLDWATER and Representative WILLIAM MILLER, their party candidates in the November presidential election. To all intents and purposes these men are strongly opposed to Senator GOLDWATER and fear his leadership will wreck their party.

But if these men cannot go along with the direction their party has taken, why don't they do as Senator THURMOND has done and forthrightly join the Democrats where they will feel right at home with the liberal elements which have control of that party? If they had the courage to do this, they would not only be where they really belong, but they would greatly assist in bringing about the party realinement that is needed in this Nation if party labels are to really mean anything.

The same applies to many of our stanch southern Democrats who would certainly find it easier to give their full support to the conservative cause under a different banner than that which is being paraded by President Johnson and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY.

It has been recognized for quite a few years that today's party labels mean virtually nothing when our present parties are as sharply divided as they are today on conservative and liberal lines. It doesn't make sense that this jumbled situation should continue, but until the liberal and conservative factions in both parties display enough courage to put the political good of the Nation above their own desires to maintain their seniority and their access to the pork barrel, such a party realinement will be almost impossible to achieve.

In this connection we might say that from their past performances many Democratic members of this State's congressional delegation are in a position almost as difficult as that which Senator THURMOND occupied in relation to giving his support and allegiance to the Johnson-Humphrey ticket.

Yet, it should be noted, all of these Democrats have indicated their support of the party ticket even though it means subjugating some of their own principles and beliefs to what they apparently consider to be the more important cause of party unity.

These Congressmen may well feel it is to their own interests and to the best interests of this State that they not jeopardize either their positions of influence or their present ability to secure Federal funds and projects for Florida by refusing to endorse the party ticket.

But when Senator STROM THURMOND declared he was leaving the Democratic Party because he felt it "has forsaken the people to become a party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big businessmen looking for Government contracts and favors," he spoke a truth which is becoming exceedingly difficult for many southern Congressmen to swallow under the guise of maintaining party unity.

Senator THURMOND couldn't swallow his distaste for where the Democratic leaders are taking the country any longer so he left the Democratic Party this week and joined the Goldwater team. His decision may be open to debate, but the integrity behind it cannot be questioned as he displayed the rare type of political courage this country needs if principles are to mean anything in the political jungle that exists today.

[From the Lebanon Daily News, Sept. 21, 1964]

STROM THURMOND, PATRIOT

The fact that Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, has changed his party affiliation from Democrat to Republican is a heartwarming example of a man who places country above party and himself.

In taking this action, Senator THURMOND tossed out all his seniority rights which he laboriously built over many years in the U.S. Senate and gave up his important committee assignments.

What Senator THURMOND has done is typical of the man. He is a great patriot. His voice has spoken out boldly time after time against the ever-quickening trend toward a centralizing of all power in Washington. Senator THURMOND is a major general in the U.S. Army Reserves. As such, he led the fight to expose the censorship imposed on the leaders of the U.S. Armed Forces and the no-win policy of the present administration.

Unfortunately a great many Americans lulled to sleep by the present material prosperity and uneducated of the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution do not understand the dangers that are threatening them, but which Senator THURMOND sees so clearly.

The Republican minority in the Senate has gained a great recruit. It has to be hoped that the Republicans appreciate what they have gained by Senator THURMOND'S enlistment.

It is a great and wonderful thing that the United States still possesses leaders who will sacrifice their own careers, if necessary, for the good of the Nation and the safety of all of us.

[From the Atlanta Times]

THURMOND NOW; WHO'S NEXT?

When men the caliber of Senator STROM THURMOND, of the great State of South Carolina, decide that the party of their choice is the Republican Party, and the candidate of their choice is Senator GOLDWATER—why, then, look out, Democrats.

The Republican Party today is the party of the people. Already sensing this are the people themselves. It's been coming for years. Now it's here.

Senator THURMOND is the first. There will be others over the months and years ahead. No matter what the consequences in seniority or power in Congress, praise be there still are men who are willing to stand up and vote their convictions, and change parties if necessary.

We have faced the danger of one-party government in this country. It is fitting that Senator THURMOND places his interest in the welfare of the Nation above blind allegiance to party.

For it was on September 19, 1796, that Goerge Washington in his Farewell Address warned against blind allegiance to party or parties, declaring that they are likely "in the course of time and things, to become potent engines by which cunning and ambitious and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government.

"Let me," said George Washington, "warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally. This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its roots in the strongest passion of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular forms it is seen in its greatest rankness and is truly their worst enemy.

"The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of public liberty."

If George Washington were here today, he would applaud Senator THURMOND and cast a stern eye upon those who seek to elevate themselves upon the ruins of public liberty.

[From the Baptist Bible Tribune, Oct. 2, 1964]

JAMES STROM THURMOND: A MAN OF PRINCIPLE

(By Noel Smith)

Senator JAMES STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, has transferred his political allegiance from the Democratic to the Republican Party. He announced the transfer in a speech to the people of South Carolina on a television broadcast in Columbia. I have read the complete text. The prose is lean, serious, and penetrating. It is a powerful political document. It will be read, studied, and appreciated by serious students of men and government when the hypocritical, artificial federaleze utterances from the characterless lips of manufactured political images are part of the lifeless mass of the political dumpheap.

The supreme consideration of Senator THURMOND'S action is not whether the preponderance of political morality and wisdom is with the Democrats or Republicans. The supreme consideration is that here in this babel of smiling mercenaries, there has emerged a man of principle; a man who chooses the pulse and water of enlightened, responsible statesmanship above the meat and wine of Washington flunkeyism; a man who believes that a U.S. Senator has no moral or constitutional right to sacrifice the souls and bodies of future American generations to the pagan bellies of today, a man whose spiritual concepts are not degraded by the lust for money and power.

Senator THURMOND is 61 years old. Son of an Edgefield, S.C., lawyer, he was graduated from Clemson College in 1923. He served as an agriculture teacher and, later, as school superintendent in the Edgefield area. He became a State senator. At 39, Senator THURMOND was on the bench of the South Carolina Circuit Court.

Eighteen years before the Pearl Harbor attack, Senator THURMOND gained a commission in the Reserve officers' training at Clemson College. When the attack came, he resigned his judgeship and volunteered for military service.

On D-Day, Senator THURMOND was in Normandy with the 82d Airborne Division. He came out of the war with 5 battle stars, 16 decorations, and with medals and awards, including the Purple Heart. He is now a major general in the Army Reserves.

Seantor THURMOND was Governor of South Carolina from 1947 to 1951. He discovered laws on the statute books that were not being enforced for obvious reasons. He en-

forced them. Government appointees no longer held but one office at a time. Horse racing stopped. The slot machines in American Legion clubs stopped operating.

When he was Governor, Senator THURMOND expanded the State's educational system. He placed Negro schoolteachers on an equal pay scale.

He led a successful movement to abolish the poll tax. He increased funds for public health and welfare. When he was Governor, Senator THURMOND ordered the arrest and murder trial of a white man charged with lynching a Negro. That was the first time in the history of the State that such a thing had been done.

While serving as Governor, Senator THURMOND was the presidential candidate of the States' Rights Democratic Party movement. He got 1,169,021 popular votes. He carried 4 States and got 39 electoral votes. A change of 27,000 votes in California and Ohio would have thrown the election into the House of Representatives.

In 1956, Senator THURMOND was elected to the Senate by a write-in vote. He is the only Senator in the history of the country to be so elected. Four years later, he gave the people of his State an opportunity to express their wishes in the regular way at the polls—a thing he was not legally bound to do. He was elected to a full 6-year term without opposition.

When Senator THURMOND became a Senator, he divorced himself of all business connections. The keyhole columnists, who despise him, have despaired of finding even a clue to a skeleton in Senator THURMOND's closet. He is one of the few Senators who lives off his salary.

In his television address to the people of his native State, Senator THURMOND gave a long list of reasons for his decision to leave the Democratic Party. Here is a part of what he said:

"It has been wisely said that 'for evil to triumph it is only necessary that good men do nothing.' Particularly is this true in time of crisis. Seldom before in the history of our Nation have we faced so great a crisis.

"The people of South Carolina have placed me in a position of trust in the National Government. From this position I have observed at close hand the conduct and factors which have brought about this crisis. I would, therefore, be most derelict in my duty were I at this time to remain silent.

"I have no choice but to speak openly, frankly, and fully to the people of South Carolina on the crisis that confronts us.

"The Democratic Party has abandoned the people. It has turned its back on the spiritual values and political principles which have brought us the blessings of freedom under God and a bountiful prosperity. It has breached the trust reposed in it by the people. It has repudiated the Constitution of the United States. It is leading the evolution of our Nation to a socialistic dictatorship.

"The Democratic Party has forsaken the people to become the party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big business men looking for Government contracts and favors.

"The Democratic Party has used the Government as a propaganda machine to distort the truth and deceive the public to the extent that a subcabinet official can publicly defend the administration's 'right to lie' and remain in office, unrebuked.

"The Democratic Party has invaded the private lives of people by using the powers of government for coercion and intimidation of individuals.

"The Democratic Party has rammed through Congress unconstitutional, impractical, unworkable, and oppressive legislation which invades inalienable personal and property rights of the individual.

"The Democratic Party has encouraged lawlessness, civil unrest, and mob actions.

"The Democratic Party has violated its trust by using the power of government to suppress information on scandals and corruption of its leaders in government and party offices."

His friends were concerned about the effect his decision would have on his political future. Immediately, he would forfeit the envied position of influence and power gained through his seniority on the Democratic side. There were many risks. It was a sobering reflection.

Here is what the Senator told them:

"To my friends who have conscientiously advised me against this step, because of a sincere belief that I could best serve the country by following a course designed to keep myself in office, I can only say that I fully realize the political risk involved in this step and that my chances for reelection might, because of this step, go down into oblivion. But in the final analysis, I can only follow the course which, in my heart and conscience, I believe to be in the best interest of our State, our country, and the freedom of our people.

"I have chosen this course because I cannot consider any risks in a cause which I am convinced is right."

"Come give us a taste of your quality," says William Shakespeare's immortal Hamlet.

Senator THURMOND has done it.

Senator THURMOND is a man of principle. Do you know what principle is? It comes from the Latin principium. It means beginning, foundation. It means the essential. It means the abiding, the permanent.

To say that a man is a man of principle, is to say that he takes the position that an automobile must operate by the application of mechanical principles, not by the emotionally lathered notions of fuzzy brained idealists. To say that a U.S. Senator is a Senator of principle, is to say that he believes that the Government of the United States, with all its traditional freedoms and liberty and recognition of personal dignity, is the effect of an adequate cause; and that that cause is the political principles and philosophy with which the Founding Fathers fashioned its foundation. A man of principle knows that the strength and endurance of no structure is out of proportion to the strength and endurance of its foundation. A man of principle refuses to sacrifice the shelter and security of tomorrow to an emotional spree today. A man of principle recognizes that the children of this country are a part of "the people." And he recognizes that when you are speaking of the "interests of the people," you cannot ignore the interests of the children. And in the midst of all the mad talk about "the people" having a right to do anything they wish to do, the man of principle contends that "the people" of voting age have neither the moral nor the constitutional right to ignore the rights of the children. The man of principle scorns the pagan theory that "the people" have the right to mortgage the souls and bodies of their children for generations to come. The man of principle denies that the American people have the right to have the attitude toward their children that the worshipers of Baal had toward theirs.

Being a man of principle, Senator THURMOND tells the people of his State in substance that he must think, and speak, and act in the interests of the foundational concepts of this Republic, not in the interests of his personal fortunes. He tells them that he must think, and speak, and act in the interests of future generations, not in his current and temporary interests as a U.S. Senator.

The truth is, the basic political views of Senator THURMOND are those that Lyndon B. Johnson has enunciated in the U.S. Senate. Take the civil rights bill which Mr. Johnson bulldozed through the Congress. On March 9, 1949, Mr. Johnson was bitterly opposing a much milder "civil rights" bill than the one he pushed through the present Congress. Here is what he told the Senate:

"Such a law would necessitate a system of Federal police officers, such as we have never seen before. It would require the policing of every business institution, every transaction made between an employer and employee, and virtually every hour of an employer's and employee's association while at work. I can only hope sincerely that the Senate will never be called upon to entertain seriously any such proposal again."

Then what is the real difference between Lyndon Johnson and Senator THURMOND?

Lyndon Johnson's record proves that his position is a position, not of political character and principle, but of political expediency. Senator THURMOND's record shows that his position is not a position of political expediency, but of political character and principle. Lyndon Johnson's record proves that he may reverse himself on every principle he has enunciated whenever it is in the interests of his power and money to do it. Senator THURMOND's record shows that power, money, and public recognition are not the stuff from which his political character and principles are fashioned.

And with which of these two positions can the blood and treasure of this country be trusted? Don't the Walter Reuthers know that if a Lyndon Johnson will advocate what is expedient for him to advocate that the time will come (and is coming) in this country when it will be expedient to advocate a Hitler government; and don't these proud and arrogant "liberals" know that the very first classes to become serfs under a dictatorship are the intellectuals and the people of the labor unions?

When Lyndon Johnson was violently opposing a comparatively mild "civil rights" bill in the U.S. Senate, JAMES STROM THURMOND, as Governor of South Carolina, was seeing to it that Negro schoolteachers equally qualified with white teachers, received the same rate of pay as white teachers.

You can trust a STROM THURMOND. You can't trust a Lyndon Johnson. You know what a STROM THURMOND will do in given circumstances 20 years from now. You don't know today what a Lyndon Johnson will do tomorrow.

Lyndon Johnson knows that STROM THURMOND has got something that all the power that Johnson's callous lusts have acquired for him cannot coerce or intimidate. He knows that STROM THURMOND has got something that all the millions Johnson has amassed since he has been on the public payroll cannot buy. And nobody will envy what STROM THURMOND has got more than will Lyndon Johnson—on his deathbed.

Senator STROM THURMOND is a man of principle. The present Washington, D.C., political establishment will never forgive him for it—just as it will never forgive Theodore Roosevelt for saying that "the all-important factor in national greatness is national character."

[From the Lawrence (Mass.) Evening Eagle-Tribune, Sept. 22, 1964]

COURAGE OF HIS CONVICTIONS

The decision of Senator THURMOND, of South Carolina, to leave the Democratic Party and join the Republican Party under the leadership of Senator GOLDWATER was irresistibly logical.

THURMOND ran for the Presidency in 1948 as a States rights candidate and carried four Southern States. His position then was what it is now—in firm opposition to the trend of the American Government under successive Democratic administrations.

"The Democratic Party," he said in announcing his support of GOLDWATER, "has abandoned the people. It has repudiated the Constitution. It is leading the evolution of our Nation to a Socialist dictatorship."

His declaration recalled three pertinent utterances.

One was delivered by a radio personality who, in comment on the closer and more friendly relations between the United States and Russia said that the Communist Russians are becoming more capitalistic and the anti-Communist Americans are becoming more socialistic. Eventually, he concluded, both American and Russian ways of life will be modified until one cannot be distinguished from the other.

Another was uttered by the News-Free Press of Chattanooga, Tenn., on President Johnson's use of the "great society" as the theme of his campaign and as a successor to the themes of New Deal, Fair Deal, and New Frontier. But the great society, in short, said the News-Free Press is the welfare state: "It's socialization, huge taxation, governmental domination, power centralization, individual freedom deterioration. It's the reverse of things that made this Nation great—personal liberty and free enterprise. The great society is a nicer way of saying 'welfare state,' which is a nicer way of describing what could become a slavery state."

The third utterance was delivered by Gus Hall, spokesman of the Communist Party in the United States, in his call to leftwingers to support the Democratic ticket this year as the only means of preventing victory for GOLDWATER whom he described as the Fascist leader of "the most virulent and malignant organized force in our history."

Hall would join the left wing that he represents with the people who push the reforms that Democratic administrations have advanced for 30 years. These are the people, he declares, who because of their experiences will say, "Let's go one step further—a step to socialism."

THURMOND happens to be a man with the courage of his convictions. He could in good conscience not do other than he did. He set an example of courage to the uncounted Americans who share his convictions but have not yet developed the nerve to act in their light.

[From the Palestine (Tex.) Herald Press, Sept. 17, 1964]

TOWARD HIGH AIMS

Americans everywhere who believe in constitutional government should be grateful to Senator STROM THURMOND of South Carolina, a man who risks his personal future in order to stand up for political honesty and the traditions of this free Nation.

THURMOND's breakaway from the Democratic Party, and his endorsement of Republican BARRY GOLDWATER is more than a mere political caprice. For THURMOND himself the move may bring an end to his career in the Senate, for his State is still heavily Democratic. But to other unhappy Democratic conservatives in the Deep South, THURMOND offers leadership away from the cynicism of their recent past.

Without saying so, he points up the falseness of politicians who put expediency ahead of principle and who therefore provide a traitor's leadership to the people who support them. He also gives answer to southern politicians who, disagreeing with the Democratic Party, propose unpledged electors or other moves that merely beg the question. THURMOND therefore makes a stand, long needed, for character which has been lacking in American politics.

Not only Democrats, but Republicans as well, have forgotten principle in a great many cases and a great many areas. A southern conservative running as a Democrat, and pledging unswerving allegiance to whatever candidates and whatever policies the national Democratic Party may choose, has his counterpart in the Republican leftwinger. In the case of both, principles fall victim to political desires.

THURMOND's move, in standing up for principle, does honor to the Constitution of the United States, which he calls on all Americans to cherish. In his advocation of a two-party system in the Southern States, THURMOND may well have been inspired by Constitution Week, which begins today. The Constitution, he may have reflected, was written by honest men for people of honesty.

It would not have occurred to those writers of the Constitution, setting up a structure of government for a free people, that political opportunists some day would put their own ambitions ahead of the Nation itself, or that the American people ever would be gullible enough to accept such false prophets. The men who created a place for statesmanship to flourish, in a world that until then had known little but oppression, could hardly have foreseen the greeds and cynicisms of too many politicians of today, or the fears and the distrusts of today's average voter.

Whether or not any American happens to agree with the principles STROM THURMOND stands for, all should admire him for the fact that he stands up for those principles, even though he may sacrifice his own political future in the process. The same forthright courage by a few other national political leaders across the country—no matter what their particular political philosophies might be—could revive statesmanship and head this country again toward the high aims of its founders.

[From the Passaic (N.J.) Herald News, Sept. 18, 1964]

SENATOR THURMOND JOINS GOP

South Carolina's segregationist, Senator STROM THURMOND, who refuses to support President Johnson in the coming election, has set an example which others who feel they cannot support their party's presidential candidate could well follow. He has left the Democratic Party and announced that he will become a Republican to back Senator GOLDWATER's candidacy.

Senator THURMOND also bolted the Democratic Party back in 1948 when he was Dixiecrat candidate against Harry S. Truman, whom he said he could not support. In so doing, Senator THURMOND put principle above party, which is commendable, regardless of what his convictions are.

No man is bigger than the party to which he belongs and he owes to that party his loyalty. When he finds he can no longer remain loyal, the honorable thing to do is to quit the party and go elsewhere. Theodore Roosevelt did it in 1912, when he left the Republican Party to become a Progressive, and others have done it, too.

Senator THURMOND's forthright action is in sharp contrast to the position taken by some Republicans in high places, including Senator CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey, who have refused to endorse Senator GOLDWATER for President, yet remain in the party. Their right to dissent is not questioned. Their place in the party is.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 22, 1964]

THURMOND'S BOLT OF PARTY A PROTEST

(By Allen-Scott)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, is a man of sincerity and deep spiritual convictions. So it comes as no surprise that he is willing to take a position in politics which could mean risking his seat in the Senate when he comes up for reelection 2 years hence.

Mr. THURMOND—a former Governor of his State, a major general in the U.S. Army Reserves and a lifelong Democrat—has just announced that he is leaving the national Democratic Party to join the Republican Party and work for the election of BARRY GOLDWATER, the Republican presidential nominee.

Even those who disagree with Mr. THURMOND's point of view on public questions cannot but applaud his forthrightness. For he could, like many politicians, easily have maintained a passive attitude toward the Democratic presidential nominee and followed the same course as some of those Republicans who didn't like the Goldwater nomination but who haven't had the temerity to bolt their party and take a position in favor of the candidate of the opposite side, with whose viewpoint their thoughts on current policies more nearly coincide.

Senator THURMOND's televised address to the people of South Carolina announcing his position was not merely an endorsement of Senator GOLDWATER. His 1,500-word speech was an emphatic protest against the trend in the Democratic Party. He says:

"I have no choice but to speak openly, frankly, fully to the people of South Carolina on the crisis that confronts us.

"The Democratic Party has abandoned the people. It has turned its back on the spiritual values and political principles which have brought us the blessings of freedom under God and a bountiful prosperity. It has breached the trust reposed in it by the people. It has repudiated the Constitution of the United States. It is leading the evolution of our Nation to a socialistic dictatorship.

"The Democratic Party has forsaken the people to become the party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big businessmen looking for Government contracts and favors.

"The Democratic Party has encouraged lawlessness, civil unrest, and mob actions.

"The Democratic Party has violated its trust by using the power of Government to suppress information on scandals and corruption of its leaders in Government and party offices.

"The Democratic Party has succored and assisted our Communist enemies through trade and aid at the expense of the American people.

"The Democratic Party has established and pursued for our Government a no-win foreign policy of weakness, indecision, accommodation, and appeasement.

"The Democratic Party has demonstrated a callous disregard for sound fiscal policies and practices.

"The Democratic Party, while hiding behind the deceitful gimmick of a darkened White House, has increased deficit spending and squandered, at home and abroad, billions of hard-earned dollars taken from the American people.

"The Democratic Party has utterly disregarded the disastrous effects of the resulting inflation on people with fixed incomes, such as retirees, pensioners, social security beneficiaries, and those who have their savings invested in insurance.

"The Democratic Party has nominated for Vice President a key leader of the Americans for Democratic Action—the most influential Socialist group in our Nation.

"The Democratic Party has encouraged, supported, and protected the Supreme Court in a reign of judicial tyranny, and in the Court's effort to wipe out local self-government, effective law enforcement, internal security, the rights of the people and the States, and even the structure of the State governments."

The Senator praises Mr. GOLDWATER as a man who "believes in and abides by our Constitution," and says:

"I personally know him to be able and responsible. He is an honest man of courage

and conviction, who trusts the American people to hold the reins of government and rule themselves."

Mr. THURMOND pledges himself to work within the framework of what he terms the "Goldwater Republican Party" and says that for him "there is no alternative." He declares that some of his friends have conscientiously advised him against this action, and that he fully realizes "the political risk involved in this step and that my chances for reelection might, because of this step, go down into oblivion."

But STROM THURMOND has concluded that he can follow only the course which in his heart and conscience he believes to be in the best interests of "our State, our country, and the freedom of our people."

One thing seems clear today—both parties are undergoing an upheaval. It is too early to tell how much the "crossover" from one party to the other will be, but there can be no underestimating the fact that both parties are having difficulty holding all of their previous following in the light of the deep differences of opinion which divide their members and which the 1964 campaign has begun to symbolize.

[Editorial from the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co., Sept. 18, 1964]

CHOOSING UP SIDES

Senator STROM THURMOND'S decision to switch his allegiance from the Democratic to the Republican Party has brought into clear focus the paradox facing many long-term Democrats and Republicans. Especially in this campaign, conservative Democrats and liberal Republicans are finding their party loyalty and their political conscience tested as never before.

This is not the first time that such a move has been made in the Senate. When Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, was running for his second term back in 1950, he switched from the Republican to the Democratic Party because he felt more at home there in his political philosophy.

Senator MORSE changed because he felt the Republicans were too conservative. Senator THURMOND has changed because he feels the Democrats are too liberal. Both take their politics seriously, and could tolerate living with a philosophy which was alien to them for only so long.

Today the historical spread of philosophy contained in both parties is being narrowed, and it can quite honestly be said that on a national basis the Democrats are now the liberal party and the Republicans the conservative.

With increasing frustration, the traditional southern conservatives have tried to maintain an allegiance to the Democratic Party that began with the years after the Civil War and was strengthened in Franklin D. Roosevelt's era. Senator THURMOND'S decision is a reflection of the soul searching which must be taking place throughout the Democratic South, just as soul searching is being done among liberal Republicans elsewhere.

While the conservative southern Democrat is tempted by Republicanism which more closely parallels his thinking, he knows that if sufficient numbers bolt the party, the congressional seniority which results in so many committee chairmanships would vanish, along with the patronage he now enjoys.

STROM THURMOND has been preaching for months now that we ought to do away with party labels. His message has been that there are no longer Republicans and Democrats, just conservatives and liberals, and that they should be recognized as such. His announcement of a change means that he is no longer willing to wait for the new labels. It is not a change of philosophy, but a recognition of existing philosophy that prompted him to put his political career at stake.

Senator THURMOND has been at odds with the Democrats before. In 1948, he was the Presidential candidate of the States Rights Party. Later he was elected Senator on an unusual write-in vote.

"STROM THURMOND, Republican, from South Carolina," has an unfamiliar ring in the ear. But at least it refers to a man who has the courage of his convictions.

[From the Shreveport Journal, Sept. 21, 1964]

REPUBLICAN THURMOND

Senator STROM THURMOND stunned the people of South Carolina and the South as a whole when he announced that he is switching from the Democratic Party to the Republican and is supporting Senator BARRY GOLDWATER for President.

THURMOND was selected by a write-in vote against the regular Democratic Party nominee in 1954, and reelected with minor opposition as an independent Democrat in 1960. A much-decorated World War II hero, he was Governor of South Carolina after the war and, in 1948, ran as a States Right candidate for President in protest to the nomination of Harry S. Truman.

GOLDWATER had repeatedly said THURMOND would be welcome in the Republican Party. Both opposed the administration on medical care for the aged, the nuclear test ban treaty and the antipoverty program. As major generals in the Reserve, both were critical of defense measures.

The effect on the two-party system in the South may be considerable. THURMOND received 39 electoral votes for President in 1948, winning the support of citizens in South Carolina, Louisiana, Alabama, and Mississippi. His example could lead to a wide switchover in this year when GOLDWATER sentiment in the South is high.

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 17, 1964]

THURMOND'S SWITCH TO GOP

(By David Lawrence)

Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, is a man of sincerity and deep spiritual convictions. So it comes as no surprise that he is willing to take a position in politics which could mean risking his seat in the Senate when he comes up for reelection 2 years hence.

Senator THURMOND—a former Governor of his State, a major general in the U.S. Army Reserves and a lifelong Democrat—has just announced that he is leaving the national Democratic Party to join the Republican Party and work for the election of BARRY GOLDWATER, the Republican presidential nominee.

Even those who disagree with Senator THURMOND'S point of view on public questions cannot but applaud his forthrightness. For he could, like many politicians, easily have maintained a passive attitude toward the Democratic presidential nominee and followed the same course as some of those Republicans who didn't like the Goldwater nomination but who haven't had the temerity to bolt their party and take a position in favor of the candidate of the opposite side, with whose viewpoint their thoughts on current policies more nearly coincide.

Senator THURMOND'S televised address to the people of South Carolina announcing his position was not merely an indorsement of Senator GOLDWATER. His 1,500-word speech was an emphatic protest against the trend in the Democratic Party. He says:

"I have no choice but to speak openly, frankly, and fully to the people of South Carolina on the crisis that confronts us.

"The Democratic Party has abandoned the people. It has turned its back on the spiritual values and political principles which have brought us the blessings of freedom under God and a bountiful prosperity. It has breached the trust reposed in it by the people. It has repudiated the Constitution of the United States. It is leading the evolution of our Nation to a socialistic dictatorship.

"The Democratic Party has forsaken the people to become the party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big businessmen looking for Government contracts and favors.

"The Democratic Party has encouraged lawlessness, civil unrest, and mob actions.

"The Democratic Party has violated its trust by using the power of Government to suppress information on scandals and corruption of its leaders in Government and party offices.

"The Democratic Party has succored and assisted our Communist enemies through trade and aid at the expense of the American people.

"The Democratic Party has established and pursued for our Government a no-win foreign policy of weakness, indecision, accommodation and appeasement.

"The Democratic Party has demonstrated a callous disregard for sound fiscal policies and practices.

"The Democratic Party has while hiding behind the deceitful gimmick of a darkened White House increased deficit spending and squandered, at home and abroad, billions of hard-earned dollars taken from the American people.

"The Democratic Party has utterly disregarded the disastrous effects of the resulting inflation on people with fixed incomes, such as retirees, pensioners, social security beneficiaries, and those who have their savings invested in insurance.

"The Democratic Party has nominated for Vice President a key leader of the Americans for Democratic Action—the most influential Socialist group in our Nation.

"The Democratic Party has encouraged, supported, and protected the Supreme Court in a reign of judicial tyranny and in the Court's effort to wipe out local self-government, effective law enforcement, internal security, the rights of the people and the States, and even the structure of the State governments."

The Senator praises Senator GOLDWATER as a man who "believes in and abides by our Constitution," and says:

"I personally know him to be able and responsible. He is an honest man of courage and conviction, who trusts the American people to hold the reins of government and rule themselves."

Senator THURMOND pledges himself to work within the framework of what he terms the "Goldwater Republican Party" and says that for him "there is no alternative." He declares that some of his friends have conscientiously advised him against this action, and that he fully realizes "the political risk involved in this step and that my chances for reelection might, because of this step, go down into oblivion."

But STROM THURMOND has concluded that he can follow only the course which in his heart and conscience he believes to be in the best interests of "our State, our country, and the freedom of our people."

One thing seems clear today—both parties are undergoing an upheaval. It is too early to tell how much the "crossover" from one party to the other will be, but there can be no underestimating the fact that both parties are having difficulty holding all of their previous following in the face of the deep differences of opinion which divide their members and which the 1964 campaign has begun to symbolize.

[From the Manchester Union Leader, Sept. 18, 1964]

STROM THURMOND, PATRIOT

The fact that 61-year-old Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, has changed his party affiliation from Democrat to Republican is not only political news but it is

a heartwarming example of a man who places country above party and himself. When a man, from his early manhood onward to his middle years, has been a member of the Democratic Party, when he has been Democratic Governor of his State and a Democratic U.S. Senator, considerable courage is needed to give up lifelong association with a political party and, when over 60, start again with another party.

Sometimes a Republican or a Democrat, disliking his party's choice for President, announces that he will not support a candidate. In some cases he also announces that he will support the candidate of the opposition party, but after the election you will generally find these political leaders safely back in their own party, enjoying the seniority they have earned over the years.

Not so with Senator THURMOND. He tossed out all his seniority rights which he has laboriously built up over many years in the U.S. Senate, and gave up his important committee assignments. Unless the Republicans see fit to recognize his years of service in the Senate, he will be in exactly the same position as a freshman Senator just elected, without the important committee assignments that give influence and power in the Senate.

What Senator THURMOND has done is typical of the man. He is a great patriot. His voice, more frequently than any other in the U.S. Senate, has spoken out boldly against the ever-quickening trend toward a dictatorship in the United States, centralizing all power in Washington. Senator THURMOND is a major-general in the Reserve Corps of the U.S. Army. As such, he led the fight to expose the censorship imposed on the military men in the United States and the no-win policy of the present administration.

Senator THURMOND made it very clear, in his ringing declaration by which he announced that he had joined the Republican Party, that there was no other choice than the one he made if we are to preserve freedom and the constitutional government in this country.

Unfortunately a great many Americans, lulled to sleep by the present material prosperity and uneducated from their school days regarding the value of the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution, do not understand the dangers that are threatening them but which Senator THURMOND sees so clearly.

The Republican minority in the Senate has gained a great recruit, one who is capable of leading them to victory. This newspaper very much hopes that the Republicans appreciate what they have gained by Senator THURMOND'S enlistment.

It is a great and wonderful thing that the United States still possesses leaders who will sacrifice their own careers, if necessary, for the good of the Nation and the safety of all of us.

[From the Wyoming State Tribune, Sept. 20, 1964]

I HAVE CHOSEN THIS COURSE

On the night of Wednesday, September 16, 1964, STROM THURMOND, 61 years old, a U.S. Senator from the State of South Carolina, announced: "For me, there is no alternative."

For him, there was no alternative but to renounce his long allegiance to the Democratic Party, and to espouse instead the cause of the Republicans, to seek and work for the election of BARRY GOLDWATER as President of the United States.

"The future of freedom and constitutional government is at stake," said Mr. THURMOND, thrice elected to the Senate from his native State under the aegis of the Democratic Party, "and this requires that I do everything in my power to help BARRY GOLDWATER return our Nation to constitutional government through his election to the Presidency.

"This also requires," said Mr. THURMOND, "that I join him in his fight, successful as of now, to make the Republican Party a party which supports freedom, justice, and constitutional government.

"It will be," said the Senator from South Carolina, a man who may, as he spoke, have recalled his long military service including the Normandy invasion with the 82d Airborne Division, "a long and hard struggle, with many battles to be fought.

"At this time," said Mr. THURMOND, "one objective takes precedence over all others—electing BARRY GOLDWATER President."

What anguish and self-probing involved STROM THURMOND'S decision to take this course is anybody's guess, but long associations are not quickly cast aside in the part of the country he comes from—nor are far-reaching decisions such as this arrived at lightly, with a mere wave of the hand.

Particularly in a case such as this where the individual concerned not only has been elected thrice to the Senate under the party's banner he now has cast aside, but also as part of a long political career beginning as a county superintendent of schools, county attorney, State senator, and Governor of his State.

For one should read STROM THURMOND'S record while at the same time hearing these words of his speech: "It has been wisely said that 'for evil to triumph, it is only necessary that good men do nothing.'

"Particularly," said he, "is this true in time of crisis. Seldom before in the history of our Nation have we faced so great a crisis."

What is this crisis that the Senator from South Carolina, the former county superintendent of schools, prosecutor, State senator, judge, Governor, soldier, major general in the Army Reserve—what crisis is he considering?

"The Democratic Party has abandoned the people.

"It has turned its back on the spiritual values and political principles which have brought us the blessings of freedom under God and a bountiful prosperity.

"It has breached the trust reposed in it by the people.

"It has repudiated the Constitution of the United States.

"It is leading the evolution of our Nation to a socialistic dictatorship."

Those are stern indictments. But there are others, from the schoolman-prosecutor-legislator-Governor-general, from South Carolina.

"The Democratic Party has forsaken the people to become the party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big businessmen looking for Government contracts and favors."

And on and on: Distorted the truth, allowed a subcabinet official to defend the administration's "right to lie" and remain in office unrebuked, invaded the private lives of individuals by employing coercion and intimidation; rammed through Congress unconstitutional and oppressive legislation; encouraged lawlessness, civil unrest and mob action; "violated its trust by using the power of Government to suppress information on scandals and corruption of its leaders in Government and party offices"; has succored our Communist enemies through trade and aid; has followed a policy of weakness, indecision, and accommodation in dealing with those same Communist enemies.

It has faltered twice at the threshold of victory over the Communist enemy; sent our youth into a war while refusing to call it a war, at the same time asking of this youth that it risk its lives without providing adequate equipment or the will to victory.

"The Democratic Party now worships at the throne of materialism." And so on.

There was one brief glimmer of soul-searching that took place here.

"To my friends" said STROM THURMOND, "who have conscientiously advised me against this step, because of a sincere belief that I could best serve the country by following a course designed to keep myself in office I can only say that I fully realize the political risk involved in this step and that my chances for reelection might, because of this step, go down into oblivion.

"But in the final analysis," said he, "I can only follow the course which, in my heart and conscience, I believe to be in the best interest of our State, our country and the freedom of our people.

"I have chosen this course," concluded the Senator from South Carolina, "because I cannot consider any risks in a cause which I am convinced is right."

THE SUPREME COURT IS DEFYING THE PEOPLE ON APPORTIONMENT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], recently wrote an article entitled "The Supreme Court Is Defying the People," which was published in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

This article is a factual and frank discussion of some of the problems confronting the Nation at the present time as a result of the Supreme Court decision.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SUPREME COURT IS DEFYING THE PEOPLE

(By Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN)

(NOTE.—A GOP leader sees legislative chaos and threat of judicial dictatorship in the High Court's rulings on how States must govern themselves.)

Have we reached the point where the preamble to the Constitution, which now reads "We, the people * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution," has been changed to read "We the Supreme Court do hereby decree a new form of government for the people of the United States"? Have we permitted the Court to constitute itself an authority supreme and contrary to the expressed will of the people?

There is a grave danger that we have. On June 15 of this year, six members of the U.S. Supreme Court took what may prove to be the longest step toward creating a judicial dictatorship in this country. They did it by decreeing that the legislatures established by the people in the States of Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, New York, and Virginia were null and void, and they dictated the form of legislative government which the people of these States must accept.

The Supreme Court proclaimed that it was acting to enhance democracy and to abolish inequities between the city dweller and his country cousin. Moreover, they have sold us this decision with the alluring slogan of "one man, one vote," a concept which is beautifully democratic in the abstract. But the States of the Nation are not governed abstractly. For 188 years they have been governed by a realistic system of legislative compromise, which recognizes the diverse interests of a diverse people. Now, suddenly, the Supreme Court says it is wrong.

The form of legislature the High Court declared null and void is in effect today in every State in the Union. It is the same form of representation which was adopted by the Thirteen Colonies when they threw off the yoke of the English kings. Basically, it is a legislature composed either of two houses, one house based upon population and another house based upon area, or of one house based

upon both population and area. The men and women of the Colonies fought, bled, and died for the right to establish State governments of their choice. This was the choice they made.

Then, a decade later, they met in constitutional convention in Philadelphia. There they forged the provisions of the Federal Constitution on the anvil of experience, hammering out the solutions to the problems of fair representation for all. Even at that time there were rural areas and populous areas, each with diverse and legitimate interests. It was only natural that the sparsely settled and less affluent States should fear the power of the rich and strong. After much debate, this truly vexing problem was solved by a historic compromise. Today we have the handiwork of that solution, the Congress, a legislative body of two Houses, one of which is based on population and the other upon State boundaries.

That was the will of the people in those times, and that has been the will of the people since, as new States have been added to our Union, each one embodying the same principle in its own State constitution. But that is not the will of six men on the Supreme Court. Let us look at how they have ordered the people of this country to refashion their State legislatures.

It all began 2 years ago in the case of *Baker* v. *Carr*, which came to the Supreme Court from Tennessee. For the first time, the Court held it had the final authority over the composition of the State legislatures. Now in the six cases recently decided, the Court used that newly assumed authority in an extraordinary way. The judges decreed that the 14th amendment, which was adopted in 1868, requires both houses of any State legislature to be apportioned on the basis of population alone. Moreover, it directed the lower Federal courts to put this new decree into practice through orders at the State level.

In Colorado, after the *Baker* v. *Carr* decision, the people of that State in 1962 had voted almost 2 to 1 to approve a plan to overhaul their legislature. Yet the Supreme Court refused to accept the plan approved by the people, and Colorado was given only 2 weeks to find a new solution. A specially called general assembly attempted to comply and adopted a new apportionment plan. Then the State Supreme Court of Colorado declared that plan to be unconstitutional. Today the citizens of Colorado do not know what they can do and—in view of all these facts—who can blame them?

In New York the supreme court not only ordered reapportionment but before it was through it had set new terms of office for members of the general assembly. The New York constitution provides for 2-year terms for its legislators, but it has been decreed that those elected this fall shall serve for only 1 year. Then there is to be a second election, and members are to be elected for another year. Then there is to be still a third election, when lawmakers are to be named to a regular term.

An even more appalling situation has been created in Oklahoma. There a three-judge Federal court has taken upon itself the role of reconstituting the State legislature. The court began by declaring invalid a portion of the State constitution and election laws. The State passed a new election law and proposed a constitutional amendment to remedy the defects. Then, in May of this year, the voters of Oklahoma approved the amendment to the State constitution and elected representatives under the new election law. Now the court has declared that amendment and election null and void and ordered new elections based on its own legislative formula—contrary to that approved by the people of Oklahoma.

I learned long ago that the people are the fountainhead of all power in this country. In Colorado and Oklahoma, as well as several other States, the people have acted decisively, but the Federal judges will not accept the result. They say that they represent some higher power to determine the form of our State governing bodies, which is a mistaken and dangerous notion.

Certainly in any representative government there exists a fundamental right in the people to determine how their legislatures shall be constituted. Yet according to the powerful dissenting opinion of Associate Justice John Marshall Harlan, the Supreme Court majority has now declared it to be unconstitutional for a State to give effective consideration to any of the following factors in establishing its legislative districts:

1. History;
2. "Economic or other sorts of group interests";
3. Geographical considerations;
4. Area;
5. A desire "to insure effective representation for sparsely settled areas";
6. "Availability of access of citizens to their representatives";
7. Theories of bicameralism (except those approved by the court);
8. Occupation;
9. "An attempt to balance urban and rural power";
10. The preference of a majority of voters in the State.

In this, the court would blindly disregard the facts of nature as well as the basic principles of representative government. A businessman in Garber, Okla., whose State legislator used to live in nearby Enid, may now have to travel to Oklahoma City to ask for the improvement of a bridge or complain about the condition of a road. A rancher or miner near Duncan, Ariz., could discover that his only representative lives in Tucson, a burgeoning electronics-and-space center with problems completely dissimilar to those at home. In my own home State, voters in sparsely settled southern Illinois may find they must go 150 miles to locate the nearest State legislator.

THE SUPREME COURT

It is a tragic misreading of the history and the temper of our Nation to say that such practical matters have no place in Government. No one appreciated this more than the present Chief Justice of the United States, when he was still the Governor of California. In 1948, commenting on the problem of representation, he stated that:

"The agricultural communities of California are far more important in the life of our State than the relationship their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I never have been in favor of restricting their representation in our State senate to a strictly population basis. It is the same reason that the Founding Fathers of our country gave balanced representation to the States of the Union, equal representation in one house and proportionate representation based upon population in the other."

That was sound doctrine then, and it is sound doctrine now. For the forces of our national life are not brought to bear on public questions solely in proportion to the weight of numbers. If they were, the 6 million citizens of the Chicago area would hold sway in the Illinois Legislature without consideration of the problems of their 4 million fellows who are scattered in 100 other counties. Under the Court's new decree, California could be dominated by Los Angeles and San Francisco; Michigan by Detroit; New York State by the five boroughs of New York City; and Pennsylvania by Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

Let us look at a specific application of the problem. It is a fundamental rule of government that "the power to tax is the power to destroy." The patriots of Boston recognized this when they rebelled against the ruinous taxes levied by George III. Consequently our forefathers safeguarded the exercise of the taxing power by providing that Congress would control the Federal purse. They provided that all revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives, where each Member must be elected every 2 years.

At the same time, the rights of each State, large or small, were protected by the requirement that such measures must also win approval in the U.S. Senate.

The Court now proposes to deny similar protection to many of the citizens of the States. In turning control of the State legislatures over to the cities, the Court is giving to the city bosses the power to tax and with it the power to destroy. For it is the city boss who often controls the nomination and election of representatives to the State legislature. The result can be foreseen. Just as all roads led to Rome 2,000 years ago, with tribute and tax revenues flowing to the Eternal City, so today we are confronted with a parallel as a result of the Court's decisions. In place of helmeted soldiers going forth from Rome to collect the tax and bring it to the emporer, we are now to be confronted with political minions surging forth from the controlling city machine to levy, collect and bring back the revenue to be used to perpetuate and further the grandeur and power of that machine.

The city machine will determine where the roads will be built, where the school funds will go, where the police protection will be provided, where the welfare funds will flow. All this and more will be determined and distributed by the city machine. Is this the representative type of government that the Court refers to? Is this really protection of the urban voters?

These are some of the problems which must have been in the mind of Governor Warren in 1948, but strangely they do not have the same impact for Chief Justice Warren. Nevertheless, the viewpoint which he expressed so well in earlier days is now on the lips of many thoughtful citizens. And they wonder what can be done to prevent the damage and disorganization which would inevitably flow from the Supreme Court's latest rulings.

The basic step we must take is a constitutional amendment to make certain that the people themselves, and not the Federal courts, have the final voice in the makeup of their own State legislatures. I have prepared such an amendment, and it has already been cosponsored by about one-quarter of the U.S. Senate. My proposal, which would be the 24th amendment to the Constitution, declares:

First, that the citizens of each State shall have exclusive power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof.

Second, that this power shall not be infringed or its exercise subject to review in any Federal court.

Third, that at least one house of each legislature must be apportioned on the basis of population as determined by the Federal census, or in the case of a unicameral legislature, that population shall be one of the determining factors of legislature apportionment.

DEBATE IS A LABORATORY

It might take at least 2 years for the adoption of this constitutional amendment. It would be proposed by Congress and must be ratified by three-quarters of the States. Such an amendment would demand careful consideration in every forum. There must be hearings and testimony. The language must be tested in the laboratory of debate.

Thus we have a second problem. We must have immediate action to prevent our State governments from being turned inside out

while we are engaged in the slow, thorough process of submitting a constitutional amendment.

Realizing this, I proposed a statute to stay the action of the Federal courts upon the request of a State or its people. A version of this proposal was approved by the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate by a vote of 10 to 2. In order to get action this year, before untold harm is done by judicial rulings, I attached the substance of this legislation to the foreign aid bill as an amendment. I chose that bill because it was the only one remaining on the "must list" to reach the desk of the President for signature before Congress can finally go home.

Some have criticized the choice of the foreign aid bill to carry this emergency amendment, but I believe it is altogether fitting and proper. One of the purposes of our vast aid program is to promote democratic government beyond our shores. My amendment seeks time to preserve it at home. The people of America themselves—not six judges of the Supreme Court—must be permitted to decide this momentous issue of State representation. If the foreign aid bill helps to win us that time, it will have redeemed, in this case, its own democratic promise—but in a manner that none of us could ever have predicted or foreseen.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to present a privileged matter.

I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3060) to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress—federally affected areas. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 1, 1964, pp. 23364–23369, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am most pleased——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wonder if the Senator would suggest the absence of a quorum? The Senate is still in the morning hour. I am sure Senators would like to hear my friend's discussion before the conference report is agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. It is satisfactory to me, but I say to the minority whip that I am bringing up the conference report at this time only because the majority leader requested me to bring it up now. I am, however, most willing to wait for the consummation of any morning business Senators may have, but I believe morning business is nearly concluded. I shall be glad to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, at the request of the minority whip, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am most pleased to present to the Senate the conference report on S. 3060, titles I through X of which extends, expands, and strengthens the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and title XI of which extends and amends Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, the Federal impact legislation.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed the report of the committee of conference together with the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

There being no objection, the report of the committee of conference, with the statement of the managers on the part of the House, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1916)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3060) to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas), having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'National Defense Education Act Amendments, 1964.'

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS OF TITLE I

"Amendment of statement of findings

"SEC. 101. The second sentence of the second paragraph of section 101 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology'.

"Schools of nursing

"SEC. 102. The second sentence of section 103(b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'private' and by striking out '(3),', and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and includes any school of nursing as defined in subsection (l) of this section'.

"Additional definitions

"SEC. 103. Section 103 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(l) The term "school of nursing" means a public or other nonprofit collegiate or associate degree school of nursing.

"'(m) The term "collegiate school of nursing" means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a college or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of nursing, or to an equivalent degree, or to a graduate degree in nursing.

"'(n) The term "associate degree school of nursing" means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a junior college, community college, college, or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited two-year program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to an associate degree in nursing or to an equivalent degree.

"'(o) The term "accredited" when applied to any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education.'

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS OF TITLE II

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 201. The first sentence of section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'and $135,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the next three fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received loans for school years ending prior to July 1, 1965, to continue or complete their education' and inserting in lieu thereof '$163,300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $179,300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $190,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $195,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and each of the next three fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received loans for school years ending prior to July 1, 1968, to continue or complete their education'.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 202. Section 202 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '1965' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1968'.

"Payment of Federal capital contributions

"SEC. 203. Effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1964, section 203 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is further amended by striking out subsection (b) and by striking out '(a)' after 'SEC. 203.'.

"Conditions of agreements

"SEC. 204. (a) Paragraph (4) of section 204 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"'(4) provide that in the selection of students to receive loans from such student loan fund special consideration shall be given to students with a superior academic background; and'.

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply to the selection of students under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 made in or after the second month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

"Terms of loans

"SEC. 205. (a) Subsection (a) of section 205 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The total of the loans for any academic year or its equivalent, as determined under regulations of the Commissioner, made by institutions of higher education from loan funds established pursuant to agreements under this title may not exceed $2,500 in the case of any graduate or professional student (as defined in regulations of the Commissioner), and may not exceed $1,000 in the case of any other student. The aggregate of the loans for all years from such funds may not exceed $10,000 in the case of any graduate or professional student (as so defined, and including any loans from such funds made to such person before he be-

came a graduate or professional student), or $5,000 in the case of any other student.'

"(b) (1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of such section 205 is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) such a loan shall be made only to a student who (A) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue a course of study at such institution, and (B) is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study, and (C) has been accepted for enrollment as a student in such institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing there either as an undergraduate, graduate, or professional student, and (D) is carrying at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution;'.

"(2) Paragraph (2) of such subsection (b) of such section 205 is amended by striking out 'and (D)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(D) the institution may provide that periodic installments need not be paid during any period or periods, aggregating not in excess of three years, during which the borrower is in part-time attendance at an institution of higher education taking courses which are creditable toward a degree, and may also provide that any such period shall not be included in determining the ten-year period during which the repayment must be completed, but interest shall continue to accrue during any such period, and (E)'.

"(3) Subparagraph (3) of such subsection (b) of such section 205 is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) not to exceed 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) shall be canceled for service as a full-time teacher in a public or other nonprofit elementary or secondary school in a State, in an institution of higher education, or in an elementary or secondary school overseas of the Armed Forces of the United States, at the rate of 10 per centum of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon, which was unpaid on the first day of such service for each complete academic year of such service;'.

"(4) Paragraph (4) of subsection (b) of such section 205 is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: 'in all cases except where the date on which repayment is to begin is suspended by reason of clause (D) of paragraph (2)'.

"(c) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply for purposes of determining the amount of any loans under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 for academic years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act. The amendments made by paragraphs (2) and (4) of subsection (b) shall apply to any loan (under an agreement under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958) outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act only with the consent of the institution which made the loan. The amendment made by paragraph (3) of subsection (b) shall apply with respect to service performed during academic years beginning after the enactment of this Act, whether the loan was made before or after such enactment.

"Distribution of assets from student loan funds

"SEC. 206. Section 206 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '1969' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1972'.

"TITLE III—AMENDMENTS OF TITLE III

"Extension of title

"SEC. 301. Title III of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking 'TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION' as it appears as the heading of that title, and inserting in lieu thereof:

"'TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING INSTRUCTION IN SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES, AND OTHER CRITICAL SUBJECTS'

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 302. Section 301 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"'Appropriations authorized

"'SEC. 301. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years, and $90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for (1) making payments to State educational agencies under this title for the acquisition of equipment and for minor remodeling, described in paragraph (1) of section 303(a), and (2) making loans authorized in section 305. There are also authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years, and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making payments to State educational agencies under this title to carry out the programs described in paragraph (5) of section 303(a).'

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 303. (a) The second sentence of subsection (a)(2) of section 302 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'as soon as possible after the enactment of this Act, and again between July 1 and August 31 of 1959' and inserting in lieu thereof 'between July 1 and August 31 of each even-numbered year beginning with calendar year 1964'.

"(b) The third sentence of such subsection is amended to read as follows: 'Each such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period July 1 next succeeding such promulgation, except that the ratios promulgated in 1959 shall be conclusive for each of the five fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1965.'

"(c) Effective with respect to allotments under subsection (b) of section 302 of such Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1964, the third sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out '$20,000' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$50,000'.

"State plans

"SEC. 304. (a) Clause (A) of section 303(a)(1) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows: '(A) acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment (other than supplies consumed in use), including audiovisual materials and equipment, and printed and published materials (other than textbooks), suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, history, civics, geography, modern foreign language, English, or reading in public elementary or secondary schools, or both, and of testgrading equipment for such schools and specialized equipment for audiovisual libraries serving such schools, and such equipment may, if there exists a critical need therefor in the judgment of local school authorities, be used when available and suitable in providing education in other subject matter, and'.

"(b) Paragraph (5) of section 303(a) is amended by striking out 'and modern foreign languages' and inserting in lieu thereof 'history, civics, geography, modern foreign languages, English, and reading'.

"Payments to States

"SEC. 305. The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 304 of such Act is amended by striking out 'five' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eight'.

"Interest rates

"SEC. 306. Paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of section 305 of such Act is amended by striking out 'as of the last day of the month' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'as computed at the end of the fiscal year next'.

"TITLE IV—FELLOWSHIPS

"SEC. 401. Effective July 1, 1964, section 402(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"'Number of fellowships

"'SEC. 402. (a) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the Commissioner is authorized to award not to exceed three thousand fellowships to be used for study in graduate programs at institutions of higher education, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, he is authorized to award not to exceed six thousand such fellowships, and during each of the two succeeding fiscal years, he is authorized to award not to exceed seven thousand five hundred such fellowships. Such fellowships may be awarded for such period of study as the Commissioner may determine, but not in excess of three academic years, except that where a fellowship holder pursues his studies as a regularly enrolled student at the institution during periods outside the regular sessions of the graduate program of the institution, a fellowship may be awarded for a period not in excess of three calendar years.'

"Award of fellowships and approval of institutions

"SEC. 402. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 403 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows: 'Of the total number of fellowships authorized by section 402(a) to be awarded during a fiscal year (1) not less than one thousand five hundred of such fellowships awarded during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and not less than one-third of such fellowships awarded during the three succeeding fiscal years shall be awarded to individuals accepted for study in graduate programs approved by the Commissioner under this section, and (2) the remainder shall be awarded on such bases as he may determine, subject to the provisions of subsection (c).' The second sentence of subsection (a) of such section is amended by striking out ', and' at the end of clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and by striking out clause (3) thereof.

"(b) Section 403(b) of such Act is amended by striking out 'under this title' an inserting in lieu thereof 'as described in clause (1) of subsection (a)', and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and the Commissioner shall give consideration to such objective in determining the number of fellowships awarded under this title for attendance at any one institution of higher education'.

"(c) Section 403 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(c) Recipients of fellowships under this title shall be persons who are interested in teaching, or continuing to teach, in institutions of higher education and are pursuing, or intend to pursue, a course of study leading to a degree of doctor of philosophy or an equivalent degree.

"'(d) No fellowship shall be awarded under this title for study at a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'school or department of divinity' means an institution, or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.'

"(d) The amendments made by this section shall become effective July 1, 1964.

"Fellowship stipends

"SEC. 403. Section 404(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended (1) by striking out 'after the baccalaureate degree,' and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Where a person awarded a fellowship under this title for study at an institution of higher education pursues his studies as a regularly enrolled student at such institution during periods outside of the regular sessions of the graduate program of the institution, the Commissioner may make appropriate adjustments in his stipends and allowances for dependents.'

"TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 501. Section 501 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'and $17,500,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the succeeding fiscal year,' and inserting in lieu thereof '$17,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $24,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $24,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $30,000,000 for each of the two succeeding fiscal years,'.

"State plans

"SEC. 502. Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 503(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 are amended to read as follows:

"'(1) a program for testing students in the public elementary and secondary schools of such State or in the public junior colleges and technical institutes of such State, and, if authorized by law, in other elementary and secondary schools and in other junior colleges and technical institutes in such State, to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program; and

"'(2) a program of guidance and counseling at the appropriate levels in the public elementary and secondary schools or public junior colleges and technical institutes of such State (A) to advise students of courses of study best suited to their ability, aptitudes, and skills, (B) to advise students in their decisions as to the type of educational program they should pursue, the vocation they should train for and enter, and the job opportunities in the various fields, and (C) to encourage students with outstanding aptitudes and ability to complete their secondary school education, take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions.'

"Payments to States

"SEC. 503. (a) Section 504(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'five' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eight'.

"(b) Section 504(b) of such Act is amended by striking out ', who are not below grade 7,', and by striking out 'six' and inserting in lieu thereof 'nine', and by inserting after 'schools' the first time it appears the following: ', or junior colleges or technical institutes,'.

"Junior colleges and technical institutes

"SEC. 504. Title V of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting after section 504 the following new section:

"'Definitions

"'SEC. 505. For the purposes of this title, the term "junior colleges or technical institutes" means (1) institutions of higher education which are organized and administered principally to provide a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree, and (2) institutions which meet the requirements of clauses (1), (2), (4), and (5) of section 103(b) and are organized and administered principally to provide a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge, and, if a branch of an institution of higher education offering four or more years of higher education, is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located.'

"Counseling and guidance training institutes

"SEC. 505. Section 511 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'Authorization

"'SEC. 511. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $6,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, $7,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the eight succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced study, including study in the use of new materials, to improve the qualification of individuals who are engaged, or are teachers preparing to engage, in counseling and guidance of students in elementary or in secondary schools or in institutions of higher education, including junior colleges and technical institutes as defined in section 505.

"'(b) Each individual who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of $75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of $15 per week for each such dependent.'

"TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

"Extension of title

"SEC. 601. (a) Section 601 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '1965' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1968'.

"(b) Section 603 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'Appropriations authorized

"'SEC. 603. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $13,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $14,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to carry out the provisions of this title.'

"Repealer

"SEC. 602. Effective July 1, 1964, title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out the center heading 'Part A—Centers and Research and Studies' and by striking out part B thereof.

"TITLE VII—UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

"Extension of program

"SEC. 701. Section 763 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'six succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'nine succeeding fiscal years'.

"TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS

"State administration

"SEC. 801. (a) Subparagraph (2) of section 1004(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting before the semicolon 'and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verifications of such reports'.

"(b) Subparagraph (3) of such section 1004(a) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof '(including such funds paid by the State to the local educational agencies)'.

"Extension of statistical services program

"SEC. 802. Section 1009(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'six' and inserting in lieu thereof 'nine'.

"TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL TITLE

"SEC. 901. (a) The National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"'TITLE XI—INSTITUTES

"'Authorization of institutes

"'SEC. 1101. There are authorized to be appropriated $32,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced study, including study in the use of new materials, to improve the qualification of individuals—

"'(1) who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training of teachers, of history, geography, modern foreign languages, reading, or English in elementary or secondary schools,

"'(2) who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching of disadvantaged youth and are, by virtue of their service or future service in elementary or secondary schools enrolling substantial numbers of culturally, economically, socially, and educationally handicapped youth, in need of specialized training; except that no institute may be established under this title for teachers of disadvantaged youth unless such institute will offer a specialized program of instruction designed to assist such teachers in coping with the unique and peculiar problems involved in the teaching of such youth,

"'(3) who are engaged as, or preparing to engage as, library personnel in the elementary or secondary schools, or as supervisors of such personnel, or

"'(4) who are engaged as, or are preparing to engage as, educational media specialists.

"'Stipends

"'SEC. 1102. Each individual who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this title shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of $75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of $15 per week for each such dependent.'

"TITLE X—AMENDMENTS OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

"SEC. 1001. The table of contents of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended—

"(1) by striking out

"'TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING INSTRUCTION IN SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES, AND OTHER CRITICAL SUBJECTS',

"(2) by inserting after

"'Sec. 504. Payments to States.'

the following:

"'Sec. 505. Definitions.';

"(3) by striking out

"'Part A—Centers and Research and Studies';

"(4) by striking out

" 'Part B—Language Institutes

" 'Sec. 611. Authorization.';

"(5) by inserting at the end thereof the following:

" 'TITLE XI—INSTITUTES

" 'Sec. 1101. Authorization of institutes.

" 'Sec. 1102. Stipends.'

"TITLE XI—FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

"Amendments to Public Law 815

"SEC. 1101. (a) The first sentence of section 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by striking out '1965' and inserting in lieu thereof '1966'.

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 14 of such Act is amended by striking out '1965' each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1966'.

"(c) Paragraph (13) of section 15 of such Act is amended by inserting 'the District of Columbia,' after 'Guam,'.

"(d) Paragraph (15) of section 15 of such Act is amended by striking out '1962–1963' and inserting in lieu thereof '1963–1964'.

"Amendments to Public Law 874

"SEC. 1102. (a) Sections 2(a), 3(b), and 4(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), are each amended by striking out '1965' each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '1966'.

"(b) Section 9(8) of such Act is amended by inserting 'the District of Columbia,' after 'Guam,'.

"Comprehensive study

"SEC. 1103. The Commissioner of Education shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transmission to the Congress on or before June 30, 1965, a full report of the operation of Public Laws 815 and 874, as extended by this Act, and his recommendations as to what amendments to such laws should be made if they are further extended."

And the House agree to the same.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
JAMES ROOSEVELT,
CARLTON R. SICKLES,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
JOHN H. DENT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WAYNE MORSE,
PAT MCNAMARA,
RALPH YARBOROUGH,
JOSEPH S. CLARK,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
WINSTON L. PROUTY,
JACOB K. JAVITS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3060) to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas), submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment.

In most respects the substitute agreed upon in conference is like the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute are noted in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees and minor and clarifying changes.

Extension of National Defense Education Act: The Senate bill extended the programs provided for in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (hereinafter called the act) for 3 additional years beyond its present expiration date of June 30, 1965. The House amendment extended the act for only 2 additional years. The substitute agreed upon in conference extends the act for 3 additional years.

Extension and amendment of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress: The Senate bill extended Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to construction and maintenance and operation of schools in federally affected areas, for 2 additional years and made such laws applicable to the District of Columbia. The House amendment extended these laws for 1 additional year. The conference substitute adopts the House position with respect to the extension of the acts, but adopts the Senate provisions with respect to the inclusion of the District of Columbia.

In including the District of Columbia under the Federal impact legislation (Public Laws 815 and 874) the conferees are well aware that Congress authorizes a Federal payment to the District from general revenues each year for governmental purposes in the District Appropriation Act. We also are aware that this payment is justified because of the large federally owned real estate holdings in the District which cannot be taxed for local purposes and because of other financial burdens imposed on the District government due to the fact that it is the location of the Nation's Capital. Nevertheless, we believe the District also should be included under the impact area laws and receive the educational benefits these programs provide. A number of cogent reasons may be given for this inclusion, chief of which is the fact that the District of Columbia is one of the most heavily impacted school districts in the Nation, as judged by the criteria in Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, and should be treated the same as every jurisdiction in the Nation.

It is the intention of the conferees that the Federal impact funds to be received by the District under Public Law 874 be used by the board of education solely for educational purposes, and that they be in addition to the funds made available for education in the District of Columbia budget. It also is the opinion of the conferees that insofar as is consistent with good educational administration, these funds be used to improve the quality and standards of the educational offerings in the underprivileged attendance areas of the city. The superintendent of schools is requested to report to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Education and Labor on the ways in which the availability of these funds during the year has improved the educational program for the children in the low income areas.

Amendments of title I: The House bill defines the term "school of nursing" and specifies that these schools will be considered as institutions of higher education for the purposes of the student loan title of the act. The Senate bill contained no similar provision. In retaining this provision in the conference substitute the conferees did not intend to make changes in existing laws. The inclusion of the definition is merely to insure the continuation of existing administrative practice.

Amendments of title II: The Senate bill authorized appropriations of $145,000,000 for the fiscal year 1965, $165,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966, $180,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967, and $195,000,000 for the fiscal year 1968 for carrying out title II of the act (relating to student loan programs).

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $163,300,000 for the fiscal year 1965, $179,300,000 for the fiscal year 1966, and $200,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967 for carrying out title II.

The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of $163,300,000 for the fiscal year 1965, $179,300,000 for the fiscal year 1966, $190,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967, and $195,000,000 for the fiscal year 1968 for this purpose.

The Senate bill provided for special consideration in getting loans to "(A) students with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools, and (B) other students with a superior academic background." The House amendment provided for such special consideration for students with superior academic background. The conference substitute is like the House amendment; but in omitting the mention of persons expressing a desire to teach, the conferees do not wish to indicate any belief that the importance of obtaining teachers for the Nation's elementary and secondary schools has in any way lessened.

The Senate bill permitted institutions of higher education to make loans to part-time students who are carrying at least one-half the normal full-time academic load. The House amendment contained no similar provisions. The conference substitute adopts this provision of the Senate bill.

Amendments of title III: The Senate bill authorizes the appropriation of $90,000,000 for each fiscal year for grants to States to assist them to acquire certain equipment. The House amendment authorizes the appropriation of $70,000,000 per fiscal year for this program. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the authorization in the Senate amendment. The Senate bill also authorizes the appropriation of $10,000,000 annually for State supervisory services and administration. The House authorized $5,000,000 annually for this purpose. The substitute is like the Senate bill.

The present law authorizes grants for the acquisition of equipment suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language. The Senate bill broadened these categories to include history, civics, geography, English, or remedial reading.

The House amendment broadened these existing categories to include reading and English when taught to persons for whom English is a second language, and also authorized grants for the acquisition of wall maps and globes.

The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the categories in the Senate provision, except that the House category of reading is included instead of the more limited category of remedial reading contained in the Senate bill.

The same differences existed between the Senate amendment and the House bill with respect to the categories in which assistance can be given for supervisory and related services. These differences are resolved in the same manner as the above.

Amendments of title IV: The Senate bill authorized the Commissioner of Education to award 5,000 fellowships for graduate study during the fiscal year 1965, 7,500 during the fiscal year 1966, and 10,000 during the fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

The House amendment authorized the Commissioner to award 3,000 such fellowships during the fiscal year 1965, 5,000 during the fiscal year 1966, and 6,500 during the fiscal year 1967.

The conference substitute authorizes the Commissioner of Education to award 3,000 fellowships for graduate study during 1965, 6,000 during fiscal year 1966, and 7,500 during fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

The Senate bill provides that of the fellowships to be awarded during a fiscal year not less than one-third of those to be awarded in fiscal years 1965 and 1966, and

not less than 2,500 for each fiscal year thereafter, shall be awarded to persons who will study in new or expanded graduate programs approved by the Commissioner under section 403(a). The House amendment provides that for fiscal year 1965, 1,500 of the fellowships awarded must be for study in such new or expanded programs, and that thereafter one-third of such fellowships must be for study in such new and expanded programs. The conference substitute adopts the House provision in this instance.

Amendments of part A of title V: The Senate bill authorized the appropriation of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1965, $25,500,000 for the fiscal year 1966, $32,500,000 for the fiscal year 1967, and $37,500,000 for the fiscal year 1968 for carrying out part A of title V (relating to grants for State programs of guidance, counseling, and testing).

The House amendment authorized the appropriation of $23,500,000 for the fiscal year 1965 and the fiscal year 1966, and $28,500,000 for the fiscal year 1967 for this purpose.

The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of $24,000,000 for the fiscal year 1965, $24,500,000 for the fiscal year 1966, and $30,000,000 for the fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

The Senate bill altered the present law to extend Federal assistance for State testing and guidance and counseling programs to all grades of elementary and secondary schools and to junior colleges and technical institutes. The present act allows Federal assistance only for testing and for guidance and counseling in the seventh and succeeding grades in elementary and secondary schools. The only change in the existing law made by the House amendment was to permit Federal assistance for guidance and counseling in all grades of elementary and secondary schools. The conference substitute follows the Senate bill.

The Senate bill also contained a provision, which was not in the House amendment, broadening the type of counseling and guidance which can be assisted to include advising students in their decisions as to the type of educational program they should pursue, the vocation they should train for and enter, and the job opportunities in the various fields. The conference substitute includes this provision.

Amendments of part B of title V: The Senate bill made several changes in part B of title V of the act which relates to counseling and guidance training institutes. The House amendment contained provisions for guidance and counseling institutes which were, with one exception, the same in substance as those contained in the Senate bill. However, the House provisions were included in a new title XI which grouped all types of institutes in one place. The exception is that under the Senate bill the institutes would be for individuals who are engaged, or are teachers preparing to engage in counseling and guidance of students in elementary or secondary schools or in institutions of higher education, including junior colleges and technical institutes. In contrast, the House amendment provided that the institutes would be for individuals who are engaged, or are preparing to engage in elementary or secondary schools as counseling and guidance personnel.

The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate bill, except that where the Senate bill authorized the appropriation of $10,000,000 for each fiscal year, the substitute authorizes the appropriation of $7,250,000.

Amendments of title VI: The sums authorized to be appropriated were the same in the Senate bill and House amendment, except that the House amendment provided no such authorization for the fiscal year 1968 since it did not extend the program into that year. The conference substitute adopts the Senate authorization of $18,000,000 for the fiscal year 1968. For a description of the conference action with respect to part B of this title, see the discussion of the new title XI.

New title XI: The House amendment added a new title to the act which authorized the Commissioner to arrange with institutions of higher education for carrying out institutes for advanced study for persons in a number of specified fields. These fields included the two fields covered by existing law—that is, guidance and counseling and modern foreign language (including English when taught to persons for whom English is a second language). It then adds provisions for institutes for reading, and for teachers of disadvantaged youth in connection with specified types of schools, and librarians (and supervisors) in elementary or secondary schools. Since the guidance and counseling and modern foreign language institutes would be taken care of in this title, the House bill repealed part B of title V and part B of title VI.

The Senate amendment did not create a new title. Instead it provided for the continuation of the guidance and counseling institutes under title V, and broadened the permissible types of institutes in title VI. The new types of institutes were for school librarians and educational media specialists and for persons who engaged in or are preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training of teachers, of history, civics, geography, English, or remedial reading.

The conference substitute, as has been described, retains the guidance and counseling institutes in part B of title V. The remainder of the institutes are authorized in the new title XI. The new title retains all the categories of institutes provided in the House amendment. In addition it includes educational media specialists and the categories of history, English, and geography from the Senate bill. In agreeing to the inclusion of geography, it is the understanding of the managers on the part of the House that that "geography" does not include the field of study known as geopolitics.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
JAMES ROOSEVELT,
CARLTON R. SICKLES,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
JOHN H. DENT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the purpose of providing the legislative history regarding the conference report, I am under an obligation to, and, in fact, under instructions from, my colleagues on the committee and the House managers to discuss briefly the basis upon which agreement was reached. I shall take the time to do so because the legislative history we make here today may be of utmost importance in the years ahead in administering the act. The report I make today supplements the report of the House managers, our conference practice being that the Senate conferees do not file a written report. Therefore, it is important that we leave no room for doubt as to the meaning of any part of the bill.

Before I do so, however, I should like to express my deepest appreciation to Senators who served with me on the conference committee for the valuable support which they gave to the Senate position on this important legislation.

The President of the United States, in signing legislation that had been passed in the 88th Congress, said that this Congress had passed more educational legislation of greater import than had been enacted by any other Congress in the past 100 years. He referred to the Morrell Act of 1862 as being the last great piece of major legislation on education, other than the National Defense Education Act of 1958, prior to the various bills that have been passed in the 88th Congress.

I make this statement now as a fitting introduction to the tribute and thanks I wish to express to my colleagues on the Senate Subcommittee on Education. I wish particularly to thank the Republican Senators who worked so closely with me and my colleagues on the subcommittee, Senator PROUTY and Senator JAVITS.

The distinguished junior Senator from the State of Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the able senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] not only signed the conference report, but were diligent in their attendance and constructive in their suggestions during our conference meetings. Without the assistance of Senator PROUTY and Senator JAVITS, in my judgment we would have had an entirely different and more limited in scope National Defense Education Act bill to consider. We would not have had a bill which follows as closely the Senate provisions of S. 3060 as the one we are proud to report this morning.

I also wish to say of these two Senators that at no time was there the slightest indication of any partisanship entering into their discussion of the problems before the committee. That is the way it should be when we work on a subject matter that is of vital concern to all the people of this country, irrespective of party membership.

This attitude on their part was but a reflection and a continuation of the careful consideration each had given to this legislation. I am proud to acknowledge publicly my gratitude to Senators PROUTY and JAVITS for their constructive assistance. S. 3060 in many of its particulars gives solid evidence of their dedication to the great cause of education.

Mr. President, I would be greatly remiss if I failed to acknowledge the wise counsel given to me by my beloved chairman, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who, although he could not be with us physically during the conference sessions, was nevertheless always a tangible presence in our midst.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a Member on this side of the aisle I believe the conference report on education is a distinct advance in our educational programs. I congratulate the conference committee. I am glad the report has come forth in its present form.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts very much for his comment.

As I indicated to Senator HILL in my report on our activities recently, there

are few, if any, subcommittee chairmen who feel more greatly indebted than I do to LISTER HILL for his unfailing tact, courtesy, and support.

The acting chairman of the Labor Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]—to each I owe a debt of gratitude for their diligence, for their support, and for their unfailing maintenance of the position of the Senate where it could be fully maintained on the basis of logic and persuasive argument, and for their gracious acceptance of those conscionable compromises which had to be made if agreements were to be secured and if we were to bring forth the strong bill that we are bringing forth in this conference report today.

There were times when materials presented by Senator RANDOLPH on the basis of communications from West Virginia educational leaders helped to resolve our problem. At other points, materials presented with vigor and lucidity by Senator YARBOROUGH carried the day. So also, in a similar manner, the contributions to the conference of Senators MCNAMARA and CLARK have had their effect upon the outcome.

Anyone who has ever served with Senator RANDOLPH in conference is aware of the fact that after he listens and realizes that a proposal is being put forth which would do great damage to the bill before the committee, in his very tactful and courteous manner he makes it clear to the whole conference that if they persist on that road they will lose the vote of the Senator from West Virginia. He did that again in our conference and was of assistance to me by so doing on several important occasions.

All Senators who participated in the conference signed the conference report. Yet, I would be less than candid if I did not indicate to the Senate that had he been able to participate in the conference, it is doubtful, in my judgment, that the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona would have found it possible to accept the agreements which were reached, since he indicated at the time of the committee consideration of S. 3060 that for the reasons given in his individual views to the committee report the basis for his opposition to the Senate bill.

Mr. President, I turn now to a detailed discussion of the bill and the agreements which were reached on each title.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS—NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Title I of National Defense Education Act contains general provisions covering the act and includes a statement of congressional findings and a declaration of policy, a prohibition of Federal control of education, and the definition of terms contained in the act.

Under the declaration of policy under existing law, there appears the statement:

We must increase our efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation. This requires programs that will give assurance that no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need; will correct as rapidly as possible the existing imbalances in our educational programs which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology.

The House version of the bill omitted the language which reads "which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology."

Since the Senate amendments to other provisions of the bill in title III and in the institutes title expanded the coverage of the disciplines beyond science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and technology, it was our view that the change suggested by the House was reasonable. The Senate conferees, therefore, receded on this point.

Under the definitions section of the bill, in the House version there appeared the terms "school of nursing," "collegiate school of nursing," "associate degree school of nursing," and the term "accredited," which were strongly urged upon us by House managers. The Senate conferees resisted the inclusion of this language, basing our resistance upon, first, the position of the American Nurses' Association, and, second, our understanding, based upon conversations with the Office of Education, that the inclusion of the defined terms neither added to, nor detracted from, the rights or benefits conferred upon persons enrolled in schools of nursing under this or any other act.

After much discussion and debate, we were reluctantly persuaded to accept these new definitions on the clear understanding, which is set forth in the statement of the managers on the part of the House, that, in fact, the addition of these terms in the language of the act does not change, in any respect, the authorities under this or any other student loan act, nor will it affect the administration of the various loan programs. It was further agreed—at the insistence, as I recall it, of Senator JAVITS—that in making legislative history on this point of the intention of the conferees it is our view that in no way does the inclusion of these terms relating to a specific profession constitute a precedent for naming, subsequently, other professions or designating preprofessional students.

In view of the discussions which took place on this point and the representations which were made which led to the recession on the part of the Senate, thus permitting the inclusion of these terms, Senators may feel that the following communications on the point may be of enlightening interest. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point there be printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of September 2, 1964, from the American Nurses' Association; my letter of September 25, 1964, to the American Nurses' Association; and their reply dated September 28, 1964.

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

AMERICAN NURSES' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N.Y., September 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I understand that the Senate conferees are scheduled to meet soon to consider the National Defense Education Act amendments (S. 3060). The American Nurses' Association would like to express its support of the Senate version of the National Defense Education Act. The Senate version does not specifically mention or define nurses or nursing education.

Since the American Nurses' Association has strongly supported other legislation which provides loans to nurses, the specific reference to nurses in the House version of the National Defense Education Act is neither desirable nor necessary.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JUDITH G. WHITAKER, R.N.,
Executive Director.

SEPTEMBER 25, 1964.

Miss JULIA C. THOMPSON, R.N.,
Washington Representative, American Nurses' Association, Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MISS THOMPSON: You will recall that on September 2, 1964, Mrs. Judith G. Whitaker, executive director of the American Nurses' Association, Inc., wrote me with respect to the National Defense Education Act amendment, S. 3060, in which she stated:

"The American Nurses' Association would like to express its support of the Senate version of the National Defense Education Act. The Senate version does not specifically mention or define nurses or nursing education.

"Since the American Nurses' Association has strongly supported other legislation which provides loans to nurses, the specific reference to nurses in the House version of the National Defense Education Act is neither desirable nor necessary."

In accordance with my obligations as a conferee, I in good faith presented this letter to the conference committee. In the discussion which followed, the position of the American Nurses' Association, Inc., with respect to the language of section 103 of the National Defense Education Act as expressed in the September 2 letter, was challenged. The matter was resolved by requesting Representative EDITH GREEN for the conference committee to telephone the American Nurses' Association to verify the position of the organization.

You can understand, I am sure, the embarrassing position in which I found myself when Representative GREEN reported that she had spoken with you and had learned that the September 2 letter had been dispatched during a period in which you were on leave, that the information contained in the September 2 letter was erroneous, and that it had been based upon language of an earlier version of the bill and that the American Nurses' Association therefore did not object to the retention of nursing in the definitions under title I of the National Defense Education Act and asked that its September 2 letter be withdrawn.

Since the position of the American Nurses' Association on this part of the bill was of vital concern to each of the conferees, the receipt of this information from Representative GREEN resulted in a recession on the part of the Senate and adoption of the House position.

I very much regret that the Senate conferees were not apprised of the correct viewpoint of the American Nurses' Association at an earlier date, since, as I have indicated, it would have spared the Senate conferees some

embarrassment in misinforming the House in good faith of the true position of the American Nurses' Association.

In order that the matter may be clarified during the legislative history which will be made on the bill when the matter is debated in the Senate, hopefully early next week, I would very much appreciate receiving your comments so that I may make a full report to my colleagues.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE,
Chairman, Education Subcommittee.

AMERICAN NURSES' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N.Y., September 28, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Chairman, Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is in answer to your letter of September 25, 1964, to Miss Julia C. Thompson, Washington representative for the American Nurses' Association.

I would like to reaffirm the context of the letter sent to you and dated September 2, 1964, in which the American Nurses' Association expressed the desire that the specific reference to nurses under title I of the National Defense Education Act be removed.

We very much regret the embarrassing position in which you were placed during the committee conference. The American Nurses' Association is equally embarrassed to learn that a conversation between Miss Thompson and Congresswoman GREEN could have been construed to mean that the information contained in the September 2 letter was erroneous. This was certainly not the intent of any comments made to Mrs. GREEN. Although it is correct that Miss Thompson was on leave when the letter was sent, the letter was properly cleared and approved through my office in New York. It expressed then, as it does now, the feelings of the association.

It is also correct that a statement was sent out preceding action on the House floor concerning several portions of the bill which were unsatisfactory to the American Nurses' Association. All but one of these provisions were removed by amendment on the House floor. This one provision is the specific reference to nurses in the bill. Only in this sense was the letter based upon language of an earlier version of the bill.

I would like to reassure you that had the American Nurses' Association changed its position, you would have been notified in writing prior to the conference. We very much regret that a hasty telephone conversation was misinterpreted and used to refute our letter to you of September 2.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JUDITH G. WHITAKER, R.N.,
Executive Director.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was the view of the Senate conferees that the legislative history that has been made in this respect should preclude this case from being considered a precedent for the future, in the event similar proposals were to be made concerning other fields. It is for that reason that these communications have been printed in the RECORD.

TITLE II—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. President, the dollar amount of loans to students in institutions of higher education are a compromise between the amounts originally contained in the House and Senate versions of the bill. Briefly, the authorization for this purpose increases the present $135 million authorization for fiscal year 1965 to $163.3 million; to $179.3 million in fiscal year 1966, $190 million in fiscal year 1967, and $195 million in fiscal year 1968.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a State-by-State tabulation of the estimated distribution of these funds, which was prepared by the Office of Education.

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

Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title II, sec. 202(a), as proposed to be amended by Senate-House conference, Sept. 24, 1964

State	Fiscal year 1965	1966	1967	1968
United States and outlying parts	$163,300,000	$179,300,000	$190,000,000	$195,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	162,176,927	178,066,889	188,693,302	193,658,914
Alabama	2,245,349	2,465,346	2,612,470	2,681,219
Alaska	65,807	72,255	76,567	78,581
Arizona	1,660,469	1,823,161	1,931,961	1,982,802
Arkansas	1,453,648	1,596,075	1,691,323	1,735,832
California	16,936,492	18,595,915	19,705,653	20,224,225
Colorado	2,270,206	2,492,639	2,641,391	2,710,901
Connecticut	2,071,351	2,274,300	2,410,023	2,473,444
Delaware	318,837	350,076	370,968	380,730
Florida	3,709,141	4,072,560	4,315,596	4,429,164
Georgia	2,704,085	2,969,029	3,146,211	3,229,006
Hawaii	568,096	623,757	660,981	678,375
Idaho	641,498	704,351	746,385	766,026
Illinois	8,082,566	8,874,490	9,404,088	9,651,564
Indiana	4,678,718	5,137,135	5,443,701	5,586,956
Iowa	3,103,388	3,407,456	3,610,801	3,705,822
Kansas	2,659,417	2,919,985	3,094,240	3,175,667
Kentucky	2,307,863	2,533,985	2,685,205	2,755,868
Louisiana	2,969,172	3,260,089	3,454,640	3,545,551
Maine	672,622	738,525	782,598	803,192
Maryland	2,298,143	2,523,313	2,673,896	2,744,262
Massachusetts	6,283,631	6,899,296	7,311,022	7,503,418
Michigan	7,057,009	7,748,449	8,210,849	8,426,924
Minnesota	3,954,895	4,342,392	4,601,531	4,722,624
Mississippi	1,931,505	2,120,752	2,247,311	2,306,451
Missouri	4,036,476	4,431,967	4,696,451	4,820,042
Montana	744,378	817,311	866,085	888,877
Nebraska	$1,546,967	$1,698,538	$1,799,901	$1,847,266
Nevada	176,388	193,670	205,228	210,629
New Hampshire	660,512	725,229	768,508	788,732
New Jersey	3,140,674	3,448,394	3,654,182	3,750,345
New Mexico	832,864	914,467	969,039	994,540
New York	13,144,547	14,432,439	15,293,716	15,696,183
North Carolina	4,104,514	4,506,671	4,775,613	4,901,287
North Dakota	786,815	863,906	915,461	939,552
Ohio	7,977,456	8,759,081	9,281,792	9,526,050
Oklahoma	2,636,526	2,894,850	3,067,605	3,148,331
Oregon	2,221,926	2,439,629	2,585,217	2,653,249
Pennsylvania	8,563,875	9,402,957	9,964,093	10,226,306
Rhode Island	861,757	946,192	1,002,657	1,029,043
South Carolina	1,640,605	1,801,350	1,908,849	1,959,082
South Dakota	758,931	833,290	883,018	906,255
Tennessee	3,205,418	3,519,483	3,729,513	3,827,658
Texas	8,943,740	9,820,040	10,406,065	10,679,909
Utah	1,844,824	2,025,579	2,146,458	2,202,944
Vermont	563,741	618,975	655,914	673,175
Virginia	2,706,635	2,971,829	3,149,177	3,232,050
Washington	3,265,223	3,585,147	3,799,097	3,899,073
West Virginia	1,424,223	1,563,767	1,657,088	1,700,695
Wisconsin	3,981,929	4,372,076	4,632,986	4,754,906
Wyoming	339,392	372,645	394,883	405,275
District of Columbia	1,422,683	1,562,076	1,655,295	1,698,856
American Samoa				
Canal Zone	23,157	25,426	26,944	27,653
Guam	16,890	18,545	19,651	20,169
Puerto Rico	1,081,698	1,187,682	1,258,558	1,291,678
Virgin Islands	1,328	1,458	1,545	1,586

NOTE.—Distribution of all amounts estimated on the basis of full-time degree credit enrollment (excluding U.S. service schools), fall 1963.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING INSTRUCTION IN SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES, AND OTHER CRITICAL SUBJECTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am pleased to report to the Senate that the conference committee agreed substantially to the amendments to title III of the National Defense Education Act contained in the Senate version of S. 3060.

One difference, the acceptance of the House term "reading" for the Senate term "remedial reading" in section 304(a) of the National Defense Education Act deserves comment. The Senate receded to the House language on this point on the assurance that the term "reading" is a broadly inclusive term which encompasses fully the category of remedial reading, which was in the Senate version of the bill.

Senators will recall that in the Senate committee report, No. 1275, which accompanied S. 3060 to the Senate floor, there appeared on page 11 the following language:

The committee recognizes that remedial reading is of prime importance. Reading skill is basic to education in all other areas. It has long been recognized that the reading ability of many students is below the level needed for maximum educational achievement. The committee understands remedial reading to mean individual or group instruction aimed at correcting faulty reading habits and/or developing improved reading skill, including efficiency and accuracy. In its deliberations the committee was influenced by the material presented to it by a Vermont physician who in a communication stated, in part—

To the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]—

"I would like to suggest therefore that you give consideration to further amending the National Defense Education Act so that more help can be provided for more children at as early an age as possible. If a child in kindergarten, or first or second grade, can receive therapy for the specific weaknesses that they so often demonstrate (auditory discrimination problems, memory span difficulties, visual and auditory perceptual disorders, attention problems, etc.) many later-grade repetitions, emotional overlays, and potential dropouts can be prevented."

The term "remedial reading" would also include specialized equipment used in special education classes. For example, this would cover such classes as those for the unusually gifted, the emotionally disturbed, the deaf, or the mentally retarded. The committee has noted that the Commissioner of Education under this title, and under the institute title, is empowered to provide support for training of such children and teachers.

The conference action in accepting the term "reading" in no way changes the emphasis which the Senate report gave to the term "remedial reading." It merely broadens to other categories of reading in our school systems the support previously accorded only to remedial reading.

In this connection also, I want to note for the RECORD the most helpful support I received from the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from West Virginia, both of whom on many occasions in our discussions adverted to the importance of working with children of all age levels to correct and remedy reading deficiencies. It was their view, which I shared and I believe the committee and the Senate shared, that a broad interpretation should be given to the reading authorities to make sure that these youngsters who need help get help. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table of title III estimated distributions.

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

Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title III, sec. 302(a), as proposed to be amended by Senate-House conference, Sept. 24, 1964, for each of fiscal years 1965–68

State	Acquisition of equipment for science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects		State administration and supervision
	Grants for public schools	Loans for nonpublic schools	
United States and outlying parts	$79,200,000	$10,800,000	$10,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	77,769,460	10,672,056	9,837,327
Alabama	2,089,073	53,059	188,955
Alaska	95,345	3,727	50,000
Arizona	825,045	56,075	82,976
Arkansas	1,096,763	21,472	99,201
California	4,692,896	693,843	849,066
Colorado	866,393	76,660	100,434
Connecticut	707,227	194,312	127,955
Delaware	133,952	33,894	50,000
Florida	2,256,586	154,385	264,126
Georgia	2,513,700	46,138	227,362
Hawaii	274,115	53,946	50,000
Idaho	430,778	15,971	50,000
Illinois	2,836,888	929,856	494,570
Indiana	2,028,256	227,141	245,847
Iowa	1,361,199	171,598	144,386
Kansas	1,025,334	91,211	113,784
Kentucky	1,852,916	155,272	167,595
Louisiana	2,141,299	250,387	193,679
Maine	494,084	62,641	50,525
Maryland	1,306,554	242,402	170,060
Massachusetts	1,528,454	461,379	247,901
Michigan	3,281,426	594,469	436,240
Minnesota	1,730,299	297,944	186,490
Mississippi	1,482,787	33,716	134,117
Missouri	1,684,094	294,573	210,521
Montana	353,453	36,733	50,000
Nebraska	$687,541	$100,261	$73,734
Nevada	96,991	7,098	50,000
New Hampshire	271,085	61,931	50,000
New Jersey	1,681,223	525,262	304,177
New Mexico	667,596	48,090	60,383
New York	4,443,154	1,486,173	803,881
North Carolina	2,915,620	34,426	263,716
North Dakota	397,376	36,378	50,000
Ohio	3,755,845	674,145	524,761
Oklahoma	1,266,671	37,798	124,464
Oregon	799,514	62,109	94,888
Pennsylvania	4,186,466	1,082,466	557,418
Rhode Island	297,661	93,518	50,000
South Carolina	1,621,303	28,038	146,646
South Dakota	441,994	41,347	50,000
Tennessee	2,159,466	55,011	195,322
Texas	5,374,317	266,180	550,229
Utah	616,541	10,825	57,713
Vermont	203,123	31,232	50,000
Virginia	2,262,271	98,487	224,487
Washington	1,235,333	102,213	157,326
West Virginia	1,105,846	30,699	100,023
Wisconsin	1,852,429	454,281	212,369
Wyoming	165,221	6,921	50,000
District of Columbia	175,957	44,363	50,000
American Samoa	50,000	2,307	10,000
Canal Zone	50,000	1,242	10,000
Guam	50,000	8,695	10,000
Puerto Rico	1,230,540	110,199	122,673
Virgin Islands	50,000	5,501	10,000

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senate conferees dwelt on the "reading" and "remedial reading" points of title III, National Defense Education Act, at some length in conference. We have the assurance of the majority House conferees—in fact, I know of no conferee on either side of the House conferees who would not share the view which I now express for legislative history—that reading, as used in the bill, covers remedial reading.

Let me say to the teachers of America, to the educators of America, that although the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] was of assistance in every part of the bill, this section dealing with reading is a monument to him, because he presented us with the data, the information, and the evidence which left no room for doubt that one of the greatest needs in the American educational system, from the elementary grades right up to college, involves the problem of reading.

The Senator from Vermont was joined by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who supplemented the evidence which the Senator from Vermont had provided from authorities in West Virginia, backing up everything which the Senator from Vermont brought up.

I close these comments by saying that, in my judgment, one of the major problems confronting us in preventing dropouts in this country from grade school, high school, and college, is the problem of better training in reading. It is not merely a matter of training students to read print. In many instances, it calls for psychological treatment. Many of these problems are psychological problems.

I remember one dramatic example of the type of difficulty with which we are confronted, that a student appearing to be normal in every other respect will see one word the right way up and the next word the wrong side up.

How can we possibly educate that child until we get to the bottom of what causes the reading disturbance? Every dollar we spend to improve reading instruction in the schools of America will pay dividends a thousandfold. If we can correct a reading problem in a child, we make it possible for that child to go on through the educational process, in many instances on to college, and that child can become a great asset to our society.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am most grateful to the Senator from Oregon for the graciousness with which he has referred to me. It is evident from what he has just said that a single letter from a constituent can sometimes carry great impact upon the course of major legislation.

The Vermont doctor who has been so interested in the difficult problems of finding out what the handicaps were of some youngsters, which makes it so difficult for them to move along in school as rapidly as their other classmates, has been valuable, indeed, to the committee. He pointed out that many of these youngsters have normal or superior intelligence and if we can find out the difficulties which they are experiencing as youngsters, and we can enable them to overcome those handicaps, they will become able, progressive students which will certainly eliminate the probability of dropouts.

While I am on my feet, let me say that those who benefit from the National Defense Education Act legislation—and that includes every citizen of this country—owe a great debt of gratitude to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. His leadership in bringing this measure to its final stages has been outstanding and has reflected the same type of progressive and cooperative outlook on his part which helped make possible enactment of more educational legislation than has been approved by any Congress in the history of the United States.

It has been a pleasure for me to work with the Senator from Oregon. I certainly appreciate his help and cooperation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would be less than human if I did not tell the Senator from Vermont that I appreciate very much the comments he has just made. But as I have said before, we did it together. Whatever we have accomplished in this bill, we did it together as committee members. I wish to thank him very much for his kind remarks.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, too often we take for granted the persistent and conscientious efforts which our representatives on conference committees make in resolving differences over important legislation. I commend the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his successful efforts in helping obtain agreement on the extension and improvement of the National Defense Education Act.

His work on the conference committee is of a part with his long and patient efforts as chairman of the Education Subcommittee of our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to help improve educational facilities and standards for American young people. As one who has served alongside him on the subcommittee and who has watched him bring together divergent views in order to make progress, I feel that he deserves the credit which is now being bestowed upon him.

Today's success is further evidence of his good efforts and, as one who has urged recognition for the 2-year community colleges, I know that in Senator MORSE we have a true supporter.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his most gracious comments. The senior Senator from New Jersey has long been our mentor on the importance of providing support to the junior and community college segment of higher education. He helped to pioneer in this field, and I therefore appreciate all the more his kind comments which I accept only as the symbol of the team of Senators, both on and off the committee, who have labored together to bring this legislation to the point of passage. On that team I count always the Senator from New Jersey. I turn now to the fellowships title of the National Defense Education Act.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

Mr. President, the following title of the National Defense Education Act currently provides for 1,500 fellowships annually. The Senate version of S. 3060 expanded this program, which is of major importance if we are to expand our higher educational teaching forces, from the present 1,500 figure to 5,000 fellowships for this fiscal year, 7,500 fellowships for fiscal year 1966, and the Commissioner would have been authorized for the final 2 years to award not to exceed 10,000 fellowships annually.

I can assure the Senate that we attempted to maintain these figures which I personally believe are fully justified by the evidence presented in our hearings. However, as Senators are aware, it is necessary at times to secure agreement to concede items of quantity provided that principles of quality are maintained. In this instance, both House and Senate retreated from the original positions and accepted the program which will provide a doubling of scholarships this year to 3,000, a doubling of that figure for the next fiscal year to 6,000, and an increase thereafter for the final 2 years of the program to 7,500 fellowships annually.

Other modifications to this title which are shown in the summary were largely of a conforming nature dictated by the policy decision on the numbers of fellowships to be established. I regret, however, that we were unable to maintain the increased stipend provisions of the Senate bill.

TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING

This title of the National Defense Education Act consists of two parts. Part A is concerned with programs of guidance, counseling, and testing. I am pleased to report that in this area the Senate version of the bill prevailed. The services under part A will now be available to schoolchildren at all educational levels from the first grade through the junior and community college level. Authorizations for this part of title V were increased from the present $17.5 million to $24 million for the current fiscal year, $24.5 for fiscal year 1966, and $30 million for fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

Title V–B of the National Defense Education Act refers to institutes for the training of teachers who are working or preparing to work in the school systems as counseling and guidance personnel.

It is a disturbing fact that only one out of five teachers and counselors who apply for enrollment in counseling and guidance institutes can be accepted. One of the main reasons for our inability to cope with this demand is the dearth of trained personnel to conduct these institutes. It should be clear that one of the intentions of this legislation is to help fill this hiatus by providing for the training of the trainers of counselors as is the case in the other institutes under title XI. By increasing the number of trainers of counselors, we would remove a major bottleneck now preventing the establishment of institutes in sufficient number to accommodate those who are qualified to enroll and wish to do so.

It should be clear, as well, that counselors in schools should have the benefit of well-trained supervisors to provide assistance in keeping abreast of new developments in this rapidly growing profession.

It is also hoped that ways can be found to administer this legislation to establish more counseling and guidance institutes in States in which it has not previously been possible to have these valuable programs. Qualified individuals who wish to attend these institutes should not be required to undergo the added expenses of long-distance travel to reach colleges or universities offering such programs.

The Commissioner of Education, I am sure, will move with his usual vigor and keen insight to make immediate use of the full range of training of counseling and guidance personnel envisaged by the act—counselors for elementary schools, secondary schools, junior colleges, technical institutes, higher education, and training for supervisors and trainers of counseling and guidance personnel.

Under the House version of S. 3060, the title V–B was repealed and the guidance and counseling institutes were transferred to a new title XI. Under existing law $7,250,000 is currently authorized specifically for guidance and counseling institute programs. Under the House version of the bill this earmarking of funds would have ceased and the funding of institutes under the new title XI of the House version would have been left fully to the discretion of the Commissioner of Education.

The House version of the bill provided for but $35 million for all institutes. The Senate version of S. 3060 would have provided $10 million for guidance and counseling institutes and $30 million for all other institutes.

The conference amendment now before the Senate maintains the guidance and counseling institute program in title V–B of the act but at the $7,250,000 authorization of existing law. The Senate receded to the extent that its conferees accepted the placing in title XI of the currently authorized modern foreign language institutes and the new institutes which were created in a new title XI of the act. These new institutes will be discussed under title XI of the bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table of title V–A estimated distributions.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title V, pt. A, sec. 501, as proposed to be amended by Senate-House conference, Sept. 24, 1964

State	Fiscal year			
	1965	1966	1967	1968
U.S. and outlying parts	$24,000,000	$24,500,000	$30,000,000	$30,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	23,616,000	24,108,000	29,520,000	29,520,000
Alabama	465,334	475,091	582,233	582,223
Alaska	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Arizona	204,342	208,627	255,672	255,672
Arkansas	244,301	249,423	305,667	305,667
California	2,090,971	2,134,810	2,616,209	2,616,209
Colorado	247,335	252,521	309,464	309,464
Connecticut	315,112	321,719	392,267	392,267
Delaware	59,684	60,936	74,676	74,676
Florida	650,456	664,094	813,847	813,847
Georgia	559,919	571,658	700,567	700,567
Hawaii	93,067	95,018	116,445	116,445
Idaho	99,136	101,215	124,039	124,039
Illinois	1,217,962	1,243,498	1,523,907	1,523,907
Indiana	605,440	618,134	757,523	757,523
Iowa	355,576	363,031	444,895	444,895
Kansas	280,212	286,087	350,600	350,600
Kentucky	412,731	421,385	516,407	516,407
Louisiana	476,968	486,968	596,779	596,779
Maine	124,426	127,035	155,681	155,681
Maryland	418,801	427,582	524,001	524,001
Massachusetts	610,498	623,298	763,852	763,852
Michigan	1,074,315	1,096,840	1,344,177	1,344,177
Minnesota	459,265	468,894	574,629	574,629
Mississippi	330,286	337,211	413,252	413,252
Missouri	518,443	529,313	648,673	648,673
Montana	95,000	97,084	118,976	118,976
Nebraska	181,582	185,389	227,194	227,914
Nevada	$50,000	$50,000	$52,527	$52,527
New Hampshire	76,376	77,977	95,561	95,561
New Jersey	749,087	764,793	937,253	937,253
New Mexico	148,705	151,822	186,058	186,058
New York	1,979,695	2,021,201	2,476,982	2,476,982
North Carolina	649,445	663,061	812,581	812,581
North Dakota	88,515	90,371	110,749	110,749
Ohio	1,292,314	1,319,410	1,616,936	1,616,936
Oklahoma	306,514	312,940	383,508	383,508
Oregon	233,679	238,578	292,377	292,377
Pennsylvania	1,372,736	1,401,518	1,717,559	1,717,559
Rhode Island	101,665	103,797	127,203	127,203
South Carolina	361,140	368,712	451,856	451,856
South Dakota	98,631	100,699	123,506	123,406
Tennessee	481,014	491,099	601,842	601,842
Texas	1,355,033	1,383,444	1,695,409	1,695,409
Utah	142,129	145,109	177,831	177,831
Vermont	50,074	51,124	62,652	62,652
Virginia	552,837	564,428	691,707	691,707
Washington	387,441	395,565	484,764	484,764
West Virginia	246,324	251,488	308,199	308,199
Wisconsin	522,995	533,961	654,369	654,369
Wyoming	50,000	50,000	56,957	56,957
District of Columbia	78,399	80,042	98,092	98,092
Outlying parts	384,000	392,000	480,000	480,000
American Samoa	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Canal Zone	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Guam	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Puerto Rico	304,000	312,000	400,000	400,000
Virgin Islands	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000

NOTE.—Distribution of all amounts estimated on the basis of school-age (5 to 17) population as of July 1, 1962, for the 50 States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and as of Apr. 1, 1960, for the other outlying parts.

TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, two actions were taken by the conference committee on the language development title of the National Defense Education Act.

First, the House conferees accepted the Senate funding provisions of what was formerly part A of the title. The Senate for its part accepted the House version of the bill which placed modern foreign language institutes in the new title XI of the act.

TITLE VII, TITLE VIII, AND TITLE IX OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

No items in titles VII, VIII, and IX were in controversy except for the duration of the extension of all titles which will be discussed separately.

TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Title X of the act, having to do with the details of the administration of the act, contained language differences between Senate and House versions of the bill. These were discussed in conference and the matter was resolved by accepting in large part the House version of S. 3060. I regret that it was necessary to do this, since in my judgment the Senate language would have enabled the Commissioner, particularly in the improvement of statistical services of the State educational agencies section, to have operated more efficiently.

However, since this is a matter which can be adjusted at a later date through subsequent legislation, if it is pressed by the administration, and since, in effect, the two versions of the language in controversy both originated in the Office of Education at differing times, it was felt that it would be inadvisable to press the matter to the point of jeopardizing conference acceptance of the balance of the agreements reached, and therefore in this instance the Senate conferees receded.

TITLE XI—INSTITUTES

The new title XI of the National Defense Education Act authorizes the expenditure of $32,750,000 to enable the Commissioner to arrange through grants or contracts with institutions of higher education for the operation by them of short-term or regular sessions institutes for advanced study, including study in the use of new materials to improve the qualifications of individuals engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, supervising, or training of teachers in the subject matter disciplines of history, geography, modern foreign languages, reading, or English in elementary or secondary schools. Institutes in these subject matters should also be made available to special education teachers such as those engaged in, preparing to engage in, or supervising the teaching of gifted children or handicapped children.

Institutes are also authorized for teachers of disadvantaged youth and for school librarians and educational media specialists.

As I indicated earlier in my statement, the acceptance on the part of the Senate conferees of the new title of National Defense Education Act was a compromise composed of a number of parts.

I have touched upon the retention in title V–B of institutes for guidance and counseling personnel. Basically, the Senate conferees attempted to keep in balance the subject matter disciplines for which equipment is authorized under title III of the act while giving support to services needed by teachers, in which categories fall the library and educational media specialists institutes, and recognizing simultaneously the great difficulty faced by some teachers in coping with young people who come from low-income families, and thus are disadvantaged by comparison to young people from more affluent strata of our society.

The House version, but not the Senate version of S. 3060, provided for the disadvantaged-youth institutes. Since this concept has not been previously subject to much Senate discussion, it will be helpful, I think, to bring to the attention of Senators the committee intent in accepting the House position on this point.

Teachers of disadvantaged youth must bring to the classroom the specialized skills of their profession, abundant enthusiasm, energy, and compassion for young people. In addition, teachers of disadvantaged youth must bring special sociological and psychological insights to the problems of disadvantaged youth; technical skills which bridge the gap between the theory of the university and the reality of the classroom; experience which bridges the gap between their own background and that of the children they teach. Most important of all, they must have developed a genuine attitude of hope for the educability of disadvantaged youth.

Teachers of disadvantaged youth often reflect a value system which differs markedly from that of the children they teach. Though some characteristics of disadvantaged children are shaped by the region in which they reside, there is much about their growth and development which is similar. A better understanding of these common characteristics can often be obtained through an intensive study of the social sciences: sociology, psychology, anthropology, social work, and application of these disciplines to the field education of the disadvantaged. These institutes

will also provide teachers with specific and specialized help in the teaching of basic subject areas: reading, mathematics, science, and the arts. The newest methods of teaching and the most advanced technology and materials will be demonstrated and used in first-hand experiences with disadvantaged youth. Institutes of this type should also provide for the training of teachers of children of preschool age. Current research indicates a crucial need for nursery school experience for disadvantaged children in order to cancel out or modify educationally disabling characteristics. There is a critical shortage of competently trained preschool teachers.

I turn now to a short discussion for the record of the educational media specialist institutes.

Over 75 years of research and practical experience with audiovisual materials and other new educational media have indicated that they can make significant contributions to effective instruction of students at all grade levels and in all subject areas. Despite this research evidence, and the effective use being made of such media in some educational institutions, there has been less extensive use of these media than one might anticipate.

It appears that the classroom teacher does not have the sources of special support she needs to make full use of motion pictures, television, audiovisual materials, and programed instruction. If these media are to assist the classroom teacher, they must be readily available, in good operating condition, and closely related to her teaching purposes. The educational media specialist can provide the administrative and supervisory support which the teacher needs in improving instruction with newer media by:

First. Locating relevant instructional media.

Second. Setting up procedures for their critical review and evaluation by teachers and other subject matter specialists.

Third. Assisting teachers in planning effective use of the media.

Fourth. Maintaining the necessary equipment and providing projection and recording services.

Fifth. Informing teachers of new developments in instructional materials and their use.

Sixth. Assisting teachers with the planning and preparation of such media as slides, overhead transparencies, tape recordings which can be locally produced at low cost to meet unique local instructional needs.

The educational media specialist requires a rare combination of administrative, instructional, and librarianship skills. He most frequently comes from the ranks of the classroom teacher, but is on occasion a school principal or school librarian. If his background is one in which there has been strong emphasis on instructional techniques, his training requires the bolstering of his administrative and planning skills, with specialized training relating to the design, production, and use of the newer media. If he is a school librarian, he may need familiarization with the problems of classroom teaching, as well as training for materials design. The technical and administrative skills of the librarian may be translated readily to the responsibilities of the media specialist.

Experience has demonstrated that certain kinds of media responsibilities may be centralized at the school district or county level, whereas other responsibilities are best decentralized to the individual school building. A large number of school districts and institutions of higher education now have audiovisual or instructional media directors. It is rare, however, that every school in a school district have a building coordinator or instructional media. A major emphasis in the proposed institute program should be on the training of persons who can work on a part-time basis as media specialists in the individual school building. Other institutes should stress the upgrading of current district media directors, and provision of specialized training in such areas as local production techniques, selection and evaluation of educational media, and techniques for the in-service training of teachers.

It was our view that a broad construction could and should be given to this authority. We feel that all levels of educational media specialists including supervisory personnel and those who are engaged in closely related work such as those who are concerned with captioned films for the deaf could with propriety participate in the institutes under this title.

PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874

The conference report also is concerned with the extension of the impacted areas legislation, Public Laws 815 and 874. As S. 3060 passed the Senate, it provided for a 3-year extension of all titles of National Defense Education Act and a 2-year extension of the impacted areas legislation.

The House version on the other hand, provided for a 2-year extension of all titles of National Defense Education Act and a 1-year extension of Public Laws 815 and 874. However, the Senate version incorporated the District of Columbia under Public Laws 815 and 874, while the House version did not.

Both House and Senate versions of S. 3060 required the Commissioner of Education to submit to the Congress through the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a report on the operation of these two laws by June 30, 1965, and authorized appropriations for the preparation of the report.

The compromise agreement was to accept the Senate position of a 3-year extension on the National Defense Education Act titles, the House position on the impacted areas legislation, but the Senate position with respect to the inclusion of the District of Columbia. The impacted areas legislation, upon enactment of S. 3060 into statute, will expire on June 30, 1966. This will enable the Congress to give heed to the recommendations contained in the report required by the conference substitute, to address itself to further extension and, I hope, to an expansion of this legislation to remove inequities which many of us feel are now contained in these acts.

Testimony taken in conjunction with other bills this session has indicated to me the strong support on the part of many for modifying further the impact statutes to include larger metropolitan areas presently excluded by virtue of the percentage of impact limitations which are contained in the laws. Further, there appears to be strong support for broadening the definition of Federal impaction, to recognize the Federal interest in other categories of children than than those now presently covered.

For these reasons, it was the feeling among the conferees that we were well advised to accept the solution of the 1-year extension of these statutes.

With respect to title XI of S. 3060, I call to the attention of Senators the paragraph found on page 14 in the section of the conference report containing the statement on the part of the House managers which reads:

> It is the intention of the conferees that the Federal impact funds to be received by the District under Public Law 874 be used by the Board of Education solely for educational purposes, and that they be in addition to the funds made available for education in the District of Columbia budget. It also is the opinion of the conferees that, insofar as is consistent with good educational administration, these funds be used to improve the quality and standards of the educational offerings in the underprivileged attendance areas of the city. The Superintendent of Schools is requested to report to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Education and Labor on the ways in which the availability of these funds during the year has improved the educational program for the children in the low-income areas.

The Senate conferees fully endorse and agree to this intent.

Mr. President, S. 3060 is a major statute which fittingly culminates what can only be described as the work of an extraordinarily education-minded Congress. Much attention has been given by the 88th Congress to education and much needed legislation has been placed upon the statute books.

We have not, however, come to grips, as yet, with what I hope will be one of our major concerns in the 89th Congress, the provision of general Federal aid to our public schools. To that goal I repledge and rededicate myself in the years ahead. The work we have done in connection with S. 3060 should not be considered a substitute for what is needed. It is not designed to give specific categorical assistance in meeting specific problems but these additions are necessarily piecemeal. The major job lies yet ahead.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. When I served as a Member of the House of Representatives, I was a member of the Committee on Education and Labor. It was my duty and privilege to handle the impacted area program on the floor of the House of Representatives. It was also my privilege to serve on the special committee that handled the National Defense Education Act and to serve on the conference committee that considered that act.

Unfortunately, I am not a member of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of this body.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Montana permit me to say, however, that we have considered him an ex-officio member of our Subcommittee on Education. As he knows, we have consulted him many times on educational problems, because he is one of the best informed Members of the Senate concerning the educational problems that face the youth of this country.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I was about to say that I have had a continuing and special interest in this field. I feel that the effective leadership and superb chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Oregon in the educational field merit the plaudits of all the educators of America.

The Senator from Oregon has achieved in this legislation and in the legislation Congress has passed during the years he has been chairman of the Subcommittee on Education many of the objectives that the late Senator Murray, of Montana, and I tried to achieve in the Murray-Metcalf bill. Many of the benefits for which we fought but failed to achieve in the original National Defense Education Act, including a broadening of the impacted area program, have now been achieved. The boys and girls of America owe much to the senior Senator from Oregon for his effective leadership as chairman of the subcommittee.

I have brought this subject up at this time because the Senator from Oregon is discussing certain compromises that were made with the House. While compromises have been made by both Houses, no compromise on principle has been reached. They were the necessary and effective legislative compromises that all of us must make in order to recognize the legislative positions of those of good will who have different views. But never has the Senator from Oregon, whether as a member of a conference committee or in his position as chairman of the subcommittee, compromised on a basic principle.

As I listen to him discuss this conference report, and look back upon the achievements of the Subcommittee on Education in this Congress, I realize that we have taken long strides forward toward the kind of education that the boys and girls of America are entitled to. Educators owe a great debt to the Senator from Oregon. But, more than that, our talented youth—our boys and girls—who are in unfortunate circumstances and must rely on vocational education and other similar resources owe a great debt to the Senator from Oregon. I compliment him on this great achievement.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the compliments of the junior Senator from Montana, and I accept them in behalf of all members of the subcommittee.

The Murray-Metcalf bill did not fail; it merely failed of passage. The Murray-Metcalf bill of some years ago planted the seed. We are only reaping the harvest from that planting, because it takes time in the Senate to pass general welfare legislation. Ordinarily it takes from 8 to 12 years to pass general welfare legislation. Education legislation often takes longer.

It has taken 100 years to try to pass some major legislation at the Federal level. But at least we are working toward the end of making certain that every boy and girl in the United States has an opportunity to develop, to the maximum extent possible, his intellectual potential through the educational process. That is the goal.

The junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and his predecessor from Montana, Jim Murray, really prepared the seedbed and sowed the seed from which we are now collecting the harvest.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another moment?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. The Murray-Metcalf bill may have prepared the seedbed, but it has been the cultivation by the Senator from Oregon and his subcommittee that has made the reaping of the harvest possible.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Montana is very kind. I appreciate his comment.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I join Senators who are expressing congratulations and commendations to the able senior Senator from Oregon for his handling of not only the National Defense Education Act, but many of the other education legislative programs that have been before us this year.

As has been truly said, the 88th Congress will probably be known as the education Congress. Much of the credit for the accolades which this Congress will receive for the work done on education is deserved by the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Naturally, we in Florida are deeply concerned about the National Defense Education Act. I do not believe we could get along without it. On behalf of the people of Florida, I join in commending the Senator from Oregon for his able leadership in this field. It will enable the educational level of America to stay at the high standards which it has achieved. Without his leadership, that level could not have been achieved. We are indeed grateful to him. I join all those who are commending him.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Florida; but again, it is the committee and the whole Senate that deserve the credit for the progress that has been made.

The junior Senator from Florida has never failed to provide me with all the assistance I have asked for in trying to have meritorious bills passed by the Senate. He knew how necessary it was to have the Senate set a high standard so that we could come from the conference with a good bill. We have come from conference with a good bill.

While tributes are being paid, I wish to say that the chairman of the conference committee this year, upon my motion, was the Representative from New York, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. He did a magnificent job of presiding over the conference. His ears and mind were always open to reason. He weighed carefully the proposals that were made. He deserves high credit for our ability to reach a final agreement in conference on the bill now brought before the Senate in the form of the conference report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is an occasion which should be noted in the annals of the Senate.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has been responsible for more good, educational legislation than anyone, I believe, in the history of the Senate. He has shown his skill not only on the floor in managing the bill and having it reported by his committee, but also by showing his understanding, his tolerance, and his ability to recognize the other man's point of view.

In conference, he has been a stalwart supporter of the position taken so far as the Senate was concerned.

It should be noted that were it not for the extraordinary and effective efforts put forth by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], aided and abetted by such outstanding Senators as the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and all the other Senators on that committee, much of this proposed legislation would not have seen the light of day.

I know from personal experience—very personal experience—how difficult the load has been at times for the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

I express to him as majority leader of the Senate my gratitude for the fine work he has done, for the understanding which he has shown, and for the results which he has achieved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] from the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] under date of October 2, 1964, which covers this subject in part.

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

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
October 2, 1964.

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

DEAR WAYNE: I hope to begin my campaign rather shortly and I want to take this opportunity before I leave to tell you how much I appreciate your public-spirited leadership on National Defense Education Act, S. 3060, and with respect to all of the major education legislation approved by the 88th Congress.

No chairman of the Education Subcommittee has ever compiled a comparable record.

If everything goes well this November I shall be working with you again next year, and I certainly look forward to it.

Please express to Charlie Lee my gratitude for his very able cooperation and counsel.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

WINSTON L. PROUTY.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I again commend and congratulate the distinguished Senator from Oregon—one of the most effective Members of this body—for the fine work he has done down through the years in the field of educational legislation, among others.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am deeply moved by what the majority leader said. I am about to read the conclusion of my statement, in which I refer to the Senator from Montana.

My committee could not have accomplished the results it did, had we not at all times had the cooperation of the majority leader, the majority whip, the minority leader, and the minority whip in the Senate. We have been able to do this because we have had an understanding and cooperative leadership.

I am particularly indebted to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for his never failing willingness to cooperate with me in the presentation of bills at the time when it was most auspicious to present them with the goal of passage in mind.

I thank the majority leader very much. I am tempted, in view of the kind remarks that the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Vermont, and others have made, to extract some of these statements for future reference, and for the political education of the people of my State. I want Senators to know that I appreciate their generosity very much.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

EDUCATION NEEDS OF WEST VIRGINIA AND THE NATION ADVANCED BY PASSAGE OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1964—SENATOR MORSE LAUDED FOR LEADERSHIP

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, after careful consideration in both Houses of Congress, and lengthy meetings between conferees, the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964 have been returned to the Senate for final action.

As a member of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and as one of the Senate conferees, it has been my responsibility to participate carefully in the development of this vital legislation. In my belief this measure represents a meaningful move forward in our Nation's drive toward increased educational opportunity for all our citizens. It embodies the expansion and improvement of a program which is already proven in effectiveness.

I wholeheartedly congratulate and commend my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his energetic and efficient management of this bill. As the diligent and dedicated chairman of the Education Subcommittee, he has labored long, and I am confident that his efforts are being recognized by all Americans who are concerned with the future of our land and the well-being of its younger citizens.

Should the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964 achieve final congressional approval today—and I believe they will—important assistance would be made available to citizens and educational institutions in West Virginia and the Appalachian region. Here, where education must become the means for individual and economic reclamation, this measure will be especially significant.

For example, the conference report which we consider carries legislative authorizations which would allocate to West Virginia an estimated $6,345,773 under the student loan provisions of title II. This total would be applied over a 4-year period beginning in fiscal 1965.

Under the provisions of title III, funds will be made available to public and nonpublic schools for the acquisition of equipment for the teaching of science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects. These legislative authorizations include financial aid for State administration and supervision, and would total nearly $5 million during the next 4 fiscal years.

Guidance, counseling and testing are educational services which are recognized as being especially vital in West Virginia. Under title V of the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964, the State would be authorized an estimated $1.1 million to improve and expand these functions.

It is evident, then, that under these three titles alone the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964 would be worth an estimated $12.4 million to West Virginia during the next 4 fiscal years.

Mr. President, I am confident that when signed into law by the President, this measure will have far-reaching effect in raising educational standards and broadening educational opportunity in all parts of our Nation. Education is the key to America's future and ultimately, our strongest weapon in the continuing struggle for the freedom and dignity of man. I support without reservation the conference report which is before us, and earnestly urge speedy Senate passage of the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964.

Mr. President, I particularly desire to call attention to the matter of the reading provisions which have been emphasized by the diligence of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The Senator has been most gracious in referring to my interest in the subject matter, not only in the subcommittee and the committee, but also, and especially, in the conference committee. Merited recognition has also been given to the Senator from Vermont for his intense interest in this subject.

In West Virginia, as was set forth so cogently in a communication from the executive secretary of the West Virginia Education Association, Phares E. Reeder, we need teachers who are proficient and skilled in the teaching of reading to the boys and girls in our State.

A thoughtful and lucidly written letter from Mr. Reeder was especially helpful to the conferees in highlighting aspects of this problem as it exists in West Virginia, and in other States. I request unanimous consent that Mr. Reeder's letter of September 22, addressed to me, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

SEPTEMBER 22, 1964.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: In the 21 years that I have served as executive secretary of the West Virginia Education Association, I have been vitally concerned with the problem of school dropouts. I believe that our State was about the first in the Nation to make a study of this problem. That was conducted in the late 1940's and has been continued since then. Now this matter has become a major national concern.

As a result of these years of study in relation to the dropout problem, I am convinced that one of the major causes contributing to dropouts is the inability to read. I have discussed this inability to read with hundreds of primary teachers. The conclusion one must draw from this discussion is that at least one-fourth of all boys and girls who enter school will have acute reading problems. It is our belief that the greatest single need in the way of preventiveness lies in the training of special reading teachers who can give adequate time and teaching skill to these boys and girls who are destined to be school dropouts.

This brings me to the purpose of this letter directed to you. It is my understanding that you are a member of the Senate Conference Committee on the National Defense Education Act as carried in S. 3060. As I understand it, the Senate version of Title III expansion adds to mathematics, science, and modern foreign language the subject areas of English, history, geography, and civics. The House version appears to add only reading and English taught as a second language. I would hope that the word reading could be included in the Senate version and the conference committee prevailed upon to accept title III as proposed by S. 3060.

I already have set forth the reason for the inclusion of reading. I would hope that the language of the bill would be of such nature that select elementary teachers could be given assistance for developing themselves into special teachers of reading.

The further extension of title III to include English, history, geography, and civics seems to me to be most vital. Few people are aware of the fact that in our own State the public elementary and secondary schools have responsibility for the total education of more than 85 percent of its children and youth. In other words, fewer than 15 percent enter college. You see, Senator, we have for too long based college entrance upon those who are graduated from high school—being totally unmindful of the great numbers that drop out of school before the completion of high school.

I am convinced that the true defense of America is an internal one. The National Defense Education Act has only begun to get at the very heart of it. If we do not strike and strike hard at these educational deficiencies of our children and youth, we all shall stand guilty of the consequences of the future. A nation can be no stronger than the educational level of its people—an education steeped in the heritage and the moral and spiritual values that have made this country of ours so great.

Extending to you my best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PHARES E. REEDER,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, remedial reading is important, but there is also a basic reading which we need. What the conference has done in the report—which I am sure will be approved within minutes in the Senate under the leadership of the senior Senator from Oregon—is broad enough. Its scope is sufficient. Its recognition of need is brought to the surface through the use of the word "reading," which covers both basic and remedial reading. I think this was an extremely important contribution of the conferees.

This legislation represents not a handout, but a hand of compassion and understanding extended to citizens of West Virginia and other States. If it is not inappropriate I wish to paraphrase a poem of Ella Wheeler Wilcox. In that poem, she had spoken of the beggar who came and asked for money. It was given to him. Later the beggar returned. The money had been spent, but he was still cold and hungry. Then, a thought was given to that beggar. And, because of the thought, not the gift, he was given the inspiration to succeed in life.

I paraphrase that poem in these words:

> Our country gave to a citizen from its store. He spent the shining ore, and came again and yet again, still needy, as before. We gave a thought, and from that thought he found himself—supreme, divine, better educated, and crowned with blessings manifold. He is poor no more.

That is what the senior Senator from Oregon has done, not in the past few days, weeks, or months, but through the years. He has given of himself in this type of legislation which deals, not with the exploitation of natural resources, but with the conservation and advancement of human resources. I commend him.

I do not wish to indulge in superlatives. It is not necessary. The Senator has indicated that he might make a compilation of the expressions today by Members of the Senate. I feel that not only the citizens of Oregon, but also the citizens of the country recognize the achievements of the Senator. They will not forget the record which the senior Senator from Oregon has been writing for so many fruitful years, especially in the field of education.

To say that the Senator from Oregon is articulate is not enough. His words are clothed with meaning. It is not enough to say that the Senator from Oregon is astute. This is true. But his astuteness brings the leadership which is necessary to conciliate the differences in the approaches to basic legislation such as we are considering today.

It is not even enough for me to say that every Senator is knowledgeable about these matters. This is important because his knowledge causes him to be understanding. How necessary that is, as we think in terms of educational programs.

I remember the recent conference. The Senator from Oregon was constructive in compromise. But he was firm in conviction. He never failed to reflect the thinking of the Senate; and all Senators on both sides of the aisle are appreciative of that fact.

Mr. President, I received a long distance telephone call from the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who is unavoidably absent today. He is a valued member of the Subcommittee on Education. He wanted to have a part in what was said in commendation of the Senator from Oregon. He asked me to express for him his gratitude for having worked with this subcommittee on this important legislation, but he also wanted to be recorded as one of those who recognized and applauded the continuing service of the Senator from Oregon in the field of education.

I believe that all Senators could in essence join in these words of praise.

We are most grateful. I am very conscious of the privilege which has been accorded me to stand for, with, and perhaps even behind the Senator from Oregon as he has moved the educational programs of this country forward. To have served with him has been a privilege that I shall always cherish.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from West Virginia, in all humility, that once more I am his beneficiary, greatly enriched by his expression of confidence. But I repeat that we did whatever was done in the bill together, and I think this is a fitting time to say to him and to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] that their insistence on the institute authorizations in the bill, so that we have a very broad institute authorization, will make it possible for many teachers in this country, particularly of both English and reading, to take refresher courses and be brought up to date on the latest techniques that have been developed for the handling of reading problem cases in the schools. The knowledge that the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Vermont have in regard to this problem is one of the greatest contributions to the bill.

The Senator will remember that there was an attempt to get us to weaken the institute program. That is what I meant when I said earlier in my speech that the Senator from West Virginia has that great ability to sit patiently and respectfully until he hears all sides, and then he makes it very clear that he will not go along, unless the committee is willing to follow where the facts lead. The facts made very clear that the institute programs should be supported. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are more responsible than any of the rest of us for getting the institute section in its broad scope into the bill.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The 88th Congress has been one of the greatest Congresses we have ever had. That statement is true certainly in the field of rights, in the field of economics, and in the field of peace. The achievements of this Congress in those fields have been outstanding in American history.

But nowhere have our achievements been more sharp, clear, or obvious than in what I believe must be this most important domestic concern of our Nation. That is in the field of education.

Today the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is once again shepherding a great education measure on the floor of the Senate—the conference report on the National Defense Education Act.

The conference report, which is excellent in every respect, provides for an extension, an expansion, and an improvement of the National Defense Education Act.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon is a most unusual Senator. I am sure all of us would have to agree that if we were to select any Senator out of the 100 Senators for unusual qualities, we would select the Senator from Oregon perhaps as No. 1. He is unusual because he is superlatively able. I do not know of any man more able than the Senator from Oregon. He is highly articulate, he is very persuasive, and has infinite charm.

At the same time, all of us at one time or another have vigorously disagreed with the Senator from Oregon. As one who has been in a number of liberal fights on the side of the Senator from Oregon, I say that even when we are working together the Senator from Oregon is not the easiest colleague with whom to work. But that is because he is an independent soul, because he has deep convictions, and because he knows when he should not and must not compromise.

At the same time, I do not believe there is a more effective legislative artisan in the Senate than the Senator from Oregon. The reason that the 88th Congress is perhaps the greatest educational Congress in history—certainly, the greatest in 100 years—is not an accident. It is not because the time has come for educational legislation. It is because there is in the Senate a man who is deeply dedicated to education, a man of extraordinary ability, and a man who has been able to produce again and again. The schoolchildren of America, the teachers of America, and the parents of America should be grateful for WAYNE MORSE. They do not have a better friend in the U.S. Senate or a man who has done more for them.

So far as the strength of our country is concerned, our strength depends more than anything else upon the intelligence, the skill, and the ability of the American people. That is our fundamental resource; and the Senator from Oregon has done a magnificent job in contributing to the future strength of America. No man has done more.

Mr. MORSE. My friend from Wisconsin is overly generous. I assure him that on rare occasions when I disagree with my colleagues my attitude is impersonal and highly professional. It has been a great pleasure to stand shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from Wisconsin on many sound liberal causes in this body, because he and I both have sought to carry out what we recognize as our primary obligation—to find out what the facts are and to test them against the

question, "Do they support the public interest?" and then vote accordingly. That is our primary obligation.

I say from this desk to the people of Wisconsin today that that is the kind of Senator they have in the United States Senate in the person of Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE. It has been my privilege to count myself as one of his close colleagues in the Senate.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. I would not wish to permit this opportunity to go by without paying my respects and commendation to the senior Senator from Oregon for the landmark work that he has done in this particular field. I recognize him as a leader in many fields, but in the field of education he is probably the foremost leader. I salute him for a task well done.

I wish to comment on one particular phase of the bill which I know from firsthand knowledge is the brainchild of the Senator from Oregon. For the first time there has been written into proposed legislation a provision which would make the impacted provisions of the general law applicable to the District of Columbia. Four or five years ago the Senator from Oregon first stood on the floor of the Senate and made that point very clearly, succinctly, and correctly. I am happy to see that finally that idea has been recognized by the Congress as a whole. As a result the District of Columbia will receive approximately $5 million a year as its share from the impacted area provisions of the general law. As the Senator so correctly pointed out some years ago, there was never any real reason why the District of Columbia should not be considered in exactly the same light as are our 50 States.

For his work in relation to that one item, as well as all items in the bill, I salute the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada has spoken about leadership. He is my leader. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] is chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia of which I have the privilege of being a member. He and I have stood together on the District of Columbia Committee seeking to obtain recognition for the District of Columbia in connection with impacted area benefits. As the Senator from Nevada has pointed out, there has been no logical reason for not including the District of Columbia these many years. We are squeezed between Maryland and Virginia, both States being the beneficiaries of millions of dollars of grants under the impacted areas legislation. We all know that in the District of Columbia there are some schools that particularly need the aid. I have brought out earlier in my statement that we have a commitment from the school authorities in the District that the money will be spent in the poorer schools in the District where it is most sorely needed. It appears that schools in such areas will receive the benefit annually of approximately $4.5 million to $5 million.

But again I say that no one Senator did it alone. I had the support of the District of Columbia Committee, and its able chairman, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. I had the support of many Senators on the Education Subcommittee, most of whom either now serve, or have served, on the Senate District Committee. Senator RANDOLPH, as I recall, served, when in the other body, as chairman of the House District Committee.

We happen to be the vehicle for the deliverance of the impacted area legislation. I am very proud that we have righted a wrong, that had existed for too long a time, through this conference report.

Mr. President, once again I wish to express my thanks to my colleagues who have stood shoulder to shoulder with me in this session in working the will of the Senate on educational legislation. On behalf of the Education Subcommittee, I express to our majority leader and to our assistant majority leader our deep thanks for the way in which they have, at every opportunity, smoothed our legislative path and strongly supported the goals of our legislation.

I particularly thank the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the majority leader, for his never failing cooperation with our committee for scheduling legislation at the most auspicious times as recommended by the committee.

We are indebted to them and to the many Senators on both sides of the aisle who have supported the position of the committee.

We are grateful, too, for the leadership of the administration from the President, and from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through every echelon of the Office of Education. I thank them for the counsel and advice we have received. The strong case that has been made for this bill and for the others could not have been made without the factual evidence and policy decisions which were taken downtown. Secretary Celebrezze and Assistant Secretary Wilbur Cohen were always available when they were needed.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I conducted what I jocularly referred to as seminars. I would ask members from the executive departments to attend our seminars as "students." I would assign to them what I called term papers when we called for research into particular subjects. The work would be assigned to them or to their assistants, who would submit reports.

Upon Commissioner Keppel and his staff associates, Dr. Peter Muirhead, and Dr. Samuel Halperin, fell, of course, the burden of providing us with the detailed informational materials which were consistently sought and invariably procured. On behalf of the committee I thank them and ask them to express to each of the departments and divisions of the Office of Education our appreciation for their magnificent and efficient provision of the logical case which was built in support of the legislation.

I wish also to express my deep appreciation, as I have on many other occasions, to the staff members attached to minority on the committee and to the minority staff members of senatorial offices who were unfailingly cooperative.

Mr. Mike Bernstein, minority counsel, and his associates, Mr. John Stringer and Mr. Ray Hurley, while he was with the committee, although fully fulfilling their obligations to the minority were also, on the noncontroversial items, of tremendous help to the majority staff. Mr. Tom Hayes, administrative assistant to Senator PROUTY, Mr. Alan Lesser, executive assistant to Senator JAVITS, and Mr. Norman Halliday, legislative assistant to Senator JORDAN, all were most helpful and cooperative in their relationships with the committee staff on this bill.

I do not hesitate to acknowledge my personal indebtedness, upon occasion, for the advice given in response to my requests by Mike Bernstein.

I feel sure also that the subcommittee would wish me to express my appreciation to the majority staff members on the committee, and in particular to our committee counsel, who sits to my right at this moment, who has with deft diligence taken much of the burden from our shoulders in the marshaling of the evidence. I am personally indebted to Jack Forsythe, Charles Lee, who stands at the wall at present, and their associates for their fine staff work on all our educational legislation.

They are, in truth, the brain trust of the chairman of the committee and the members of the subcommittee.

I wish also to thank the girls of the committee office who worked long and hard throughout the course of this Congress in the preparation of our evidence.

I am very appreciative of the help given the subcommittee by Mr. Bob Perrin, Senator MCNAMARA'S administrative assistant, Mr. Dick Yarborough, legislative assistant to Senator YARBOROUGH, the legislative assistant to Senator CLARK, Mr. Ralph Widner, and by Mr. Dick Royce, who is associated with Senator RANDOLPH.

Mr. President, this completes my presentation. I yield the floor, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks as attachment A, a summary and table relating to the conference bill.

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

ATTACHMENT A

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS (S. 3060)

Amendments agreed upon by Senate-House conferees, September 24, 1964.

CONFERENCE REPORT

Three-year extension of entire act.

Title I—General provisions

After reference to imbalances in our educational programs omits the language: "which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology."

Title II—Student loans

Increases authorization to $163.3 million in fiscal year 1965 from present $135 million, $179.3 million in 1966, $190 million in 1967, and $195 million in 1968.

Removes annual institutional ceiling of $800,000.

Extends loan program to accredited post-secondary business schools and technical institutions, public and nonprofit private.

Defines eligible institutions of higher education to make specific reference to public and other nonprofit collegiate and associate degree schools of nursing.

Eliminates special consideration provision for prospective elementary school teachers and for students with superior background in science, mathematics, engineering, and language. Replaces with provision giving priority for the granting of loans to students with "superior academic background."

Increases yearly limit on loans to graduate and professional students from $1,000 to $2,500; increases aggregate limit for such students from $5,000 to $10,000.

Authorizes institutions to extend moratorium on loan repayments (but not on accrual of interest) to part-time students.

Extends "forgiveness" to teachers in nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education.

Allows part-time students carrying at least a one-half academic workload to receive loans.

Title III—Financial assistance for strengthening instruction in science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects

Expands the program for equipment acquisition and State supervision by adding English, reading, history, geography, civics; increases authorization from present $70 million annually to $90 million for acquisition of equipment; from present $5 million annually to $10 million for State supervision and administration.

Provides for promulgation of allotment ratio biennially, and increases the minimum yearly allotment to each State to $50,000.

Authorizes schools to use equipment for other subjects "if there exists a critical need therefor."

Provides for the computation of the rate of interest on loans to nonprofit private schools for each fiscal year rather than for each month.

Title IV—National defense fellowships

Increases maximum number of fellowships to 3,000 in fiscal year 1965; 6,000 in 1966; 7,500 in 1967; and 7,500 in 1968. In fiscal year 1965, one-half of the fellowships, and not less than one-third of the fellowships in fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968 must be in "new or expanded" study programs.

In determining number of fellowships to be awarded for study at any one institution, Commissioner must consider national and regional need for facilities.

Limits award to include any person studying for a Ph. D. and intending to teach, or continue to teach, in an institution of higher education.

No awards for study at a "school or department or divinity."

Adjusts fellowship stipends for full calendar year of study and permits awards for any 3 years of graduate study.

Title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing

Increase authorizations to $24 million in fiscal year 1965 from present $17.5 million; $24.5 million in 1966; $30 million in 1967; and $30 million in 1968.

Extends program to all elementary grades, public junior colleges, and public technical institutes.

Authorizes guidance and counseling institutes at not less than the present level of $7.25 million. These institutes are for counseling and guidance personnel in elementary or secondary schools, or in institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and technical institutes). Stipends may be paid to all who attend institutes.

Title VI—Language development

Increases authorization for language development program (VI–A) to $13 million in fiscal year 1965 from present $8 million; $14 million in 1966; $16 million in 1967; and $18 million in 1968.

Modern language institutes (see title XI).

Title X—Administration and improvement of State statistical services

Requires State agency to keep records and afford access thereto.

Requires accounting procedures to assure proper disbursement of Federal funds, "including such funds paid by the State to the local educational agencies."

Title XI—Training institutes

Authorizes $32.75 million each for fiscal years 1965–68 for institutes for teachers or supervisors (or student teachers or supervisors) of modern foreign language, reading, history, geography, English, disadvantaged youth, school library personnel, educational media specialists.

Stipends may be paid to all who attend institutes.

Federally affected areas

Extends the federally impacted areas legislation (Public Laws 815, 874) for 1 year and directs a study of the effects of these laws. Includes District of Columbia in this program.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE OF EDUCATION

National Defense Education Amendments, 1964

	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY					
Title I—Amendments to National Defense Education Act of 1958:					
Title II—Student loans	$10,300,000	$120,900,000	$191,900,000	$195,000,000	$101,000,000
Title III—Science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects	10,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	
Title IV—Graduate fellowships	9,950,000	44,698,500	87,973,000	123,937,500	91,312,500
Title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing:					
Grants to States	3,000,000	24,500,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	
Institutes for counseling personnel		7,250,000	7,250,000	7,250,000	
Title VI—Language development	5,000,000	14,000,000	16,000,000	18,000,000	
Title VII—Educational media research		5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	
Title X—State statistical services		2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	
Title XI—Institutes for critical subjects	22,750,000	32,750,000	32,750,000	32,750,000	
Title II—School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Public Law 815		38,410,000			
Public Law 874	5,000,000	241,145,000			
Subtotal	66,000,000	631,403,500	473,623,000	514,687,500	192,312,500
Administrative expenses:					
Personnel compensation	454,440	840,000	885,000	885,000	477,000
Other	545,560	711,000	750,000	750,000	403,000
Subtotal	1,000,000	1,551,000	1,635,000	1,635,000	880,000
Total new obligational authority	67,000,000	632,954,500	475,258,000	516,322,500	193,192,500
EXPENDITURES					
National Defense Education Act:					
Title II—Student loans	10,300,000	120,900,000	191,900,000	195,000,000	101,000,000
Title III—Science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects	10,000,000	97,840,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	2,160,000
Title IV—Graduate fellowships		9,950,000	44,698,500	87,973,000	123,937,500
Title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing:					
Grants to States	3,000,000	24,500,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	
Institutes for counseling personnel		2,175,000	7,250,000	7,250,000	5,075,000
Title VI—Language development	800,000	6,440,000	14,320,000	16,320,000	15,120,000
Title VII—Educational media research		1,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	4,000,000
Title X—State statistical services		2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	
Title XI—Institutes for critical subjects	13,650,000	28,750,000	32,750,000	32,750,000	13,100,000
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Public Law 815		1,921,000	23,046,000	9,602,000	3,841,000
Public Law 874	3,350,000	163,217,000	79,578,000		
Subtotal	41,100,000	459,443,000	531,292,500	486,645,000	268,233,500
Administrative expenses	920,000	1,507,000	1,628,000	1,635,000	941,000
Total expenditures	42,020,000	460,950,000	532,920,500	488,280,000	269,174,500
Number of positions	85	135	135	135	80
Man-years of employment	54	122	131	131	80

Mr. HART. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, may I briefly express some thoughts?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. I have listened to the expressions of appreciation and praise voiced about the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] by others of my colleagues here. I share in each of those expressions. Some were couched in language I would not be able to master if I had time carefully to write it. But the main thought which underlies the feelings of each of us, I believe, is that Senator MORSE, more than any other Member of this body, bears the responsibility for developing legislation which serves the most precious asset which this country possesses. It is its children and its young men and young women.

If America is to succeed in this now very tiny world, it requires the maximum development of the potentials of our young men and young women. If we succeed in this effort, history will find, I think, that we have succeeded as a people because of that. If we fail, history may note the United States as a nation which occupied the center of the stage, as some other nations have, but then became, as other once-leading nations, a footnote in history.

So I think there is no greater responsibility borne by the Senate than that borne by the chairman of the Education Committee. This conference report is a dramatic demonstration of the effectiveness with which he carries that responsibility and the leadership he gives us.

This conference report reflects, if I may be very practical about it, the shrewdness, the astuteness, of the Senator from Oregon as a bargainer.

We ought to look at the figures authorized by the Senate version for the purpose of education and its broad ramifications, then at the figures the House proposed, and then at the figures which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] brings before us in the conference report. Rounding out the dollars, we find that the Senator's version proposed the amount of $1,870,000,000. The House version would have limited the figure to $1,180,000,000. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] presents a conference bill which authorizes $1,800 million.

This is one little rule of thumb by which the people of America may measure the effectiveness of the Senator from Oregon.

I am delighted, of course, to see the substantial sums that will be coming to Michigan under titles 2 and 3. Beyond that, I am grateful that the cause which the Senator from Oregon has undertaken and advocated for some years has been brought closer to fruition. For example, loan forgiveness and institute stipends are now available to teachers in nonpublic as well as public institutions.

I could continue by citing other improvements in the bill, but I want to sum up simply by saying that I am the father of eight children, and I know the excellence of their educational opportunity will be measured in part by what we in the Congress do. Nothing America undertakes, including the race to the moon, has a priority greater than our responsibility for provision for the intellectual and physical welfare of the young men and women of our country who will be coming into adult leadership a few years from now.

Finally, I am glad that we have included all the disciplines, and not merely the mathematicians and linguists, and scientists, because if the mathematicians and scientists develop still more awesome weapons, it requires a citizenry with a balanced sense of history to decide and insure that they shall be prudently used or controlled.

So we come to the close of the session with no more dramatic demonstration of carrying out that responsibility than the proposal which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has before the Senate. I thank him for another significant contribution to America and its people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I respond by saying first to the people of Michigan that their two Senators have always given complete cooperation to my Subcommittee on Education bills.

They recognize that the greatest resource we have is our youth. Unless we develop to the maximum extent possible the brainpower of our country, we cannot keep ahead of Russia. If we cannot keep ahead of Russia in manpower, we had better see to it that we keep ahead of her in brainpower.

The two Senators from Michigan have recognized the importance of that fact, and they have worked with me with great cooperation throughout the years that they have served in the Senate.

The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] is necessarily absent at this moment. I wish the junior Senator from Michigan to know that, as a member of the subcommittee and one of the conferees on the bill, the senior Senator from Michigan has been of great assistance in bringing forth a bill which, from the standpoint of meeting some of the needs of education of our country, is the strongest bill that we have ever brought to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], who participated extensively in the hearings committee consideration, and who was a stalwart source of strength to me in the conference committee actions which have produced this extension of the National Defense Education Act and the impacted areas school aid, is necessarily absent today.

As I earlier indicated I greatly appreciate his contributions to the successful passage of this bill through the Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement he intended to deliver today be inserted 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 YARBOROUGH

We Americans are children of that phase of intellectual history known as the Enlightenment, a golden age in which men came to believe that a better life was possible through the use of reason and education. The 88th Congress has reaffirmed America's trust in the values of its ancient heritage, by the advances which have been made here in the name of education. This Congress has already passed the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1963, the Nurse Training Act of 1964, the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964, and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Soon we shall take final action on the last of the major education bills of the 88th Congress, the 1964 amendments to the National Defense Education Act and impacted areas legislation.

I should like to pay tribute to my chairman on the Education Subcommittee, the senior Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE. His knowledge of the educational need of this Nation is unsurpassed. His vigor in pressing the fight for better education is unmatched. Truly no man has done more for American education than has WAYNE MORSE.

The conference report on the National Defense Education Act extension bears witness to the negotiating skill of our chairman. I believe it is fair to say that the final version is very favorable to the Senate position. The program of loans and matching grants to schools for the purchase of equipment was broadened to include materials for the teaching of English, reading, history, geography, and civics. The institutes for the advanced training of teachers were expanded to include teachers of English, history, and geography. School librarians, education media specialists, and teachers of handicapped children were also added. The authorization for loans for college students was increased by steps to $195 million in 1968. The number of graduate followships was increased by steps to 7,500 in 1967 and 1968.

Aid for education can be justified from many levels—from National, State, and local governments, from foundations, from labor and business, and from individuals. As an elected official from my State, I have worked at the Federal level for programs to aid Texas education. In 1963 the programs authorized by the National Defense Education Act contributed $9.7 million to Texas education. In that same year the Office of Education spent a total of $29.4 million on all its educational programs in Texas. Estimated figures for 1964 are $11.9 million under the National Defense Education Act and $51.4 million for all programs administered by the Office of Education.

I am hopeful that the achievements of the 88th Congress, the "education Congress," will point out the need for devoting more resources to the improvement of education in this country. For although the Federal Government has taken the lead, it cannot and should not bear the burden alone. I look to the future with confidence that the challenge thrown down by the Education Congress will be accepted across the land and that a new era for the cause of education will have come into being these past 2 years.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, S. 3060, the National Defense Education Act amendments bill is a forward-looking measure of considerable significance to Vermont and the Nation.

Vermont's current allotment for student loan money is about $466,000. The bill would raise this allotment gradually over a four fiscal year period to $673,000.

Nonpublic schools in Vermont are currently eligible to receive loans for equipment in the amount of $24,291. This figure will go up to $31,232 for this fiscal year and for each of the following 3 years.

Grants to Vermont for supervisory purposes will go from the present $20,000 to $50,000 annually.

Moreover, Vermont which is now eligible for an allotment of $50,000 for guidance, counseling, and testing will see that allotment gradually increased to $62,652 annually.

On two occasions, the Senate has approved my bill to extend loan forgiveness to teachers in nonprofit, private, and elementary secondary schools, and institutions of higher education. Each time the House failed to act on this measure. However, the loan cancellation provision was inserted in S. 3060 and now anyone who borrows from National Defense Education Act loan funds can get up to 50 percent of his loan canceled if he later teaches at a school or college—whether public or private.

Also embodied in S. 3060 is the language of the Keating-Prouty bill which would allow private schoolteachers to receive the same stipends as public schoolteachers receive when they attend National Defense Education Act institutes.

Recognizing the fact that present law should be broadened, the Labor and Public Welfare Committee is proud to report that our schools may soon purchase, by reason of this pending legislation, teaching equipment for English, reading, history, geography, and civics. In the past, equipment purchases could be made with Federal assistance only in the fields of science, foreign languages, and mathematics.

We have a good bill here—one which will tend to encourage a balanced emphasis on all subject matter. The bill is very necessary because there has been a danger that too much stress might be put on the sciences to the detriment of other areas of study.

In the Senate this has been a bipartisan bill. It was drafted with care and will improve our educational system without an iota of Federal control.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the estimated authorizations for the State of Vermont under amendments to the National Defense Education Act.

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

Estimated authorizations for the State of Vermont under amendments to the National Defense Education Act (conference version)

	Current allotment, fiscal year 1965	Authorization			
		1965	1966	1967	1968
Title II student loans	$466,044	$563,741	$618,975	$655,914	$673,175
Title III instructional assistance grants to States for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling:					
Loans for nonpublic schools	24,291	31,232	31,232	31,232	31,232
Grants for public schools	157,984	203,123	203,123	203,123	203,123
Grants to States for supervision	20,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Grants for guidance, counseling, and testing	50,000	50,074	51,124	62,652	62,652

Mr. PROUTY. Again, Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, and, indeed, all the members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and I express my heartfelt thanks to Mr. Charles Lee, Mr. Mike Bernstein, and Mr. Jack Forsythe, whose counsel proved to be invaluable.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Vermont on the statement he has made. I congratulate him personally for the fine work he has done as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee handling educational matters. Down through the years he has been a stalwart in this field. His contributions have been great, and his understanding of the needs in this particular area have always been to the point, and always nonpartisan.

In addition to what I have had to say about the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, I feel credit should go also to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who is on the floor, and who contributed so much to this accomplishment; also to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

In addition to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who now has the floor, I think we also want to recognize the fact that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has made many worthwhile contributions, as has also the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who participated in these meetings and although on occasions he disagreed, he nevertheless did make many contributions.

Finally I believe the committee as a whole is entitled to the thanks of the Congress and the Nation.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished majority leader for his generous remarks concerning me and other members of the committee. I agree wholeheartedly that every member who served on the Education Subcommittee and on the full committee have participated to a great degree in the interest of a better educational system in this country.

I share the majority leader's view that all members of the subcommittee and the full committee are entitled to a great deal of praise from those who are really interested in and concerned with one of the major problems which we must face as a nation, namely, adequate education for our boys and girls, if we are to maintain the freedoms and the type of government which we have now, and our position in the world tomorrow. I am very grateful to the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator from Oregon will help me at the moment—I gather that Senators are discussing the NDEA conference report.

Mr. MORSE. I have explained the conference report. As I said before the Senator entered the Chamber, I am greatly indebted, as is the entire committee, to the Senator from New York for the cooperation and leadership he extended to us in bringing about what I think is one of the major bills on education that this Congress has considered in many decades.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe this Congress will go down as the "Education Congress." We owe a great debt of gratitude to the senior Senator from Oregon. On many matters he often finds himself challenged by a majority of the Senate, as I do, too.

When it comes to education, however, I think he has shown such a delicacy of leadership in terms of exactly what could and could not be done that the whole country should be grateful to him.

This achievement, which has often been effectuated by him, notwithstanding his own deeply held convictions on many occasions to the contrary, because of the vast requirements of American education, makes the adoption of the report a sort of summing up of the accomplishments of this Congress in this field. It should be deeply gratifying to the Senator from Oregon.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from New York has stood in my position, a comparable position, so many times that he knows how appreciative I am of those kind words. I want the Senator from New York to know how much I appreciate his strong leadership in the field of education—and on all other fields in the Senate, for that matter. The Senate would not be the great body it is, and that we agree it is, without the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I feel exactly that way about the Senator from Oregon.

One of the most signal achievements of the bill is to enlarge the horizon of the particular educational disciplines which relate to the national defense, more nearly an approach as to what they really should do, than what they have been under the National Defense Education Act up to now. I consider the addition of history, geography, and civics, along with English and reading, to be at long last an adult recognition of what it means to arm people with education for their own security and their own defense.

I am sure the Senate will approve the conference report; I am delighted that the House has approved it. As the days go by, every person who is being educated in this country, and the parents and friends of those people, as well as the citizens of America, should realize what a monumental achievement and

how constructive is this particular bill that we are approving today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the action of the Senate today in adopting the conference report on the national defense education bill is a further tribute to the effective work of Senator WAYNE MORSE.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, the distinguished Senator from Oregon has earned the deep gratitude of all those who are interested in advancing American education.

Many have called the 88th Congress the "Education Congress" because of the many pieces of legislation adopted which have helped to strengthen education.

Certainly this description would not have been possible without the tireless and dedicated efforts of Senator MORSE.

It has been a pleasant and rewarding experience for me to serve with WAYNE MORSE on the Education Subcommittee. I look forward to continuing our efforts in the 89th Congress.

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

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have already, in the absence of the Senator from Michigan, expressed my great appreciation to him, as a member of the Subcommittee on Education, for making the bill possible.

His generosity is very much appreciated. But I repeat that I did not do anything. We all did it together.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Michigan with respect to the field of education. I only regret that it does not carry over to the field of foreign relations and appropriations for foreign aid.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while I truly thank the Senator for his comments on education legislation, I hope eventually, as an educator, to educate the former president of the University of Arkansas in the field of foreign relations.

FAILURE OF PASSAGE OF INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS BILL AT THIS SESSION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it is common knowledge that intervention by the White House with Congress is responsible for killing the bill which would have given from $5 to $7 per month increase to those living on social security pensions.

Apparently the decision has been made by the White House that unless Congress would approve the administration's medicare program the bill providing for these increases in social security benefits was to be pigeonholed.

This decision displays a callous disregard for the plight of the millions of our aged who have been looking forward to this increase in their social security checks to meet their rising living costs.

For the past several weeks administration rubberstamp supporters have been shedding their crocodile tears in an effort to display their great concern for the plight of our elderly citizens.

Yesterday it had appeared that the conferees would be able to agree and approve the increased social security benefits effective immediately and then let the question of medicare go over for the determination of the next Congress. But yesterday morning when the conferees met we were presented with an entirely new 215-page bill which we were told represented the administration's latest version of a medicare proposal and we were given to understand that orders had been given by the White House either to accept this new proposal or to kill the entire bill.

This means that Congress is going home after having voted itself a $7,500 annual salary increase and a $10,000 increase for the Cabinet members while at the same time denying increases for those living on social security pensions.

This action demonstrates the political farce of this administration's claim of an interest in the welfare of our elderly citizens.

INVESTIGATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STADIUM BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the majority membership of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration in its approach to the investigation of the Baker-McCloskey charges, are acting like a group of small boys delaying a trip to the woodshed in the pious hope that something will happen to the principal before they get there.

Let us stop dodging around the issue and call the witnesses: Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Baker, Mr. Reynolds, and Mr. Jenkins.

Ask Mr. McCloskey why he paid $109,205.60 for an insurance bond, when the bill, by Mr. McCloskey's own admission, should have been $73,631.28.

Did this $35,000 overpayment represent kick-backs, pay-offs, and political contributions?

Did Mr. McCloskey charge these kickbacks and political contributions off as a normal business expense on his tax returns?

Does this overpayment represent an illegal procedure for making political contributions?

These are the questions that the committee should be asking, and these are the questions which must be answered before the American people will be satisfied.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does not the Senator believe that the name of Walter Jenkins should be added?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired. The Senate is still operating in the morning hour.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is no question that Mr. Jenkins should be called, as should many other witnesses whom I did not mention. I have cited only three; but those three should certainly be called at an early stage. We have a right to ask that the committee get down to the meat of the problem and stop the shadowboxing which is currently taking place in the committee.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Senator from Delaware. The people of the Nation are cognizant of the fact that he has done a great service for the Senate and the people of the United States in insisting upon a true and full disclosure of the sleazy business that has been taking place with respect to the Bobby Baker case.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. Just as in the case of small boys who delay a trip to the woodshed because the principal is there, if this matter is delayed until after November 3, the principal will still be back in the U.S. Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FILE A REPORT OF ITS ACTIVITIES FOR THE SECOND SESSION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be authorized to have printed in the RECORD, after the adjournment of Congress, a complete report of the committee's activities for the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

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

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS SALARY ACT OF 1955—BILL INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, at the desk is H.R. 12042, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1955. This bill was never referred to the District of Columbia Committee, for the reason that it was merged into an overall salary act. I therefore ask unanimous consent that H.R. 12042 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, H.R. 12042 is indefinitely postponed.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR THE JUDGES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS—CORRECTION OF ENROLLED BILL

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives transmitting to the Senate, House Concurrent Resolution 370.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate, House Con-

current Resolution 370, relating to the enrollment of the bill H.R. 5871.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution relates to a technical amendment and is required to correct an error in H.R. 5871, which is a retirement act pertaining to District of Columbia judges. It makes a correction in the act that has been miscited. I ask that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 370) was agreed to.

THE 88TH CONGRESS AND FISHERIES

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, probably no Congress in the history of the United States has labored as effectively in behalf of the U.S. fisheries as has the one which is now ready to adjourn. I have previously, and on several occasions, called attention to this.

"Significant Fishery Legislation of the 88th Congress" is the title of a speech delivered at Atlantic City on September 22, before the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, by H. E. Crowther, Deputy Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, of the Department of the Interior. Because it is such an excellent summation, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Crowther's remarks before the Commission be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SIGNIFICANT FISHERY LEGISLATION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

(Remarks by H. E. Crowther, Deputy Director, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, 23d annual meeting, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, September 22, 1964)

At the close of the 1st session of the 88th Congress the press referred to that session as being the longest during a time of peace with the least accomplished. Now that we can look at both sessions, a generalization of that kind would be incorrect, particularly concerning fishery legislation. The 88th Congress took more significant action concerning fisheries than any Congress since the 84th which took the time and expended the effort necessary to create the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956.

One measure of activity on fishery legislation in this 88th Congress is the number of committee hearings held on proposals that would in some way affect fisheries. During this Congress the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries participated in 37 such hearings. The real measure though is the number and substance of enacted proposals and there are five to which we can point with satisfaction. They are:

S. 1006 (Public Law 88–498), sometimes referred to as the subsidy bill but properly known as the United States Fishing Fleet Improvement Act;

S. 627 (Public Law 88–309), sometimes referred to as the State aid bill or the Federal aid to States bill but properly known as the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964;

S. 1988 (Public Law 88–308), to prohibit fishing by foreign-flag vessels in the territorial waters of the United States;

S. 978 (Public Law 88–424), medical care for fishing vessel owners; and

Public Law 88–205 which amended Public Law 480 to permit domestically produced fishery products to be treated as surplus agriculture commodities under certain conditions for the purposes of titles I and IV of Public Law 480.

UNITED STATES FISHING FLEET IMPROVEMENT ACT

The new law is in the form of an amendment to the fishing vessel construction subsidy law which expired on June 12 1963, to extend the life of that law from its expiration date last year to June 30, 1969. At the same time, the new law makes substantial changes in the earlier program. For example, the maximum subsidy is changed from 33⅓ percent to 50 percent of the cost of the vessel. The requirement for a finding of injury which limited the earlier program to the New England groundfish fishery, is eliminated. A new requirement has been added that the vessel be of advanced design which will enable it to operate in expanded areas and that it be equipped with newly developed gear. There is also a stipulation that the vessel will not operate in a fishery if such operation would cause economic hardship to fishing vessel operators already operating in that fishery. The committee report indicates that by "newly developed gear" the Congress intends that the vessel be equipped with "the most modern gear available."

Under the new law a notice and hearing are required prior to the granting of a subsidy. This procedure will be of great assistance in determining whether or not the granting of a subsidy would cause economic hardship to fishing vessel operators already operating in that fishery.

Another new element in the law is the authority for a subsidized vessel to be transferred to a different fishery after notice and hearing and upon the approval by the Secretary of the Interior of the transfer. Here again the law takes into consideration the protection of the economic interests of those already in a fishery.

Because the law will now have a wider application than it had in the past, it is anticipated that a greater number of applications will be received. The authorization for the annual appropriation of funds was therefore raised from $2½ million to $10 million. The amounts that will actually be appropriated under this authorization will no doubt depend upon the extent to which the industry moves to upgrade our deteriorating fleet by use of this program.

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1964

For some 6 years the Congress has had pending some form of proposal to provide to the individual States assistance from the Federal Government for research in and development of commercial fisheries. Bills in the 86th and 87th Congresses all took the form of a grant-in-aid program to be financed by a transfer of funds from the section 32 funds held by Agriculture. In some cases the proposals would have used our present S–K fund (which comes by transfer from Agriculture) and other proposals would have created a new fund for the purpose that would have been a twin fund to the S–K fund.

In the 88th Congress there were a number of proposals that followed this same pattern, but there was also a new type of proposal which would provide Federal aid to the States from a fund created by direct appropriation. It was this latter type proposal that finally won the approval of the Congress and was enacted as Public Law 88–309. This act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States through their respective State agencies which regulates commercial fisheries in carrying out projects designed for the research and development of the commercial fisheries resources of the Nation. Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam are treated as States. The act contains four different authorizations.

Section 4(a) authorizes the appropriation of $5 million annually for 5 years, which is to be apportioned annually among the States according to a formula based upon the amount of commercial fishery activity in each State. The funds are to be available for expenditure for 2 years and if not used revert to the Treasury of the United States. Projects approved under this subsection will be financed by the Federal Government and by the State government and the share of the Federal Government cannot exceed 75 percent. The apportionment to each State shall be not less than one-half of 1 percent nor more than 6 percent of the amount appropriated annually under this section.

Section 4(b) authorizes the appropriation of $400,000 for each of the first 2 years of the program and $650,000 for each of the last 3 years of the program. This money is to be made available to the States in amounts to be determined by the Secretary for the purposes of the act. The Secretary must give preference to those States in which he determines there is a commercial fishery failure due to a resource disaster arising from natural or undetermined causes. Under this subsection the money may be used for any purpose the Secretary determines to be appropriate to restore the fishery affected by such failure or to prevent a similar failure in the future. Projects approved under this subsection are to be financed entirely from Federal funds and the money appropriated is available until expended.

Section 4(c) authorizes the appropriation of $100,000 annually for 5 years. The funds are to be made available to States in amounts to be determined by the Secretary for developing a new commercial fishery. The funds are available until expended and projects approved under this subsection are to be financed entirely from Federal funds.

The fourth authorization is contained in section 9 of the act and is not related to the preceding authorizations. The section amends section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to permit the fishery loan fund established by that act to be used for loans to Alaska fishermen for charter of fishing vessels for temporary replacement pending the repair or the permanent replacement of vessels damaged or lost in the earthquake disaster of March 27, 1964. The charter loans are to be repaid only from the net profits of the operation of the chartered vessels after deducting a reasonable amount for salary of the fishermen chartering the vessels. This fourth authorization expires June 30, 1966.

PROHIBITION OF FISHING IN U.S. TERRITORIAL WATERS BY FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS

Foreign-flag vessels have been denied the privilege of fishing in U.S. territorial waters almost since the beginning of the country by an interpretation of the laws which govern the documentation of U.S. vessels. However, in all that time there has been no statutory penalty for violations and the only course of action open to U.S. enforcement vessels has been to request any violator to leave U.S. waters.

This situation was highlighted in 1964 when the Coast Guard apprehended Cuban fishing vessels fishing in our territorial waters off the coast of Florida. There being no Federal law providing penalties, the violators were turned over to the State for prosecution.

Public Law 88–308 provides a clear statement of the prohibition against fishing in U.S. territorial waters by foreign-flag vessels and provides for enforcement of the prohibition and statutory penalties for violations. The law also prohibits foreign-flag vessels from taking any Continental Shelf fishery

resource which appertains to the United States. As defined in the act such resources are limited to the sedentary species, that is to say, organisms which, at the harvestable stage, either are immobile on or under the seabed or are unable to move except in constant physical contact with the seabed or the subsoil of the Continental Shelf.

Exceptions are provided for either by international treaty or by specific authority from the Secretary of the Treasury under certain conditions after approval by the Secretaries of State and Interior and the individual State concerned. With the increasing amount of foreign fishing activity off the coasts of the United States, this clarification of U.S. policy concerning its territorial waters and its interests on the Continental Shelf will be extremely helpful in the management of our fisheries by both State and Federal agencies concerned.

MEDICAL CARE FOR FISHING VESSEL OWNERS

Section 322 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 249) provides as follows:

"(a) The following persons shall be entitled, in accordance with regulations, to medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization without charge at hospitals and other stations of the Service;

"(1) Seamen employed on vessels of the United States, registered, enrolled, and licensed under the maritime laws thereof, other than canal boats engaged in the coasting trade."

This section of the Public Health Service Act then goes on to list six other classes of persons who are eligible for such medical service. Under the terms of the quoted portion of the act, both employed and self-employed U.S. fishermen were provided medical services for many years until 1954 when an administrative ruling interpreted the word "employed" as not covering fishermen who were self-employed. The purpose of Public Law 88–424 is to restore to self-employed fishermen eligibility for the medical care in the section of the act quoted above.

This purpose was accomplished by this new law by adding to the classes of persons eligible for medical care an 8th class as follows:

"(8) Persons who own vessels registered, enrolled, or licensed under the maritime laws of the United States, who are engaged in commercial fishing operations, and who accompany such vessels on such fishing operations, and a substantial part of whose services in connection with such fishing operations are comparable to services performed by seamen employed on such vessel or on vessels engaged in similar operations."

Only vessels of 5 net tons or more are eligible to be registered, enrolled, and licensed under the maritime laws of the United States. In effect, then, crewmembers aboard such vessels will continue to be eligible for the described medical service under section 322(a)(1) and owners of vessels of 5 net tons or more who actually accompany the vessel and whose services are such as to qualify under the language of Public Law 88–424 quoted above will be eligible under section 322(a)(8).

FOOD FOR PEACE

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 (Public Law 88–205), enacted in the 1st session of the 88th Congress, contained one section amending section 106 (7 U.S.C. 1706) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (commonly known as Public Law 480). The amendment provides that for the purposes of titles I and IV of Public Law 480, the term "surplus agricultural commodity" shall include any domestically produced fishery product (not including fish flour until approved by the Food and Drug Administration) if the Secretary of the Interior has determined that such product is at the time of exportation in excess of domestic requirements, adequate carryover, and anticipated exports for dollars. The amendment will not be effective for the purposes of title I until January 1, 1965.

The new law will permit, under the conditions stated, the sale of domestically produced fishery products in the currency of the country of destination under title I of Public Law 480 after January 1, 1965. It also permits the products that qualify to be sold for dollars in foreign countries by means of long-term loans as provided for in title IV of Public Law 480.

These five legislative actions will not, of themselves, solve all the problems that confront the U.S. fishing industry but they will be helpful and they do indicate an increasing awareness on the part of the Congress and the American people to the needs of a historically basic production industry.

SIGNIFICANT FISHERY LEGISLATION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

(By H. E. Crowther, Deputy Director, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries)

Resolution 1—Concerned with the distribution of shrimp and shrimp products:

"Resolved, That seafood, including shrimp and shrimp products should be exempt from being a regulated commodity during shipment, whether or not such seafood shipments are part of loads which include nonexempt or regulated commodities, to insure fast delivery demanded by a scattered market and to avoid delays and excessive costs of shipment."

Bureau of Commerical Fisheries action: The Bureau has testified at hearings and has a continuing policy in support of exemption for fishery products.

We believe the intent of this resolution is to continue the exemption from economic regulation for fishery products. The Bureau agrees with this intention and has taken a positive position in this regard in legislative reports submitted over the years when the matter of regulation of commodities has been before the Congress. In 1963, we testified before a House committee on H.R. 4700 which dealt with seafood and other commodity regulations involving transportation. We also recognize the problem of fishery products being transported in the same truckload with regulated commodities. However, it may be extremely difficult to attain exemption for seafoods in mixed loads in view of all the other requirements that the Interstate Commerce Commission has to recognize in implementing transportation regulation. Nevertheless, the Bureau will continue to follow this situation closely to help insure that fishery products receive and retain exemptions consistent with efficient operation of the industry.

Resolution 3—Extension of United States and States fishery jurisdiction to 12 miles:

"Resolved, That the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission go on record as favoring the extension of the U.S. coastal jurisdiction over fisheries to 12 miles and the extension of the jurisdiction of the States to the same extent as the Federal jurisdiction is extended, and direct its officers and staff to present this position as forcefully as possible to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the appropriate congressional leaders."

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries action: Action by Bureau of Commercial Fisheries not required.

Resolution 5—Concerning the Atlantic coast offshore lobster stocks and fishery:

"Resolved, That the Commercial Fisheries develop and carry out a program to evaluate the offshore populations in relation to other lobster populations of the Atlantic coast, and make recommendations for the most desirable use of the offshore stocks, and further

"Resolved, That the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission go on record as supporting an American lobster investigation and assist the Bureau in getting the necessary money to implement the program."

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries action: The 88th Congress added $200,000 to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries fiscal year 1965 appropriations. A tentative program is being developed which will be discussed soon with an informal steering committee of the States involved. The Bureau's program will be centered at the Boothbay Harbor, Maine, laboratory, and will study the inshore lobster populations of coastal New England and the offshore populations. This latter population has been subjected to a rather intensive fishery by fishermen of the United States. Many fishermen believe this to be the spawning stock for inshore lobsters. In addition, Russian and French vessels have carried out exploratory fishing operations in this area which may indicate an interest in developing an offshore fishery for lobsters at a later date.

Resolution 7—To strengthen fisheries research program in the Middle Atlantic Bight:

"Resolved, That the Middle Atlantic section request the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission make the strongest possible representations to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to initiate a comprehensive research program of the marine environment and fisheries of the Middle Atlantic Bight, working in cooperation with the adjacent States and qualified private institutions; and further

"Resolved, That the Congress be requested to appropriate a minimum of $1 million per year for the next 5 years to carry out this research program."

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries action: Research in the Middle Atlantic Bight area by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries was increased in fiscal year 1965 through the addition by the 88th Congress of $200,000 for research on the sea clam. This species has been the object of an intensive fishery on the Continental Shelf in the area from New Jersey to Virginia. The fishermen report declining catches and a scarcity of sea clams.

This program will consist of both biological research and exploratory fishing studies.

Biological research will be centered at our Oxford, Md., laboratory. Preliminary studies were begun here during fiscal year 1964 and were financed at about $55,000. The additional funds will allow an expansion of these studies.

A Bureau exploratory fishing program for surf clams was initiated in the Middle Atlantic Bight last fiscal year. As a result of industry concern over the decline of surf clams in the present industry area off New Jersey, a cooperative industry-Bureau program was conducted during the last 18 months. Close cooperation with industry throughout ths program has been maintained with the Eastern Sea Clam Committee of the Oyster Institute of North America.

Two areas of definite commercial potential have been located—one about 30 miles off the Delaware coast and the second approximately 25 miles outside of Chincoteague Bay, Va.

The best catch rate achieved was 10 bushels in a 5-minute drag.

Under the present Bureau program, a systematic survey and evaluation of all potential surf clam producing areas in the Atlantic Bight area and off New England is planned.

RUNAWAY-FLAG OPERATIONS IN THE MARITIME INDUSTRY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in the September 18 issue of the Seafarers Log, editorial attention was directed to a problem which should interest all who are interested in strengthening, developing, and restoring our maritime industry.

I found the editorial of such great interest that I ask that it be printed in the RECORD, so that my colleagues and others may have an opportunity to read it.

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

The problems facing the U.S. maritime industry are legion. They include the steady decline of the domestic shipping industry, the hostile policies of Government agencies, which should be bending their efforts to strengthen U.S. maritime, but have instead adopted policies which are aiding its decline. Waivers of the 50–50 requirements of Government-financed oversea cargoes is another problem crying for solution. On the horizon is the specter of increased mechanization and automation aboard ship.

The SIU and other maritime unions have been attacking these problems with vigor, and although the difficulties are many and varied, they have been making progress toward solving them.

One very basic problem faced by maritime, however, is very little nearer to solution today than it has ever been. The problem of runaway-flag operations is not only one of the biggest difficulties faced by maritime, but is also a major stumbling block in the solution of many of the other problems. It not only has an adverse effect on the maritime industry, but both directly and indirectly is a threat to the security of the entire Nation.

The basic spur to increasing runaway-flag operations is simple greed. U.S. ship operators remove their vessels from American registration and register them under the so-called flags of convenience to avoid the necessity of paying U.S. taxes and to avoid paying the decent wages and maintaining the decent safety and working conditions which have been brought about on U.S.-flag ships only after a long, hard fight by the U.S. maritime unions.

This tax dodging is only one way in which runaway-flag operations undermine the security of the Nation. More directly, it undermines national security because it is problematical whether these vessels, registered under the flags of foreign nations, could be called back for use in the event of a national emergency. The "effective control" principle is a nice theory, but as recent political upheavals in Panama and Honduras have shown, "effective control" may prove to be no control at all. Panama and Honduras of course are two of the major runaway-flag nations.

The U.S. maritime unions were formed to improve seamen's wages and working conditions at a time when they were so bad as to be considered a crime against decency. Runaway-flag operators are now being allowed to turn back the clock on wages and working conditions, undermining the hard-won gains of labor. Seamen's lives are again being endangered by lax safety and maintenance procedures—a laxity which would not be tolerated by the SIU and other maritime unions. After lining their pockets with money saved on taxes and lax safety and maintenance procedures, the runaway-flag operators complete their "silver lining" by cutting seamen's wages to the bone—often back to the bare minimum levels eliminated by the rise of strong maritime unions nearly 30 years ago.

There are solutions to the problem of runaway-flag operations. The SIU and the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL–CIO have pointed out many times to the highest levels of Government that a possible solution to the problem would be to remove the tax loopholes which make runaway-flag operations so lucrative to the shipowner. This is one very promising solution to the problem.

Nothing can be done however, until the Government can be made to act—and up till now it has seemed that no force on earth was capable of moving the supposedly responsible departments of the Government out of their lethargy and indifference. The SIU has maintained and will continue the struggle to get action to end this evil.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MUSKIE TO ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, at the 13th Annual Commissioners and Governors Conference on Metropolitan Washington Problems, the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] delivered a stirring address on the problems confronting our Nation's metropolitan areas.

Senator MUSKIE is a leading authority in this field. His Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, on which I am proud to serve, has done an outstanding job of realistic study of the problems confronting urban areas and their governments.

I hope that Senators vitally interested in the orderly development of the Washington metropolitan area will read this important speech carefully.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator MUSKIE's address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE METROPOLITAN CHALLENGE

(Address by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, before the 13th Annual Commissioners and Governors Conference on Metropolitan Washington Problems, Arlington, Va., October 1, 1964)

By the year 2000, 85 percent of our population will live in urban areas, experts tell us. Here, in our own National Capital region, 3 million new residents will be added by the end of the century.

The pressures of a metropolitan America already pose the greatest threat to our traditional Federal-State-local relations, as well as the greatest challenge to the maintenance of a strong, representative, and flexible Federal system.

There are the physical problems. We face water shortages, transportation snarls, urban blight, and wasteful land use.

There are the social problems. We face increased juvenile delinquency, rising crime rates, and uneasy race relations.

There are the political problems. We face shifting metropolitan boundaries, fragmented local government, and conflict between the central city and the suburbs.

There are the financial problems. We face limited revenue resources and almost limitless expenditure needs; soaring tax rates in the suburbs and falling tax bases in the cities. State and local debts are mounting, while State and local revenue sources fall behind.

Metropolitan areas currently require: $600 million annually for sewage treatment facilities; $400 million annually for pure water; $200 million annually to rebuild each square mile of slums; and $1¼ million dollars annually so commuter railroads can stay in business.

These problems stagger the imagination. They tax our ingenuity as well as our purse.

The metropolitan area is a new type of community, one in which its inhabitants have little or no feeling of community. It is neither a neighborhood, city, State, nor nation. There are no anthems, flags, or mottos. Loyalities are mixed, and problems grow with growth.

While our population has skyrocketed, the land most of us occupy has diminished. In 1940 nearly a quarter of our population lived in rural areas. In 1962 less than 8 percent still lived in the country. The remainder, victims of a technological revolution, moved from farms to urban areas. Mechanized farming, hybrid seeds, better planting methods, and more efficient animal husbandry add to our wealth with continually less human effort. And as this agricultural revolution advances, even more rural Americans will stream into our cities.

What does the new arrival find in our metropolitan centers? Is his environment a liberating influence? Or does he see urban living as a necessary evil, imposed by a technological revolution that has made him an alien in his own land?

The truth lies somewhere between these extremes. Our cities are large and exciting; they house our cultural and educational centers. The standard of living, for most, is higher. On the other side of the ledger, inadequate transportation, excessive noise, dull architecture, and air pollution are strong barriers to safe and sane urban living. We have responded to the economic necessities and this press of population accompanying the transformation of the American landscape, on a haphazard basis. In spite of gallant efforts, we have not rendered our urban areas either beautiful or really habitable.

The press and flux of population made suburban development inevitable. The city—dirty, crowded, and noisy—accelerated this exodus. The city dweller fled in his automobile to find cleaner air, less congestion, and a slower pace of living. For this, however, he ransomed much. As one commentator put it, "he entered the land of 'no.' No storm drainage and no sewers. No curb, no gutter, and no sidewalks. No parks, no playgrounds, and no street lights. No fireplugs, no fire halls, and no firetrucks. No public garbage collection. No modern policing. No zoning and no subdivision control." Look-alike residential housing and gaudy commercial strip development quickly dotted the pastoral landscape the suburbanite sought.

This portrayal is both a historical analysis and a recitation of current events. As President Kennedy put it: "In a few short decades we have passed from a rural to an urban way of life, and in a few short decades more, we shall be a nation of vastly expanded population, living in expanded urban areas and housing that does not now exist, served by community facilities that do not now exist, moving about by means of systems of urban transportation that do not now exist."

How are we going to meet these needs?

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, in its report, "Alternative Approaches to Governmental Reorganization of Metropolitan Areas," explores various proposals designed to create a sense of community in metropolitan areas. The commission found there can be no pat solution for easing the problems of political and structural complexity at the local level. One approach called for the merging of outlying districts with the core city, thereby abolishing governmental fragmentation. Another, apparently more feasible, approach called for areawide functions to be performed by a regional government, with each local unit having representation. This federated approach has been adopted by only one metropolitan area in the country.

The establishment of metropolitan councils on a voluntary basis, composed of elected officials; is yet another alternative. Few

such bodies exist. You, along with 9 or 10 other agencies, have been pioneers in developing the voluntary regional council as a happy compromise between those who want no change and those calling for the centralization of all metropolitan functions.

The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments is the institutional recognition of the fact that yours is a regional community. More than 5 million people will live here in another generation. And most of this growth will take place mainly in the suburbs. This staggering increase will require a sharp rise in public facilities. Federal, State, and local funds will all be required to finance independently planned and executed construction programs. Greater coordination, then, is vital. For example, metropolitan water supply and sewage disposal projects demand an areawide attack and a cooperative program. No one level of government alone can handle such regional problems.

Your council understands this need for coordination. You act as a forum where members can meet and discuss common problems. As a study group you make recommendations to member counties, cities, States. But you have never lost sight of the fact that planning is of no value unless it leads to appropriate action. The adoption of the "Year 2000 Plan" and the construction of the Potomac interceptor sewer bear witness to this.

One of the council's most recent and significant accomplishments is receipt of a Federal urban renewal demonstration grant. The purpose of this grant is to assist in bringing together for the first time various local governmental data. This in turn will encourage a greater degree of standardization for metropolitan land use and housing classification. Federal efforts to bring about greater uniformity will also be aided. The project will demonstrate the feasibility of voluntary local cooperation as the basis for regional action. Despite these accomplishments, much work remains to be done.

The final report of the Congressional Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems, although dated in some respects, is still a fair assessment of the conference's basic difficulty. The report declared, in part, that "despite such welcome steps as the establishment of an operating budget, and the employment of its own executive secretary, the * * * conference has still far to go before it will be dealing effectively with Washington metropolitan problems."

The council has yet to become the authentic voice of the National Capital region. Metropolitan problems cannot be solved unless there are strong advocates able to reach and educate area residents, able to persuade local units that vitally needed action requires joint effort. The council must develop and fight for its own views on issues of areawide concern.

State governments must also bear a responsibility for encouraging regional solutions. Most States have tended to react to the metropolitan challenge in a haphazard fashion. The fiscal, jurisdictional, research, and planning needs of the large urban centers have commonly been ignored or handled on a piecemeal basis.

As a result, cities have turned to the Federal Government. This has alarmed many defenders of States rights. But demands for the preservation of States rights must be matched by an acceptance by the States of their responsibilities toward their major population centers.

The Council of State Governments and the Advisory Commission, the latter of which I am a member, have made several legislative proposals designed to assist State governments in meeting this urban challenge. If the States are to remain viable partners in our Federal system, they must adjust their operations and organization in light of the revolution on the urban frontier. Both groups, therefore, have recommended the establishment of a new agency of State government for metropolitan or local affairs. This new agency would assist the metropolitan areas with respect to the problems of local governmental planning, structure, organization, and finance. Neither Richmond nor Annapolis has such an office, although both provide some of these services. Such a department could also assist the Governor in formulating effective policies to meet metropolitan problems.

The national character of many metropolitan questions makes Federal participation necessary. Several existing Federal programs have already had a significant impact on our metropolitan areas. In addition, three current proposals could make a substantial contribution to orderly urban growth and development.

First, a dimension of the National Capital region's water pollution difficulties is covered in S. 649, which I introduced in the first session of this Congress. It would amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act concerning grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works. Of special concern to metropolitan areas is the provision that these grants may be increased by 10 percent for a project that is part of a comprehensive regional plan. The Senate, by a vote of 69 to 11, passed this needed legislation. If passed by the House, this measure will do much to strengthen the position of metropolitan planning agencies.

Second, metropolitan area planning would be further assisted by the enactment of S. 855. Senators HUMPHREY, MUNDT, and WILLIAMS joined me in February 1963 in sponsoring this advisory commission proposal. It was considered at length by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and unanimously passed the Senate last January. The bill would require—

1. Establishment of a legally constituted metropolitan agency, charged with the responsibility for areawide planning; and

2. An assessment by this agency of certain Federal grant applications made by local governments before being acted upon by the relevant Federal departments and agencies.

Planning Agency approval of applications is not a prerequisite to Federal assistance under this bill. But the proposal recognizes the role of adequate planning as crucial to achieving metropolitan objectives relating to open-space land projects, airport construction, waste treatment works, urban renewal, public housing, hospital construction, and urban highways. These projects would be viewed as part of a regional plan. The bill would strengthen the concept of a metropolitan community.

It would also establish a frame of reference for all Federal activities affecting an urban area. Programs covered under this measure must be related to each other as well as to local development, if Federal funds are not to be spent on conflicting objectives. Economy, then, also demands this full exchange of information among the political subdivisions within a metropolitan area prior to the allocation of a Federal grant.

And finally, I have supported proposals for the establishment of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs. Until now, the Federal Government's reaction to the emergence of a metropolitan America—like that of the States—has generally been disjointed, sporadic, and unplanned. Such a department is necessary for coordinating the numerous Federal programs that have an impact on metropolitan areas.

These three proposals for congressional action differ in many respects, but all have one feature in common: they seek to establish the foundations for a viable metropolitan community.

A memorable passage from Prof. Kenneth Galbraith's book, "The Affluent Society," portrays our dilemma. He described "the family which takes its * * * air-conditioned, power-steered, and power-braked automobile out for a tour (and) passes through cities that are badly paved, made hideous by litter, blighted buildings, billboards, and posts for wires that should long since have been put underground. They pass on through a countryside that has been rendered largely invisible by commercial art. They picnic on exquisitely packaged food from a portable icebox by a polluted stream and go on to spend the night at a park which is a menace to public health and morals. Just before dozing off on an air mattress, beneath a nylon tent, amid the stench of decaying refuse, they may reflect vaguely on the curious unevenness of their blessings."

Galbraith may exaggerate, but there is indeed an "unevenness" of blessings. Our citizens, and their representatives at all levels of government, are becoming more aware that action in the public sector must be as imaginative and progressive in providing the public service we require as the private sector in providing the luxuries we want.

Joint Federal-State-local cooperation and innovations in government are needed now.

President Kennedy said: "The challenge is great, and the time is short. Shall we begin?"

The council, just by its existence, represents a beginning.

Now, as President Johnson has said, "Let us continue."

U.S. CONTROL OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, October 1, 1964, there was a full-page statement which labeled nuclear weapons authority a "hypocritical hoax." It was charged that the President of the United States has been totally misrepresenting this Nation's control of atomic bombs—in the words of the ad, "damnable deceit, and flagrant falsification."

Mr. President, this Nation's nuclear weapons policy is an appropriate subject for national discussion and debate. However, one of the most disturbing elements of the present political campaign is the way in which the Republican presidential and vice-presidential candidates are dealing with the question of control of atomic weapons, the conditions under which they should be used, and the question of under whose authority such use should be implemented. The Republican candidate for the Presidency has espoused the concept that small nuclear conventional weapons—whatever that means—should be placed under the jurisdiction of the field commanders, a statement which he later explained as meaning the Commander of NATO.

The public debate thus far seems to have generated more heat than light, because it has failed to define the term conventional. In their public statements, Republican spokesmen use the term "nominal and conventional weapons" in a loose manner, when discussing atomic weapons; and in at least one instance, the "conventional weapons" referred to by the Republican candidate were interpreted to mean systems with a destructive capability equal to the bombs that destroyed Nagasaki and

Hiroshima. When one challenges the Republican spokesman, however, they explain the terms in a way that benefits their arguments in somewhat the way done by Humpty Dumpty, in "Alice in Wonderland."

In a conversation with Humpty Dumpty, Alice was puzzled by his use of the word "glory"; and she said, "I do not know what you mean by 'glory'."

Humpty Dumpty smiled contemptuously and replied: "Of course you don't—'til I tell you. I meant 'there's a nice knockdown argument for you'."

Alice said: "But glory doesn't mean a nice knockdown argument.

"When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said, in a rather scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less."

Alice replied: "The question is whether you can make words mean so many different things."

Mr. President, my point is that what matters is not what we Americans think we mean, but is what our allies and our enemies believe we mean.

There now seems to be agreement on at least one point: that the smallest nuclear weapon available is the projectile fired from a Davy Crockett launcher. This weapon is rated as having a yield equivalent to that of 40 tons of TNT, as compared with the 1½ tons of World War II "blockbusters." Therefore, it would seem that the definition of the word "conventional" rests upon the destructive explosive capability of a specific weapon, not upon all of the weapon's characteristics that one should consider. I hope I possess some knowledge of the characteristics of atomic weapons, obtained during 13 years of service on the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. The Joint Committee has been kept currently and fully informed about the size and the performance characteristics of this Nation's atomic arsenal. Based upon this knowledge, I would take exception to the application of the word "conventional" to atomic weapons of any size.

Let us talk a little about the characteristics of atomic weapons which the Republican candidate for the Presidency has so easily ignored, or perhaps does not understand—in either case, a disservice to the American public. All atomic bursts produce blasts, just as ordinary explosives do. All atomic bursts produce heat, but much greater than that produced by ordinary explosives. All atomic bursts produce nuclear radiation, either as bomb particles or as irradiated natural soil elements, or both. This radiation effect belongs exclusively to atomic explosions.

Consequently, the atomic bomb contains three distinct killing effects in one package. Blast and heat from a nuclear weapon can be used discretely, to avoid damage to the user and to a friendly country in a combat zone. Radiation contamination is a different matter. I am fully aware that the circles of damage from heat, blast, and radiation are concentric. However, heat and blast are transitory in nature; but radiation can contaminate land masses for long periods of time.

The characteristics of this Nation's atomic arsenal and, more specifically, the effects of the use of an atomic weapon are, therefore, greater than merely the damage caused by the explosive force measured by its equivalent in TNT. Forty tons of TNT when detonated would certainly have equal killing power, within certain ranges; whereas, the detonation on the battlefield of a 40-ton Davy Crockett would not only cause devastation by its explosive force, but would bring with it other disturbing characteristics. This is the crux of the problem. An atomic weapon, regardless of size, has the capacity to contaminate land masses and prevent early entry into the general area of the detonation, not only by the enemy forces, but also by friendly troops. Such contaminations would deny for extended periods of time the use of the land to occupants of the country unfortunate enough to be at the scene of such an event. By no stretch of the imagination can I see the wisdom of fighting a war with atomic weapons in friendly countries, as a means of freeing them from occupation or oppression, unless no other alternative is available. Who would set fire to his neighbor's house, if he were sure of starting a conflagration from which both he and his friend would not escape?

The second consequence of the use of atomic weapons is the possibility of escalation which then would result in an all-out atomic war and widespread destruction of both friend and foe, alike. This is not a new issue; no bolt of lightning from Mount Olympus has brought wisdom and insight to a fortunate few. The issue was debated during the Eisenhower administration. It was proposed by certain military leaders during the Korean war, and was rejected by both President Truman and President Eisenhower. The late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, explored the possibility of the use of such weapons to wipe out supply bases and lines on the mainland of China; and the Eisenhower administration was asked to consider their use when the French were losing Indochina, a decade ago. In each of these previous cases the idea was rejected by both civilian and military leaders, because of the possibility that the use of such weapons would irrevocably lead to the use of larger and larger nuclear systems, and would result in long-term damage to the people we were trying to help. The Republican candidate for the Presidency apparently does not think this is a real concern; but others in positions of authority and responsibility do think so.

The statement that battlefield communications may make it impossible to obtain quick Presidential approval to use such weapons, and the question of whether the NATO commander can, under certain specific conditions, use nuclear weapons on his own decision, cannot, and perhaps should not, be completely and publicly clarified, because of the security involved. I believe it would be wrong for this administration, in order to defend itself on this score, to reveal the instructions to American commanders in the field and the conditions under which they would be authorized to use such weapons without Presidential authority, if, in fact, this be the case. There is reason to doubt that, except during the actual moment of crisis, any President can say with certainty in advance that he would or would not use atomic weapons, or that he would or would not delegate his control to the NATO commander. The situation as of that moment would obviously dictate the necessary measures to be taken. It is interesting to note that for years the Defense Department has wrestled with the question of authority delegated to the field.

The chain of command in connection with calling up or using atomic weapons has been analyzed over a long period of time. All possible ways have been explored to achieve, on the one hand, the use of a nuclear weapon when a worthwhile target of opportunity presented itself, and, at the same time, to assure the necessary precautions, so that the weapon would not be used in an ill-advised manner and precipitate a nuclear war. Personally, I do not want sergeants in the field, however talented and well intentioned, to be in a position to make a mistake which might cost the Nation dearly. In realizing that the circumstances at any given time will require different responses under different conditions, it is much more important to know the character, maturity, and wisdom of those who would have to make that decision, than it is to know the details of the planning for such a decision.

The President of the United States has demonstrated many times the capability to act rationally and prudently in very trying situations; and he is not given to making decisions on the basis of emotion or the desirability of a power play which, if exercised at the wrong time, could bring chaos. He has the capability to stand firm in the face of adversity, and to pass judgment in a cool and calculated manner; and he has the capability and courage to deny the ill-advised use of power. I would advise against insistence upon any ironclad set of rules that would deny the President the flexibility of choice he requires in order to be able to meet unforeseen events.

The possession of great power imposes its own restraint in this nuclear age. Powerful nations, just as powerful men, can afford to be more cautious in the exercise of power than can weak nations or weak men, who must depend upon the element of surprise. To challenge the rationality of weapons management in the presence of the makers of such policy, without regard to the character and personality of those involved, is a disservice. The congressional committees, such as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy or the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee and others, have repeatedly examined this problem of control, and have accepted the system as it is now constituted, with authority for the use of weapons in the hands of the President. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has

repeatedly examined this problem; and while it may have suggestions for improvement of the control system—indeed, certain of its suggestions have been adopted, in general the system has been acceptable to the committee. One should not lightly set aside the judgment of mature persons who have examined the problem in great detail.

The other disturbing factor is that the Republican presidential candidate, being an active Reservist in the Air Force and a Reserve major general, as well as a member of the Armed Services Committee, could, if he had so wished, have familiarized himself in great detail with the methods and rationale by which weapons were to be made available to the field. But nothing he has said to date gives any indication that he has taken the time to do so. Again I deplore his choice of words, and the fact that he consistently uses the words "yield", in terms of explosive force, as a criterion of whether a weapon is conventional or unconventional. As the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has stated repeatedly. "There is no such thing as a conventional atomic weapon." An atomic weapon is different from any other weapon known to man, and its careless use would have consequences extremely unpalatable to mankind.

A rebuttal of this statement might be that if this Nation had taken the time and had used the money required in order to develop "clean" nuclear systems—whatever that term means—we could then indiscriminately use atomic weapons in combat safely, and without fear of massive contamination. To this I would reply:

First, bringing the clean systems down to less than 40 tons would be a poor use of fissionable materials in terms of efficiency and cost; and

Second, the mere fact that we were fortunate enough to be able to afford clean systems would not necessarily mean that the enemy would respond in like kind. The burden is upon us to protect our friends from heavy radioactive contamination. Our opponent would have no such compunctions. If he did not have "clean" systems, he would use whatever atomic weapons he had available.

Another charge, sometimes heard, is that the signing of the limited nuclear test ban treaty not only prevents us from testing "clean" systems, but also handicaps the development of devices for peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The truth is that there are presently underway surveys for the construction of a canal between the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean; and one of the methods being looked at very carefully is excavation by the use of controlled nuclear explosions. Some say the Russians never would allow the use of atomic energy for this purpose, because it would violate the intent of the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

I ask consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article written by Howard Simons, and published in the Washington Post of September 13, 1964. The facts contained in the article are substantially correct.

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

[From the Washington Post of Sept. 13, 1964]

SOVIETS REVERSE OBJECTION TO ATOMIC "DIGGING" IDEA

(By Howard Simons)

The possibility of joint East-West projects using nuclear explosives for mining and excavation was raised by atomic scientists from the Soviet Union and Rumania at the recent Atoms-for-Peace Conference in Geneva.

Though the overtures were made informally on a scientist-to-scientist basis they have aroused considerable interest among administration officials here.

The Soviet overture marks a dramatic reversal in the Russian attitude toward Project Plowshare, the Atomic Energy Commission's program for developing nuclear explosives for peaceful uses. Six years ago at the last Atoms-for-Peace Conference the Soviets accused the United States of using Plowshare as a disguise for continuing atomic weapons development during the moratorium on weapons testing beginning at that time.

The fact that both Rumanian and Russian scientists broached the subject of collaboration this year is significant, too. On a number of occasions American officials have said that the terms of the year-old nuclear test ban treaty inhibit wide use of nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes. The treaty says, in effect, that fallout from underground nuclear tests—which the treaty sanctions—must be confined to the national boundaries of the blast.

In the light of previous Soviet intransigeance American officials were never very optimistic that the treaty could be easily amended to exempt Plowshare detonations from this restriction. The United States had proposed such an exemption and the Soviets vetoed it. Now, however, Soviet interest in Plowshare activities, and more specifically in joint Plowshare efforts makes the prospect for treaty amendment less remote.

The first official U.S. response to the Soviet and Rumanian suggestions was made by AEC Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg at the concluding session of the August 31–September 9 meeting in Geneva. Seaborg said:

"Significant suggestions for methods of international collaboration and participation have been proposed by delegates from a number of nations. It is hoped that through such international support and cooperation nuclear weapons technology can be converted into a valuable research and engineering tool for the benefit of all mankind."

Positive action on international cooperation in Plowshare activities, in which the United States has a technological lead, may come next week when atomic experts gather in Vienna for the Eighth General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Seaborg will be at this meeting, as will V. S. Emelyanov, former head of the Soviet civilian atomic program.

It was Emelyanov, the Russian "Mr. Atom," who collared Plowshare expert Gerald Johnson in a corridor at the Geneva meeting and suggested to Johnson the possibility of joint U.S.-Soviet studies of Plowshare projects of mutual interest.

Johnson, an associate director of the AEC's Livermore radiation laboratory, was also recipient of a Rumanian proposal of possible collaborative Plowshare activities under the auspices of the IAEA. Specifically, Johnson said in a telephone interview, the Rumanian suggested that IAEA establish a panel of experts from interested nations to see what could be done in the way of international cooperation.

Officials here are already speculating on some possibilities for such cooperation. The simplest approach would be something akin to the Rumanian notion of gathering experts to review Plowshare progress and possible projects. The Rumanians, for example, mentioned some unspecified needs for nuclear explosives in their mountain regions.

Emelyanov told Johnson of his country's interest in using nuclear explosives for irrigation projects and for moving mountains to expose mineral resources. Tunisia and Egypt have been exploring the use of nuclear explosives to open up canals for commerce to the interiors of those countries. And Australia has had talks with AEC experts on using nuclear explosives.

Johnson, himself, suggested at Geneva that one possibility would be to invite the world's atomic experts to observe a Plowshare experiment in this country, and officials do not dismiss this idea as a future possibility.

Though AEC experts have not yet perfected Plowshare devices to the point where they are relatively free from spewing fallout in intolerable amounts the experts are nonetheless confident that such devices are possible in the near future. Experiments toward this end are continuing in underground test sites in Nevada.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there is every evidence that there does exist a real possibility of joint East-West development of nuclear devices and techniques for their use in civil engineering projects. Surprisingly, the possibility of such an agreement was raised by the atomic scientists from the Soviet Union and Rumania, at the recent Atom for Peace Conference in Geneva. They made the first overtures for such joint projects to this country. That reaffirms my faith that there is hope that the benefits of the peaceful uses of atomic energy will eventually be made available to all men.

The Kennedy administration decided early—and Congress supported the decision—that only the ability to respond with massive retaliation would not give this Nation a choice. All of the arguments presented for building up our conventional armaments were justified in my opinion. The term "conventional armaments" in wars has always had a specific meaning in the minds of military planners and political leaders. Does it make sense at this time to prostitute that term and to use it so lightly as to include atomic weapons, of whatever size they may be?

Some will say that to state that atomic weapons are different in character, effect, and consequences is merely to echo what has been said in the past about other weapons—from the longbow to the airplane. In "The Art of War," Machiavelli wrote of his concern as to the effects of firearms on warfare, and the need to study realistically how their devastating effects could be minimized.

All those weapons had the capability to destroy men—not man, but could not escalate as easily and quickly into a massive holocaust of destruction. Atomic weapons, regardless of size, can do so.

The Republican presidential candidate states that atomic weapons of small size will be conventional weapons, and will be used as freely as present-day artillery, automatic weapons, and the like. What are "small sizes"? All of mankind's efforts now seem to be avoid the proliferation of atomic weapons of all sizes, because of the fact that these

weapons not only inflict damage upon the combatants, but also have certain genetic consequences for men yet unborn. We cannot present two faces to the world. In our attempt to create the image that we, as a nation and as a people, abhor atomic weapons of all kinds, and that we work for the day when they will be abolished from the arsenals of the world, we must not, on the other hand, lightly talk about atomic weapons as conventional weapons to be placed under the control of men, however honorable, whose principal training has been in the art of warfare.

The control of such weapons and such actions must remain in the hands of calm and prudent men who, while concerned about the defense of the Nation, never lose their concern about the effects of nuclear weapons upon mankind. The loss of a tactical advantage, because of denial or delay in the use of atomic weapons in a given situation, might be to our final good, if the consequences of the use of such a weapon might be the destruction of civilization.

The Republican presidential candidate has stated repeatedly that if NATO were given direct command over nuclear forces, trained and ready, no single European nation would attempt to develop its own national nuclear forces as France is now doing. He just does not seem to measure the realities of the world. The mere placing of nuclear systems under the direct control of NATO to be used at its discretion, would not in any way have stopped the French from developing their own nuclear forces. The fact is that France, for her own special reasons, always has felt that, as a nation, she must have her own national nuclear force, to be used as she might determine necessary. What France sought was, not the possession of such systems, but the right to use them as she willed.

The Republican candidate for the Presidency also states that if nuclear arms were not placed directly under the control of field commanders or, as he later qualified it, the Supreme Commander of NATO, and if there were any withdrawal of our nuclear strength from Europe, the result would be that, if localized Communist invasion occurred, no real options, except full-scale intercontinental retaliation or surrender, would be left to the West. He also proposes that a nuclear NATO could meet local invasions on the spot with local tactical nuclear forces. To suggest such a thing as easily as he has done is like suggesting the use of a 75-millimeter cannon to destroy a mouse in one's own living room. We might eliminate the mouse, but we also would eliminate the very thing we were attempting to protect.

The Republican presidential candidate seems to accept the fact that atomic weapons of a certain size are the logical successors for the military roles now performed by correctly defined, conventional weapons. This view can be supported only by a selective use of facts or in ignorance of the facts. I repeat that there is no such thing as a conventional nuclear weapon.

Winston Churchill has said:

> Mankind * * * has got into its hands * * * the tools by which it can unfailingly accomplish its own extermination. That is the point in human destinies to which all the glories and toils of men have at last led them. They would do well to pause and ponder upon their new responsibilities.

Mr. President, I hope the American people will pause and will ponder the implications of nuclear weapons.

KEIFER GRAY—FORTY YEARS OF DISTINGUISHED FEDERAL SERVICE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, when 1964 comes to a close, it will mark the retirement from Government service of one of its outstanding public servants—Keifer L. Gray, District Director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, at Anchorage, Alaska.

Mr. Gray's career with the Government covers a span of more than 40 years, and all of those years have been with the one agency.

Four decades ago Mr. Gray accepted his initial post with Immigration as a Patrol Inspector at Marcus, Wash. From this position, promotions came to Mr. Gray at a steady pace. These advancements took him from station to station throughout many States of the Union. He served in New York City, San Pedro, in the Midwest, and in the northwestern part of the country. Alaska assignment first came when Mr. Gray was sent there as Deputy District Director in 1957. In this 2-year tour, Keifer Gray was found by Alaskans to be a dedicated public official; and his reassignment to Omaha, Nebr., in 1959, was viewed with dismay by his friends and associates. Therefore, it was good news to Alaskans when, in 1962, they learned that he was to return, to take charge of the Alaska district.

Those who have worked with Mr. Gray nominate him as tops as a friend, a supervisor, a man of warmth, congeniality, and generosity, and possessed of a splendid sense of humor.

During his two Alaska assignments, Mr. Gray has had opportunity to enjoy some of the magnificent sports-hunting and fishing which Alaska offers. Only last year he came back from a hunting trip with a close-to-record breaking Dall sheep. Those familiar with the habitat of this elusive animal know that return from the hunt with one is, in itself, indicative of the fact the hunter is a man of superb vitality and energy, for these prized animals are found in the rocks and crags of the tallest mountains.

In addition to his love of the outdoors, Mr. Gray is an avid reader. I also understand that he plays an excellent game of pinochle, and is a formidable cribbage opponent.

His working days have been busy and full; but he is never without time to lend a hand to one and all who turn to him for help. In 1952, while stationed in Seattle, Mr. Gray alone handled 1,200 naturalization cases. Understandably, in the 40 years with Immigration he has acquired a multitude of memories; but the one which he avers is most vivid is of the occasion when he traveled to the tiny village of Gambell, on St. Lawrence Island, in Bering Strait, to naturalize six Siberian Eskimos.

I am proud to have this opportunity to pay tribute to this distinguished American. I share the views of his secretary, Mrs. Helen M. Newberry, who says, "we all hate to see him leave, but we know he richly deserves his retirement."

WENDELL WILLKIE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, October 8 will mark the 20th year since the passing of Wendell Willkie, the Republican candidate for the Presidency in 1940, and one of the great Americans of our time. It is fitting that we pay tribute to his memory.

Wendell Willkie was the first world political figure after World War II to call attention to the revolution of colonial peoples for self-determination, and to our common responsibility for freedom everywhere, under the title "One World."

October 8, therefore, is an appropriate time to bring to general public attention the significance of the role Wendell Willkie played and the contribution he made to American unity in behalf of freedom during a difficult time. The President of the United States is, of course, in a better position to do this than is any other man. The late President John F. Kennedy paid tribute to Wendell Willkie in New York City. President Dwight D. Eisenhower paid tribute to Wendell Willkie in Boston, Mass.

The following are quotations from speeches of Wendell Willkie and from his book "One World," and are inscribed in an open book, made of stone, in front of a cross, with a crusader's sword upon a torch emblazoned upon it, at his grave.

ONE WORLD

(By Wendell Willkie)

I believe in America, because in it we are free—free to choose our government, to speak our own minds, to observe our different religions; because we are generous with our freedom, and we share our rights with those who disagree with us; because we hate no people and covet no people's lands; because we are blessed with a natural and varied abundance; because we have great dreams; and because we have the opportunity to make those dreams true. There are no distant points in the world any longer. Our thinking in the future must be worldwide. We must establish, beyond any doubt, the equality of men. The world is awakening at last to the knowledge that the rule of peoples by other peoples is not freedom. Freedom is an indivisible word. We must be prepared to extend it to everyone—whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin. The only soil in which liberty can grow is that of a united people. We must have faith that the welfare of one is the welfare of all. We must acknowledge that all are equal before God and before the law. Only the productive are strong. Only the strong are free. It is inescapably true that to raise the standard of living of any man anywhere in the world is to raise the standard of living, by some slight degree, of every man, everywhere in the world. Whenever we take away the liberties of those whom we hate, we are

opening the way to loss of liberty for those we love. The moral losses of expediency always far outweigh the temporary gain. The test of people is their aim, not their color.

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AVOID BOND ELECTIONS BY RENTING FACILITIES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, an excellent article in the Wall Street Journal of September 22 points up a "gimmick" which local governments have been using for some time in attempting to get around the need for voter approval to issue bonds. The "gimmick," described in some detail in the article, is simply to have someone else build the facility—a county courthouse, for example—and then lease it. The "someone else" might be a public employees' pension fund or a nonprofit corporation set up specifically for this purpose. These schemes are symptomatic of a basic difficulty in State-local relations; namely, the shackling of local governments by outmoded State constitutional and statutory restrictions on borrowing.

The technique described in the article is not new. State and local governments hit upon it many years ago, when endeavoring to get around constitutional debt limits. It is a costly device, for the quasi-public corporations that finance the facilities issue revenue bonds which bear an interest rate up to one percentage point higher than that of high-grade general-obligation bonds.

Local government officials, when faced with a compelling need to replace obsolete public structures and to build additional facilities, claim that this device is their only way to meet the needs of their people. Proposed bond issues, often requiring under State law—as in California—approval by as many as two-thirds of the voters, are being turned down by the hundreds; and in many States, local officials are hamstrung by outmoded constitutional debt limits which bear no relationship to present-day governmental needs. Under most State laws, revenue bonds can be issued outside such debt limitations.

Several years ago the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations looked at the local debt problem, and made a number of recommendations which, if followed through by the States, would help the situation. The Commission is a continuing national body. It was set up by Congress in 1959.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are members of the Commission, which is charged with the responsibility for continuing study and efforts toward improving the effectiveness of our Federal system of government. The rest of its membership is drawn from the Federal executive branch, from State and local governments, and from the general public.

In its report entitled "State Constitutional and Statutory Restrictions on Local Government Debt" the Commission concluded:

The Commission believes that the present maze of constitutional and statutory restrictions upon local government borrowing constitutes a serious impediment to effective local self-government in the United States. These restrictions handicap self-reliance of local communities and governments, and impel them toward increased financial dependence on State or Federal Government resources. In many States, present provisions have contributed to complexity and deviousness in local debt operations. The Commission believes that State action to remedy this situation is necessary and urgent, and should be designed to relate any State regulation of local debt more realistically to the ability of local governments to service such debt.

In view of the sophisticated administrative tools available to local government officials, the Advisory Commission sees no need for archaic constitutional and statutory provisions limiting local government debt by reference to the local base for property taxation, and recommends that the States consider replacing this traditional shotgun type of debt limitation with a system under which the bond market itself would provide a regulator and a safeguard with respect to local borrowing. Under this system, local bond issues carrying prospective rates substantially above the rate prevailing on high-quality municipal securities would be singled out for further scrutiny by the State government.

The Commission believes that decisions as to the amounts to be borrowed by local governments should be left to their elected governing bodies, subject only to permissive referendums, and that such referendums should be determined by simple majority vote.

In many instances, local bond issues fail because they are poorly prepared and inadequately explained. Many local governments, particularly the smaller ones, do not have sufficient competence to develop the body of technical information needed for a successful bond issue. For this purpose, the States should provide technical and advisory assistance to local governments; and the Commission has recommended that they do so. Only by vigorous action by State governments can the situations described in the Wall Street Journal article be alleviated.

I ask that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal of Sept. 22, 1964]

BYPASSING VOTERS: MORE STATES, LOCALITIES, AVOID BOND ELECTIONS, BY RENTING FACILITIES—PENSION FUNDS, OTHER BODIES DO THE BUILDING; ARGUMENT RAGES ON COSTS, LEGALITY—SPEEDY CONSTRUCTION A GAIN

(By Donald A. Moffitt)

SAN FRANCISCO.—On October 6 citizens of Santa Cruz County, Calif., will ballot on a $4 million bond issue to build a new courthouse. But they don't accomplish much if they vote no. County supervisors already have made plans to get the courthouse built anyway—by a method that may well cost taxpayers more than the bond issue would.

The technique they are considering is an old one that's being revived by a growing number of cities, counties, and even States to bypass the voters who have been defeating an increasing number of bond issues lately. It's a two-step procedure:

First, find somebody else to build the courthouse, school, jail, office building, golf course, or whatever it is that's involved. That somebody can be a public employees' pension fund or a nonprofit corporation created for the purpose. It can even be a governmental agency empowered to issue bonds of a type other than the "general-obligation" issues that must be approved by voters.

A CURRENT OBLIGATION

Then, rent the facility under a long-term lease that provides for the government involved to assume ownership when the lease expires; in most cases, this rent can be partially applied to the purchase price of the facility. Legally, rent payments under such a lease usually have been held to be a current government obligation, payable out of general tax revenues, with no special voter approval required. This is true even though the lease usually obliges the government involved to pay rent for quite as many years as it would have to pay interest on a voter-approved bond issue. It's even true if the rent payments go to pay interest and principal on revenue bonds issued by whatever body built the facility, as they often do.

As can well be imagined, this technique has been assailed vehemently by taxpayers, legal writers, and even some judges—though more judges have upheld it when irate taxpayers have brought suit.

Even many governments using the leasing technique profess to dislike it, largely because of its cost. The effective interest rate on leases of government facilities ranges from a fraction to a full percentage point above the very low interest rate on general obligation bonds, which currently averages 3.3 percent.

But leasing arrangements nevertheless have been spreading as government officials have found it increasingly difficult to win bond elections. Santa Cruz County will set no precedent if it leases a courthouse citizens voted not to build. A few localities already have used the leasing technique to, in effect, reverse the results of a bond vote.

BONDS NO—BUT COURTHOUSE YES

When the 56-year-old courthouse at Santa Rosa, Calif., was condemned as unsafe a few years ago, Sonoma County officials went to the people five times in 3 years with proposed bond issues to build a new one; the citizens voted down all five. But workmen nevertheless are now putting finishing touches on a new $4 million courthouse and jail. The county established a nonprofit corporation to borrow money, build the facility, and lease it to the county.

In Los Angeles County, male lawbreakers are hauled off to a $17 million jail, built under a leasing arrangement after voters defeated a bond issue that had been proposed for its construction.

To be sure, such cases are still rare. Far more often, public officials arrange to have facilities built under leasing arrangements without ever putting a bond issue proposal up for a vote.

But many are frank to admit that they are turning to leasing because they fear a bond issue would be defeated. And their fears are far from groundless. Voters did defeat 37 percent of the $5.8 billion in State and municipal bond issues that were put up for approval last year, according to the Daily Bond Buyer, an investors' publication. That's up from a rejection rate of 30 percent in 1962, and only 25 percent in 1958.

"In the Midwest, we broke out with a rash of public rejections of general obligation bonds," says William Ford, executive director of the Illinois Building Authority. "Some means had to be found to provide needed facilities."

REVENUE BONDS ARE DIFFERENT

This building authority was organized by Illinois last year to become that "means." So far it has sold $25 million in revenue bonds. The money is being used, among other things, for buildings and equipment to be leased to State colleges and universities, and for a new penitentiary to be leased to the State prison system.

Revenue bonds are retired from income of the specific facilities built or acquired with bond proceeds. In many cases that income consists only of the rent paid by the government leasing the facilities. Nevertheless, revenue bonds legally are in a different class from general-obligation bonds, which are backed only by the "full faith and credit" of the Government unit issuing them; unlike these bonds, revenue bonds usually don't require voter approval.

"We haven't had a successful bond election for general public buildings since 1940," says John R. Leach, deputy chief administrative officer of Los Angeles County. "The voters will go only for things like hospitals and juvenile wards." General-obligation bond issues in the county must be passed by a two-thirds majority, and officials say the county's urban sprawl makes such a majority exceedingly difficult to get. Voters in one part of the county, they say, won't approve bonds that would go to build a courthouse or golf course in another part of the county that may be 30 or 40 miles away.

So officials have taken advantage of a 1949 state law allowing public employees' retirement funds to invest in real estate sold or leased to governments. In the past 6 years the Los Angeles County Employees Retirement Association has built projects costing $87 million, including the $17 million men's jail and a $1.4 million golf course. It has spent $24.6 million on projects now under construction, including five more golf courses, underground parking lots and a courthouse, and has committed another $25 million for future projects.

All these projects are being or will be leased to the county. Thus they will add to county lease-purchase obligations that taxpayers already are feeling in the pocketbook. It's estimated that rent obligations, plus amounts set aside for eventual purchase of the rented facilities, account for nearly 20 percent of the increase in the county's property tax rate since 1959. The Los Angeles County rate currently is $2.40 per $100 assessed value, up from $2.09 in 1959; of the 31-cent increase, it's estimated, 6 cents was made necessary by lease-purchase commitments.

Some still bigger projects are now being planned for building under lease arrangements. Alameda County and the city of Oakland plan to lease jointly a $25 million sports coliseum being built by prominent local citizens (they include William F. Knowland, BARRY GOLDWATER'S State campaign manager).

BIG CHICAGO LEASE

Chicago and its surrounding Cook County will lease jointly an $87 million civic center which will house offices of many county and city departments. The center is being erected by Chicago's Public Building Commission, which sold revenue bonds to finance it.

Though no overall measure of the trend is available, Alan V. Barlett, statistician for the Bank of America, estimates that in California alone the State and local governments have incurred substantially more than $200 million in lease-purchase obligations. But he complains that "nobody can find out what the debt is precisely, since most of it is relatively recent and municipalities don't report it as a debt."

The municipalities are within their rights, under a California Supreme Court decision, in taking this view of leasing arrangements. In some other areas, however, there's still a question as to where leases belong in the legal distinction between current obligations of a government and long-term debt.

THE LEGAL PROBLEM

And the question is crucial. Most States prohibit officials of either the State or local governments from incurring debts of more than a year—or, at least, debts that come due after the expiration of the officials' terms in office—without express voter approval. If leases were to be placed in this category, officials would have to arrange elections on leasing arrangements just as they do on general obligation bond issues.

A good many people would like to put leases in this class. As far back as 1868, a Federal judge termed the classification of lease rentals as current obligations "a proposition in legal metaphysics that I cannot comprehend." Several legal writers are attacking it currently on essentially the same basis.

But this view is losing ground. A legal survey, already somewhat outdated, found that leasing of schools had been upheld recently in five States and ruled illegal in only two, while specific leasing arrangements for various other kinds of facilities had been upheld in all five States in which they had been challenged. The survey did find that State building authorities created to lease facilities to State agencies had been held valid in only four States and invalid in six, but the situation in one of the six, Illinois, has changed since the survey was taken. An Illinois building authority established in 1941 was held to be unconstitutional but the authority organized last year was held to be valid under a constitutional 1961 State law.

OTHER CRITICISMS

Legal technicalities aside, critics have other arguments against leasing. One, of course, is what they view as the questionable ethics of bypassing voters. Another, and frequently bitter, argument is based on cost. James M. Wiley, manager of Dean Witter & Co.'s municipal bond department and a resident of California's Alameda County, combines the two in attacking the county's plan to lease the new $25 million sports coliseum jointly with Oakland.

The county, says Mr. Wiley, is "being saddled with substantial nonvoted debt and unnecessarily heavy taxes for years to come." He calculates the proposed 35-year lease on the coliseum will cost county taxpayers 4 percent in yearly interest for a total interest cost of $21,655,000. A 25-year, 3.5-percent issue of general obligation bonds, he says, would cost only $10,237,500 in interest.

The interest rate on lease rentals is calculated in different ways. If the organization building a facility issues revenue bonds, the government leasing the facility pays rent high enough to pay the interest on those bonds. If no bonds are involved, the government and the building organization simply agree on an interest rate in negotiations. When pension funds are involved there may be legal requirements; California law, for instance, specifies that pension funds must receive interest on their investments of at least three-quarters of 1 percentage point more than the going rate on U.S. Government bonds. The State consequently is paying nearly 5 percent interest on some of its leases of public buildings.

FOR THE DEFENSE

Government officials have several arguments for leasing, besides the contention that it is the only way they can get facilities they need greatly but that aren't glamorous enough to appeal to voters. While many concede that leasing is costly, some argue that it isn't as costly as a simple comparison of interest rates would make it appear, and that in some cases leasing actually may save money.

If Alameda County were to hold a bond election for the new sports coliseum it will lease jointly with Oakland, the start of construction would be delayed a year or more, says William E. Davis, assistant county administrator. Since he estimates construction costs are increasing 5 to 8 percent yearly, he contends a speedy start under a leasing arrangement will save enough on building costs to offset part of the extra interest cost—besides which the county will save the several hundred thousand dollars it would cost to hold an election.

Alameda County, says Mr. Davis, already has saved money because of the flexible construction timing that leasing arrangements permit. The construction contract for a welfare building that the county leases from an employees' pension fund, he says, was awarded some years ago when there was a "minor slump in the construction industry. As a result, the low bid was $800,000 below the cost estimated by the architect. This was a very significant saving to the taxpayers."

AVOIDING COMPLICATIONS

Robert W. Christensen, executive director of the Chicago Public Building Commission, says Chicago will lease its new $87 million civic center jointly with Cook County largely because the participation of two government units would make general-obligation bond financing complicated. Obviously the situation would be snarled considerably if Chicago voters approved a bond issue for the city's share of the project while county voters turned down a bond issue for their share, or vice versa. Leasing, he says, not only gets around this but provides a simple method of splitting the costs; county and city each pay rent on the offices they will use in the center.

In some areas, leasing has gained ground because State constitutions severely limit the amount of general-obligation bonds government units can issue even with voter approval. The Pennsylvania constitution limits bonded debt of school districts to 2 percent of their assessed valuation. Harold O. Spiedel, acting deputy superintendent of public instruction, says this is so little that "if some of our school districts had to go to general-obligation bonds, they just wouldn't be able to build anything at all."

Pennsylvania law permits school districts to establish nonprofit, municipality authorities to issue revenue bonds, build schools with the proceeds, and lease the buildings to school districts. A statewide school authority operates in much the same manner, leasing schools to districts that, for one reason or another, don't wish their own authority. Since 1952, just under $2 billion worth of Pennsylvania school construction has been financed through these agencies, nearly two-thirds of it in the past 6 years.

RESOLUTIONS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on October 1 I participated in the Western States Water and Power Consumers Conference at Bismarck, N. Dak.

The previous day the National Farmers Union held a meeting of the board of directors of that organization and adopted the following resolutions which were given to me at Bismarck and which I commend to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY AT BISMARCK, N. DAK., SEPTEMBER 30, 1964, IN REGARD TO A MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

The board of directors of the National Farmers Union believes with the great conservation leaders of our history that America's material resources must serve the human resources of the Nation.

While we recognize the tremendous importance of the hydroelectric projects which have been built in the Missouri River Basin over the past decade, we feel that the economic growth and diversification of the region could be greatly speeded up by comprehensive planning and development.

We are aware of what has been achieved in the Tennessee Valley in flood prevention, low-cost power, improvement of navigation, reforestation, soil erosion control, and conservation of natural resources.

We are also aware that the Missouri Valley development has been hampered by the piecemeal, haphazard approach caused by overlapping jurisdiction and bureaucratic jealousy.

We therefore recommend that Congress consider and approve legislation creating a Missouri Valley Authority, a public corporation, to coordinate, unify, implement, and expand the work of existing agencies so that the administration on a regional basis can move forward more rapidly with comprehensive, multiple-purpose resource development.

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY AT BISMARCK, N. DAK., SEPTEMBER 30, 1964, IN REGARD TO THE SOUTHWEST POWER MONOPOLY

The members of the board of the National Farmers Union, taking cognizance of the announced plans of the Western Energy Supply and Transmission Association—a group of nine investor-owned power utilities—to form a $10½ billion generating, transmission and distribution monopoly covering nine southwestern States, are aware that these utilities have extorted from consumers over a period of years many millions of dollars in the form of overcharges.

The overcharges made by just one company alone, the Public Service Co. of Colorado—which is the company headed by the man who will be the president of the new supercombine—have during the period of 1956–60 amounted to more than $20 million.

We take further note that the Western Energy combine has planned to exclude all electric power projects financed wholly or in part by our Federal Government and all rural electric cooperatives.

We note that also besides the nine member firms several additional groups have been invited to participate. These are located in southern California—an area where power groups, public and private, have for many years joined in an attempt to destroy the family farm provision of the reclamation law known as the 160-acre limitation; and that the Imperial Valley Irrigation District is included, which has been receiving water from a federally financed project in violation of Federal law and in defiance of our U.S. Government.

We fear that the supercombine, not content with dominant control of generation and transmission in the southwest, is designed to strangle, emasculate and destroy farmer-owned transmission and distribution cooperatives.

The announced policy, if carried out, will clearly bypass State regulation and be in direct violation of the Federal Power Act, the Sherman Act and possibly other regulatory and antitrust laws.

We therefore hereby resolve:

That the President of the United States direct the Attorney General to study the plans of the proposed supercombine to determine what laws may be violated and to take appropriate steps to enjoin, arrest and bring to a halt the implementation of the plans for formation of power monopoly which would violate law.

That the Federal Power Commission thoroughly investigate the plans of the proposed combine and determine the extent to which the Federal Power Act may be violated.

That the Securities and Exchange Commission investigate in regard to the securities which may be sold and promoted by such a combine.

That the appropriate committees of the Congress take recognition of the monopoly dangers involved in this plan and consider the adoption of new or strengthened legislation to deal with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

"ISSUES AND ANSWERS"—INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR MANSFIELD ON ABC RADIO AND TELEVISION PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an interview I had on the ABC radio and television program known as "ABC's Issues and Answers," in which I participated with Bill Downs, ABC news correspondent, and John Scali, ABC State Department correspondent, on Sunday, September 27, 1964, be printed in the RECORD.

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

ISSUES AND ANSWERS

The ANNOUNCER. Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, here are the issues: Will the Warren report become a political issue? Should we negotiate an end to the war in Vietnam? Do you favor a Johnson-Khrushchev summit conference?

For the answer to the issues, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, and majority leader of the U.S. Senate, member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and one of the Senate's most knowledgeable men in foreign affairs. To interview Senator MANSFIELD, ABC News Correspondent Bill Downs and ABC State Department Correspondent, John Scali.

Mr. SCALI. Senator MANSFIELD, welcome to "Issues and Answers."

In a few hours the Nation will know what the Warren report has to say about the assassination of the late President Kennedy. From what you know about this report, sir, do you see any issue in it which might become a political campaign issue?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I do not. I have had a chance to look at it. I agree with the report of the Commission which was set up. I think it was a high-class Commission, men of great integrity and ability. They have gone into this matter thoroughly and I certainly would hope that a report of this nature would not become a political issue in the campaign.

Mr. DOWNS. Senator, without breaking the release time or any confidences, do you believe that there is anything in the report that Congress should follow up on?

Senator MANSFIELD. If there are any recommendations, and I do not know, because I didn't get to the end of the report, it would be my belief that the Congress should immediately anticipate the recommendations from the President to follow out any recommendations made by the Warren Commission and I am quite certain that we would stay in session and give those recommendations every consideration possible.

Mr. SCALI. Do you think this will interfere or alter the timetable for adjournment of the Congress?

Senator MANSFIELD. I wouldn't think so, and it needn't be so because if there are recommendations they should be given speedy consideration.

Mr. DOWNS. When will Congress adjourn?

Senator MANSFIELD. Optimistically we can adjourn by this coming Saturday, but I have my fingers crossed.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, as you know there have been many voices raised abroad who insist that the late President Kennedy was killed as a result of a plot, or conspiracy. From what you know of this report, do you think that the conclusions in it will satisfy these people who see this sort of conspiracy involved?

Senator MANSFIELD. Possibly not, because there are some people who are trying to gain notoriety and publicity from such a thesis. Among them, of course, the Soviet Union, which I understand has issued its own release on the tragedy. There are others in this country who have made a gimmick out of it, so to speak, and have been giving lectures and making money at the same time.

People read into this report what they want to, but I think because of the great integrity and distinction of this committee that by and large the American public will accept it.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, Senator, you say Congress is going to adjourn possibly next week. How do you rate the achievements?

Senator MANSFIELD. I would say that this Congress, this year, would rank with any other year in the history of the Republic. President Johnson sent 51 recommendations down beginning in January of this year. Fifty-one of those recommendations have been passed in the Senate. Forty-five became law. The rest are in conference or—bills like Appalachia which we passed a few days ago, have still to be considered in the House. I don't see how you can do much better, and this, of course, is exclusive of the appropriation bills and there you will find that as usual the Congress has reduced the appropriations of the President considerably.

Mr. SCALI. Well, Senator, the big question mark of course is the fate of the medicare bill. How do you see this resolving itself?

Senator MANSFIELD. That is hard to say. I am hopeful that out of the conference which will resume next Tuesday that some sort of a proposal will emerge because as you know what the Senate did was to pass a health care bill. Not a medicare bill, because the doctors are not involved, but it has to do with hospitals, nursing care, and nursing homes for our citizens who are 65 years of age or over. We have 18 million people in that category and they are increasing at the rate of 1,000 a day. I would hope that if we can't get the original King-Anderson-Gore amendment passed by the Senate we would get the Ribicoff proposal which gives the elder citizens of our country a choice between accepting additional social security payments or coming under a health plan.

Mr. DOWNS. But you don't see this happening in the next week, do you?

Senator MANSFIELD. I am hopeful.

Mr. DOWNS. What would you rate its chances in the House?

Senator MANSFIELD. That I don't know. That is why I say I am hopeful.

Mr. SCALI. Well Senator, is what you are saying that, at least as far as the Senate goes, that all the President's "must" legislation has been approved.

Senator MANSFIELD. Every single piece of it.

Mr. SCALI. And do you know of any parallel for a record such as this?

Senator MANSFIELD. I do not. That is why I say that this year's record will stand up with the record of any year in the history of the Republic.

Mr. DOWNS. In other words, you feel you have a pretty good congressional record to go back home and campaign on?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, let me make a slight correction, there. This is not a Democratic record, this is a congressional record and the Republicans have time and time again furnished us the difference needed to get some of this legislation through, so I think the credit should go to the Republicans and the Democrats who are Members of the Congress, for the fine record which we have made this year.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, just broadening our horizon, here, a moment, all the political polls that have come up with any conclusions so far show President Johnson way ahead of Senator GOLDWATER. Question No. 1: Do you believe in these polls?

Senator MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. SCALI. Why?

Senator MANSFIELD. Because I just never pay any attention to them. I believe in hard work, handshaking, wearing out shoe leather, meeting with the folks, and that is what counts and not the polls, because, it is just like legislation, you never know how a bill is going to turn out until they count the votes. I am glad they are encouraging. I think it indicates a swing toward Johnson, but I wouldn't place too much credence in them.

Mr. DOWNS. How about the Senate, specifically? I think there are 35 seats up.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is right.

Mr. DOWNS. Would you make any prediction about Democratic gains?

Senator MANSFIELD. I would estimate we would gain, two, three, or four seats as of now.

Mr. DOWNS. Would you want to be specific as to what States?

Senator MANSFIELD. I would prefer not to.

Mr. SCALI. Do you expect the Democrats will gain in the House, too?

Senator MANSFIELD. I would assume if we gain in the Senate, they will gain from 10 to 15 to 20 members in the House.

Mr. SCALI. A personal question, too, in that area Senator: Do you wish to stay on as Senate majority leader?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, speaking personally, this is a matter which is always up to the Democratic conference. I didn't seek the position in the first place. The Democrats asked me unanimously, and I agreed. It is up to them.

Mr. SCALI. Well, do you want to?

Senator MANSFIELD. Again, it is up to them, because no one should seek a job of this kind. I don't mind seeking the Senate job that I am seeking, but I have never sought any other political position and it is a little bit unusual in politics to really say you have been drafted for a job, but it is the truth.

Mr. DOWNS. Well then, you wouldn't turn it down as a——

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I wouldn't turn it down because I have found a great deal of satisfaction in working with my Democratic colleagues, in working with the Republicans and being able to achieve reasonable results and doing what we all could do collectively in behalf of the interests of the country as a whole, rather than either political party.

Mr. SCALI. Senator MANSFIELD, one of the Senators who has been mentioned as perhaps worthy of an important role in the Senate is Senator PASTORE. Do you believe that he could be of great assistance to the President in any role in the Senate?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes, JOHN PASTORE is one of the outstanding Senators, in my opinion. He has ability, integrity, he gets things done, he is a fine, forceful speaker. He represents his people well, and if he happens to be the choice of the Democratic conference, that would be fine, but again, of course, the Democratic conference would have to make that selection.

Mr. DOWNS. In working with the two Presidents of this administration, have you found it easier to work with Lyndon Johnson than you did with John Kennedy?

Senator MANSFIELD. I found it very easy to work with both Presidents. They differ in style. Kennedy was not as out-going as Johnson is but they have both been considerate, they have both been kind and they have both made my path a great deal easier.

Mr. SCALI. Do you think the friendships and the knowledge that President Johnson had from his days in the Senate has been a major factor in the record of Congress in passing the legislation which he thought was so important?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed I do.

Mr. DOWNS. But you have not worried about the principle of keeping the legislative branch separate from the executive, he has not been telling you exactly what to do? You could exercise your own judgment, I mean?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, yes; absolutely. Neither he nor President Kennedy have tried to tell me what to do because both of them recognized the line between the executive and the legislative. I recognize it and I am very jealous of the prerogatives and the responsibilities of the legislative branch of the Government and as long as I am the majority leader, that line is going to observed.

Mr. SCALI. Well, Senator MANSFIELD, I thank you very much.

In just a moment, we will be back with more issues.

(Announcement.)

Mr. SCALI. Senator MANSFIELD, the Republicans say they are banking on what they call the "silent vote," which has been called many things, "backlash," or anything else you want to call it.

From what you have observed, have you seen any real signs that there is such a "silent vote"?

Senator MANSFIELD. Not in anything that I have observed but I wouldn't gainsay them in that respect. There is a silent vote, there always is a silent vote. How that vote will go is anybody's guess.

Mr. DOWNS. Actually what some people call ballot-box bigotry, I mean they can say one thing but when they get inside that—in the polling booth, they vote, say, their prejudices. They say this is true, that it showed up in the primaries in Wisconsin, Indiana and Maryland, where Governor Wallace did gain a substantial vote. Do you think there is a real sleeper in this election?

Senator MANSFIELD. Perhaps, of sorts, but I think that aspect has been overemphasized, that people are becoming more aware of what the law of the land is and realizing that as far as its application is concerned, that the States in their laws have priority. So there may be something to it, but I think as time goes on that that will dissipate.

Mr. SCALI. Senator MANSFIELD, what do you see as the result of this election, do you expect a landslide win by President Johnson?

Senator MANSFIELD. I never expect a landslide win in any race. Any political race is difficult. Anyone who takes it for granted or who relies on polls I think is in for a rude awakening. It takes hard work and it takes an acceptance of nothing which would indicate that it is going to be easy going. If you are going to win you've got to get out and work and work right up to the last minute, just like for a piece of legislation you have to go out and work for it. You know what the results will be when they count the votes, but only then.

Mr. DOWNS. The Republicans say in connection with this silent vote that there is now going on a political change, that there is a major realinement of our political ideologies. Do you think that is true?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I wouldn't say that is true, but there is nothing to stop members of either party from going over to the other if they don't agree with the precepts of their own party, but as far as a liberal-conservative party alinement which has been advocated from time to time, I don't see it in the immediate future.

Mr. DOWNS. You see no threat to the two-party system. If there is a Johnson landslide, and the Republicans lose in the Congress, you have strangers, the regular party Republicans out of control, would you say there is a possibility that the Republican Party might disappear?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, and I would deeply regret it. I think this country is strong because it has a good two-party system and I would point out that parties have been down before but they bounced back because the American people as a whole do not like to see too great a disparity between the two parties and it isn't good for the country.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, Mr. GOLDWATER appears to be making an issue out of the fighting in Vietnam where he says both Defense Secretary McNamara and President Johnson are guilty of allegedly lying to the American people about what is going on there.

Do you agree at all with this criticism? Do you think the President and Mr. McNamara have lied about what is happening there?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I thoroughly disagree. They have been telling the American people the truth. They have been telling the combined leadership, both Republican and Democrat, of the House and Senate what the situation is. President Johnson has had I believe 10 or 11 meetings with the leadership of both houses, and that includes Republicans, this year, to discuss Vietnam mostly, but other matters as well. He has kept the American people informed. He is hiding nothing and I think he is doing the very best he can within the knowledge which he possesses.

Mr. SCALI. Do you object at all to Senator GOLDWATER making a campaign issue out of the fighting in Vietnam?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, not at all. I think any aspect of foreign policy should be discussed, but I hope it would be discussed constructively. Anybody can criticize. Anybody can be negative. But if you do criticize, then I think you ought to come up with an alternative.

Mr. DOWNS. As a matter of fact, Senator, you have been not entirely uncritical of what has been going on out in Vietnam.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DOWNS. And you have put forward suggestions that perhaps we should negotiate an end to that——

Senator MANSFIELD. Just a moment. First, let me say even though I am majority leader of the Senate, I am a Senator from the State of Montana and I have the right to my own independent judgment. I have exercised it and I will continue to exercise it in that capacity.

I have said, speaking of negotiations, that when President de Gaulle made his proposal seeking to bring about a settlement of the situation in all southeast Asia, that it ought to be given consideration. I get a little tired of proposals being made by De Gaulle, for example, and our State Department automatically shrugging them off. Now maybe he's got something, maybe he hasn't, but we have nothing to lose if we look into his proposal because it is a difficult area and we are involved there to a tremendous extent, both in terms of materiel and more important in terms of 18,000 Americans.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, De Gaulle, isn't he talking about neutralization?

Senator MANSFIELD. He has advocated that. If he has got something, let's look at it, but that does not mean that I advocate it.

Mr. SCALI. Well, if we examine the De Gaulle proposal—and I assume the State Department has——

Senator MANSFIELD. I would hope it has, but I am not at all certain it has.

Mr. SCALI. If it has, and it rejects the concept of neutralization as something which would weaken and eliminate whatever chances we have for a military victory, where do we go from here?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, let me say this: As I see it, our main job in Vietnam is to keep—in South Vietnam—is to keep that country together, to try to give it some stability and some permanence and I think what we ought to do, as long as you have asked the question, is to see if something could not be arrived at by means of which the Cambodians and the South Vietnamese could arrive at an agreement covering their border. I think we ought to step up the defenses against the infiltration of men and materiel along the Ho Chi Minh Trail down through Laos. I think we ought to make sure that we have stiff enough naval patrols to keep the same elements coming down by sea from North Vietnam, but the main job is to try to make that country stable, give those people some hope because they have been in a war of one kind or another since 1939 and that is the No. 1 job, not the idea of interdicting supply places in North Vietnam, not the idea of invading North Vietnam or Communist China.

Mr. SCALI. Well, Senator, how do you persuade the Communists to do this, though? After all, there was an agreement whereby Laos was to be neutral and removed from the cold war. They clearly have violated that agreement and are seeking to overthrow the coalition government of Laos. They are continuing to use the Ho Chi Minh Trail, and indeed some of the areas up north for infiltration. How do you propose that you close off these routes short of sending in more American forces?

Senator MANSFIELD. Not more American forces because you've got a 250,000-man army in South Vietnam. A Vietnamese army. I would put those people up there, take them out of Saigon and other places and make them defend their own country. After all, this is their war. As far as Laos is concerned, it is true you have had North Vietnamese cadres coming in and joining the Pathet Lao. But Prince Souvanna Phouma is still in control, at least on paper he is still the executive head of this government, coalition or otherwise.

Mr. SCALI. If you move them all up to the border areas to seal off whatever routes are available, what happens inside the country where the Vietcong are very strong and where they are capable of taking over control of many of the provinces?

Senator MANSFIELD. Which they have already, but at least you give them an opportunity to bring about a degree of stability in South Vietnam itself.

Mr. DOWNS. How about the charges that the United States is engaged in illegal aggression in that part of the world, that we should admit it and turn the whole problem over to the United Nations?

Senator MANSFIELD. First the United Nations will not take over responsibility in that area. Nobody will do it with us. We are in there now and the idea is not to go north, not to pull out, but to do the best we can to help the Vietnamese help themselves to achieve the stability which they must have if they are to survive.

Mr. SCALI. Well, Senator, if we sought to enter into any negotiations now for some sort of agreement with the Communists, don't you think the present unsatisfactory military position on the Western side would actually invite the Communists to get the better of the negotiations?

Senator MANSFIELD. Of course it would. That is why I would be against negotiations at the present time because if there are ever going to be negotiations, as far as we are concerned we should negotiate from strength.

Mr. SCALI. Well, then, do you favor sending more American military advisers into that area, or in some way doing something in a military fashion that we haven't done up until now?

Senator MANSFIELD. I do not.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, General Taylor, I believe, reported to one of the congressional committees that we are stuck out there for a long, long war of attrition. That there is no military victory possible. That the only way we can arrive at a settlement is to make through attrition the fighting so costly to the Vietcong and the Communists that they will seek an arrangement.

Are we willing to expend that amount of time and money and blood to get this result, which maybe will take years and years?

Senator MANSFIELD. At the present time, Bill, we have no choice, and we will see this thing through.

Mr. SCALI. Do you approve of the instructions that are reported to be guiding American pilots out in that area; namely, that if the North Vietnamese and/or Communist planes try to strike at the American ships in that area, that they should follow them and destroy them, even if it means crossing the North Vietnamese or Chinese Communist borders?

Senator MANSFIELD. I do.

Mr. DOWNS. That is the theory of hot pursuit. In other words, we should be prepared to risk intervention by Peiping—the Chinese Communist government?

Senator MANSFIELD. If anybody attacks us we should retaliate in kind.

Mr. SCALI. Even if it does mean crossing the frontiers?

Senator MANSFIELD. Regardless of the consequences we have to defend our own 7th Fleet and our own ships out there.

Mr. DOWNS. Do you know of any plans for getting SEATO more involved, our allies in that part of the world?

Senator MANSFIELD. It is an utter impossibility. As one of the signatories of SEATO I have never had too much faith in it. I think it is more of a paper treaty than anything else and I think there is no possibility.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, some of the Republicans are hinting rather darkly that once the November elections are over, the Johnson administration will make some sort of deal with the Communists on Vietnam. Do you know of any such deal in the works?

Senator MANSFIELD. Absolutely not, and I certainly would hope that whatever moves we do make in the region of southeast Asia we would let November 3 intervene, because things in this difficult world in which we live have to be faced up to, they can't be delayed, they can't be dodged, they can't be evaded so I would hope that there is nothing political in what we are doing and I am absolutely certain there is not.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, one followup question to that: If the government of Premier Khanh is overthrown again—and they are having a difficult time now—and if a new government takes power—which is on the neutralist hue, and invites us to get out, do you think the U.S. Government should pull out its some 18,000 military advisers and give up this area to——

Senator MANSFIELD. No, you are going too far ahead of me in your crystal gazing. You are raising too many "iffy" questions. Let me answer it in this way: First, I think the biggest mistake made was the assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem, who I think was the only hope to bring stability and peace to South Vietnam and to keep that country free and independent. Now we have had two coups since his assassination last November. We may have other coups, but I think for the present the best thing we can do is to string along with Khanh and see if something cannot be worked out to give—I must emphasize this point—to give, primarily, stability to South Vietnam itself.

Mr. DOWNS. You are not advocating the return of Madam Nhu or anything like that?

Senator MANSFIELD. I am not, because I differentiate between Ngo Dinh Nhu and Madam Nhu on the one hand and Ngo Dinh Diem, the President of the country, on the other.

Mr. SCALI. Well, Senator MANSFIELD, thank you very much. In just a moment we will be back with more issues and answers.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, Senator MANSFIELD, the Republicans say that the Democrats are creating a phony issue when they raise this question of a nuclear trigger, that our military commanders already have the authority to use the nuclear bomb.

Senator MANSFIELD. This is something which should lie within the province of the President entirely. Whether or not there is this sort of arrangement, I do not know. I don't want to know. I don't think the people should know because it is the kind of information which would be of great benefit to the enemy, so I hope we would get away from this and recognize the fact that the President is the man who has to keep his hand on that button.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, then, to get away from it, Senator, what do you think the General Motors strike is going to do to our present prosperity? Is it a threat to the economy, can there be a settlement, will it affect the election?

Senator MANSFIELD. Of course, it is a threat to our economy, but I am very hopeful in view of the fact that the other two in the Big Three in the auto industry have settled with UAW, that this week GM will settle as well, and I am confident the prospects are good.

Mr. SCALI. Do you see any prospect that labor is drifting away from their traditional support of the Democratic Party?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I would say they are staying with the Democratic Party by and large.

Mr. DOWNS. One final question, Senator. What would happen to the Democratic Party if Senator GOLDWATER wins?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well in this country we make the best of anything that happens and the people make the choice and what the choice of the people is will be all right with me and we will get along very well.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, thank you very much, Senator MANSFIELD, for being with us on "Issues and Answers."

The ANNOUNCER. Our guest has been Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana. He was interviewed by ABC News Correspondent Bill Downs and ABC State Department Correspondent John Scali.

We hope you will join us again next week at this same time for another program of "Issues and Answers."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in any residential area in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the For-

eign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12259) to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of nationals of the United States against the Government of Cuba.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1531. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana;

S. 1640. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad; and

S. 3174. An act to amend section 5 of the Employment Act of 1946.

TRIBUTE TO SENATE STAFF—RESIGNATION OF KENNETH TEASDALE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as Members of this body we are fully aware of the great assistance of staff personnel to us in our work in the Senate even though the public may not be fully cognizant of it. I would like to take a moment, therefore, to say a word of appreciation in public about these men and women who function in our offices, in committee, and on the floor of the Senate. They are as dedicated and devoted and hard working a group as will be found anywhere in the Government. Many of them are outstanding in their professional and other skills and they have made exceptional contributions in connection with the enormous detail which is an essential aspect of the legislative process.

As this session draws to a close, we are about to lose a most valuable member of the Senate staff, Mr. Ken Teasdale, who is general counsel to the majority policy committee. Like his predecessor, Mr. Harry McPherson, whose great ability was recently recognized by the administration in designating him as Assistant Secretary of State, Ken Teasdale has given invaluable help to the majority leadership and to other Members of the Senate, both Democrats and Republicans.

In the 2 years that he has served the majority, Ken Teasdale has served as a brilliant lawyer, as a fine parliamentarian, and as a most responsible aid to the majority and to the Senate as a whole.

I want to take this occasion to wish him well in his new endeavor. As I understand it, he will go into private law practice with his father in St. Louis, Mo. He is an excellent lawyer. I am sure he will serve the people of that city and State with the same extraordinary legal ability that he demonstrated in the Senate. I want to express to him, on behalf of the leadership and the majority, deep appreciation for his dedicated contribution to the work of the Senate and the Government of the United States.

I wish Ken Teasdale well. I express the hope that before too many years have passed he may return to the Senate and occupy one of these seats in the Chamber.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. INOUYE. I wish to associate myself with the eloquent remarks of the majority leader, and to add that Ken Teasdale is one of the finest men I have met along my life's pathway.

I wish him the very best in his future.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. I do not know of any young man more deserving of the tributes just made by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Hawaii than Ken Teasdale.

I wish him well in his chosen profession when he returns to the great State of Missouri.

Ken Teasdale has served the Senate faithfully and well. He deserves the best.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the 2d session of the 88th Congress is drawing to a close. In one way or another, a hiatus of the Senate is imminent. This Senate of the 88th Congress has been the most active, the most productive in my personal memory. It has been, in my judgment, outstanding in the contribution which it has made to the Nation's welfare both at home and in its relations with other nations.

I shall not run through, at this time, a list of its achievements. Most of them are well known to the Members of the Senate.

But I should like to point out that the Senate, operating under procedures that sometimes have been described as cumbersome, has nevertheless dealt decisively with a great number of divisive and deeply rooted issues. Members of this body felt deeply and passionately, even as the American people, on both sides of such issues as equal rights and reapportionment. But operating almost wholly on the basis of consideration, cooperation, and mutual restraint, this institution has given a remarkable demonstration of its capacity to resolve passionately deep human differences on the basis of reason and accommodation. In so doing, it has reaffirmed its vitality and its essentiality in the structure of the Government of the Federal Republic. This sort of achievement is not something which can be conjured up by a majority leader or a minority leader. It is an achievement which derives from the character, the good sense, the ability, and the patriotism of the 100 men and women who compose this body.

The record of this Congress, in short, is the work of all Members of the Senate, of Republicans and Democrats alike, of proponent and opponent. For the majority leadership, I want to say in all frankness, that without the friendly cooperation, the hard work, and the positive contribution of the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], in particular, my own responsibilities could not have been discharged. I am deeply indebted to him as a thoughtful colleague, as an understanding friend, and a truly great American. To him and to the committee chairmen, and to all Members whose dedication to duty, especially in this election year, entailed personal inconvenience and sacrifice, I want to express an appreciation for myself personally and for the Nation.

Mr. President, since January of this year, President Johnson sent 52 major recommendations to Congress and a total of 129 including appropriations.

So far as the Senate is concerned, those 52 major recommendations have been approved by this body.

In the field of appropriations, it is estimated that Congress has reduced the requests presented by the Budget Bureau at the beginning of this year to somewhere in the vicinity of $4.1 billion. This is a factor which I believe the general public seems to overlook. If we look at the record, going back for more than a decade, we find that every Congress, whether controlled by the Democrats or the Republicans, substantially reduced the requests sent down every year by the administration then in office.

MEASURES FAVORABLY REPORTED TO THE SENATE BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY DURING THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a list of measures favorably reported to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during the 88th Congress, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

S. 51, partially retrocedes jurisdiction over the Pole Mountain District of the Medicine Bow National Forest. Approved August 27, 1964—Public Law 88–494.

S. 277, increases number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year from 100 to 150. Approved September 12, 1964—Public Law 88–589.

S. 332, prohibits futures trading in Irish potatoes. Passed Senate July 21, 1964.

S. 400, provides penalties for misuse of feed made available to relieve distress or preserve foundation herds. Approved September 11, 1964—Public Law 88–585.

S. 581, extends for 2 years the authority for leasing tobacco acreage allotments. Approved July 19, 1963—Public Law 88–68.

S. 582, extends for 2 years the exemption of "boiled peanuts" from marketing quotas. Approved July 19, 1963—Public Law 88–76.

S. 623, provides for payments to assist agricultural producers in Alaska to carry out farmland development measures.

Referred to House Committee on Agriculture June 26, 1963.

S. 692, authorizes establishment of an agricultural program for Guam. Approved September 7, 1964—Public Law 88–584.

S. 762, provides for increased 1963 wheat acreage allotments in Tulelake area of California. Approved July 17, 1963—Public Law 88–64.

S. 829, provides for marketing quotas for Irish potatoes. Reported to Senate March 16, 1964.

S. 1253, changes election procedures for county ASC committees. Companion bill, H.R. 9178, was approved August 31, 1964—Public Law 88–534.

S. 1388, extends Cache National Forest to include lands in and near the Pineview Reservoir site, Weber Basin project. Approved August 19, 1963—Public Law 88–99.

S. 1588, authorizes extension of conservation reserve contracts through 1965, and increases annual limit on cropland conversion program to $20 million. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture October 14, 1963.

S. 1604, permits rice producer withdrawing from rice production to transfer his production history for allotment purposes without transferring his land. Approved January 28, 1964—Public Law 88–261.

S. 1605, amends Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to abolish registration under protest and permit registration number to be shown on label. Approved May 12, 1964—Public Law 88–305.

S. 1703, extends Mexican farm labor program 1 year. Approved December 13, 1963—Public Law 88–203.

S. 1790, provides U.S. contribution to cost of relocating utilities in certain watershed projects. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture June 29, 1964.

S. 1915, makes it clear that Secretary of Agriculture may provide for allotments under milk marketing orders so that instead of receiving a uniform blend price producers will receive a higher return on allotment milk and a lower return on excess milk. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture October 14, 1963.

S. 2218, transfers 360 acres from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior for the Foothills Parkway. Approved August 10, 1964—Public Law 88–415.

S. 2370, provides for U.S. contribution to maintenance of watershed project dams and works furnishing protection to the Rio Grande Canalization Project. Approved September 18, 1964—Public Law 88–600.

S. 2687, amends and extends Public Law 480, 83d Congress. Conference Report approved by House on September 23 and by Senate on September 24, 1964.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

H.R. 40, provides for grants for the construction of research facilities at State agricultural experiment stations. Approved July 22, 1963—Public Law 88–74.

H.R. 1642, provides for sale of animal quarantine station at Clifton, N.J. Approved September 12, 1964—Public Law 88–592.

H.R. 4242, provides for sale of reserved mineral interests in land in Pender County, N.C. Approved August 31, 1964—Public Law 88–544.

H.R. 4997, extends the 1963 feed grain program through 1965. Approved May 20, 1963—Public Law 88–26.

H.R. 5067, permits limited transfers of 1963 cotton acreage allotments which could not be planted because of natural disasters. (Committee was discharged from further consideration of this bill on the day after the day it was referred to the committee.) Approved April 26, 1963—Public Law 88–12.

H.R. 5860, amends the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 to permit deductions for promotion and reserach activities. Approved July 8, 1963—Public Law 88–61.

H.R. 6196, provides for cotton and wheat programs for 1964 and 1965. Approved April 11, 1964—Public Law 88–297.

H.R. 6601, authorizes sale of land in Grand Junction, Colo. Approved September 18, 1964—Public Law 88–603.

H.R. 7588, provides for prompt trial of national forest and grassland rules violation by a U.S. commissioner (at the election of the violator). Approved August 31, 1964—Public Law 88–537.

H.R. 9747, extends Armed Forces milk program for 3 years. Approved August 31, 1964—Public Law 88–529.

H.R. 10069, authorizes Lassen National Forest land exchange. Approved August 31, 1964—Public Law 88–524.

H.R. 10222, provides for a food stamp program. Approved August 31, 1964—Public Law 88–525.

H.R. 10419, provides for payment of part of patronage refunds in cash after a bank for cooperatives becomes subject to Federal income tax. Approved August 31, 1964—Public Law 88–528.

H.R. 11846 permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase processed food grain products for donation and sell grain, instead of having Commodity Credit Corporation grain processed. Approved August 31, 1964, Public Law 88–550.

House Joint Resolution 192 validates certain rice acreage allotments for 1962 and earlier years. Approved October 28, 1963—Public Law 88–160.

House Joint Resolution 403 extended time for filing of leases of 1963 tobacco acreage allotments until 20 days after its enactment. Approved July 30, 1963—Public Law 88–80.

House Joint Resolution 1026 extends time for filing lease of 1964 tobacco acreage allotment with county committee. Approved August 20, 1964—Public Law 88–469.

RADICAL RIGHT TAKES TO THE TELEPHONE—PUTS HATE AND FEAR WITHIN THE REACH OF ALL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before Congress adjourns, I invite the attention of the Senate to a manifestation of our national life which I believe deserves the attention of the country. There is an accumulating body of evidence that the American people, who have directed their attention for so long to the radical left—and quite rightly—should turn their attention also to the radical right.

What I am about to state has been foreshadowed by the experiences of other Senators, such as the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] who sometime ago it will be remembered, made a revealing and eloquent speech on the subject.

The American radical right, which in recent years has had virtually a free hand in sowing fear and suspicion through innuendo and lies, is being challenged on several fronts. It has done its work under the guise of anticommunism, but such anticommunism creates rightist totalitarian dangers of its own and is mischievous, deceiving, and self-defeating.

A week ago, a group of 100 distinguished civic, educational, religious, and business leaders organized the National Council for Civic Responsibility to challenge false and misleading right-wing radio broadcasts. This week, two books written by experts in the field of extremist organizations were published to cut through the propaganda and invective and lay bare the tactics and the methods of the major right-wing organizations.

It is about time that the alarm bell on the radical right was sounded, loudly and clearly. For too long the responsible people of this country have watched in silence as the extremists on the right ape the tactics of their opposite numbers on the left in seeking to undermine the American people's confidence in their own leaders and the democratic processes through which they were elected.

It is about time that responsible Americans realized that the fight against extremism—which is always alien to the democratic way—is a two-front war, and that we have been neglecting one front, the extreme right.

The cause of this neglect is not hard to determine. Following World War II, this country learned the hard way about the designs of the international Communist movement, and attention was focused on the extremists of the left who would bury us. Later, after the American people and government became alert to this danger, the radical right continued to label as Communist anyone who opposed them and their dogmatic and totally false view of patriotism and Americanism.

The use of this smear tactic has shielded the radical right far too long. Their continually repeated falsehoods can no longer be treated lightly or ignored as the work of a few isolated members of the lunatic fringe. They do irreparable harm, not because these accusations are true, but because they often remain unchallenged because they seem beneath contempt.

I hope to lay before the Senate the record of one of the smaller, but more insidious of these groups, because I feel that full public scrutiny of ultraright organizations, their spokesmen and their aims, is the only real answer.

That is why the formation last week of the National Council for Civic Responsibility is so important. Arthur

Larson, director of the World Rule by Law Center at Duke University, and spokesmen for the council, said its members would expose the falsity of the allegations made by radical right organizations, especially over the air. He said the group was formed because its members were concerned "about the damage that will be done to the American standards of political discussion and responsible behavior" if the radical right's misstatements on political issues and personalities are allowed to continue.

This group, the National Council for Civic Responsibility—and I hope many others yet to come—will find much material for action in the two books just published: "The Strange Tactics of Extremism" by Harry and Bonara Overstreet, and "Danger on the Right," by Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein, who are officials of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

The Overstreets, who are widely read experts on the nature and designs of communism, write that the radical right does not help us to defend our country against communism or to carry forward the enterprise of freedom.

Their book shows how similar are the tactics of the radical right and the radical left—the doctrinaire approach to all problems, the use of the conspiracy theory of history, and the readiness to use lies or innuendo to undermine confidence in a civic or political leader or an institution.

I hope that the record of the organization I will talk about today will provide one more example of how the radical right is clouding meaningful discussion in the American civic and political arenas with invective and false information.

It should be remembered that professional haters have been with us throughout our history, and have found little difficulty in convincing themselves of treasonable insinuations in the White House, the Supreme Court, or Congress, but have found great difficulty in overcoming the good sense of the American people.

A belief in what they said and wrote was a convenience, but not a necessity, to the haters of earlier times, because most of them were strictly partisan with strictly partisan political motives in mind. But in the last few decades the character and the tempo of smear activity has accelerated, until today we have reached somewhat of an apogee in modern mass libel.

I would like to introduce to you today a nationwide organization not run by professionals but by enthusiastic amateurs and apparently inaugurated and dedicated to bringing hate and fear within the reach of all. The organization called itself Let Freedom Ring, but perhaps it should be called, Let Hate Be Heard. It provides the ultimate in conveniences—a short tape-recorded hate message available at any hour of the day or night, and at the cost of only a phone call.

The group apparently has its national headquarters in Sarasota, Fla., and for the nominal fee of $20 yearly sends to its outlets throughout the country a weekly script, at least 40 of which the local outlets must use if they want to maintain their franchise. This, says the Let Freedom Ring headquarters, allows local outlets some time to present local messages, presumably aimed a local officials.

I first became aware of this organization about 2 months ago and in a very personal manner. Constituents began calling my office with reports that somebody was making tape-recorded messages available, claiming that I had a "100 percent pro-Communist, America-last voting record," among many other things.

Like almost any other person in public life, I decided to ignore this as the work of the local cranks who linger on the edges of society in any community. Then, my office began to get letters and phone calls from concerned citizens in many parts of the country informing me of the attacks and offering assistance. One even went to the trouble of making a tape recording of the message and sending it to me.

These letters, and subsequent research by my staff, indicates that Let Freedom Ring is now plugged into the telephone systems in—and I hope the Senators from these States will take notice—Florida, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Colorado, and California. Most of the scripts sent out by the headquarters in Sarasota are recorded by local people in these communities—using as many different voices as possible—and put on the telephonic broadcasting devices across the Nation simultaneously.

We have learned that Let Freedom Ring has been organized nationally for about 20 months. We have been able to collect a representative sample of the scripts it has distributed, and have listened in on some of their telephonic hate messages in several locations around New York City, in Philadelphia, and in Boulder, Colo.

We have learned that in this relatively short period of time Let Freedom Ring has attacked with innuendo and outright lies and in the most irresponsible, personal, and vicious manner, Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower, Chief Justice Earl Warren, U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, the late Eleanor Roosevelt, and many other prominent and loyal Americans.

It has used half-truths and lies to indicate that the higher echelons of our Defense Establishment are working to deliver the country into the hands of the enemy. It has alleged that American aid to Yugoslavia goes directly to the Soviet Union, that our Government would aid in the execution of former Venezuelan Dictator Perez Jiminez, and that the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund—which feeds thousands of hungry youngsters throughout the world—"is one of the best examples of subversion."

In short it has done everything possible to cast the cloud of suspicion over the loyalty of elected officials and doubt over the capability of our form of government to defend us from communism.

The Sarasota headquarters, for example, in telling its story to potential affiliates, brags about even this petty a triumph:

> You will be amazed at the influence that you can have on public opinion almost immediately. Last year, for instance, we were given credit for having killed the UNICEF Christmas card drive locally—an accomplishment of which we are very proud.

I feel it is important to bring this radical and extremist organization to the attention of the Senate and the Nation for three reasons:

First. The method used by Let Freedom Ring makes it faceless, and anonymous. A voice on the telephone. Not even the written word where the inaccuracies and innuendoes can at least become apparent to reasonable people on considered reading. No, just the short message over the phone, which leaves you asking what exactly was said, but with just enough of the message to cause suspicion and doubt.

Telephone officials in many parts of the country agree that there is absolutely nothing they can do to regulate the use of their equipment, except in cases of overt criminal activity. It is almost impossible, however, for the individual telephone customer to find out from his local company just who rents the equipment for Let Freedom Ring broadcasts. On occasions it has even taken the press months to find out who is responsible for these messages, as was the case with reporters for the Sarasota Herald Tribune. In September 1962, however, the operator of a Let Freedom Ring device in Berkeley, Calif., which was broadcasting vicious, anti-Semitic messages, was exposed by the Anti-Defamation League as a man who a year earlier had written ADL to say that "(Adolf) Eichmann had the right idea." But reporters in New York and New Jersey have encountered great difficulty discovering who is actually recording the messages, and apparently this is just the way the Let Freedom Ring people want it.

Second. When made the subject of this kind of smear, most of us in public life tend to ignore it, as I originally did, because we feel that whatever protest we raise will give such organizations and their wild charges even more of the publicity and notoriety they crave. And we are right. The bulletin produced by Let Freedom Ring in search for new outlets carries this paragraph:

> The initial broadcast we send you will be especially "strong" (but factual), in order to get as much free advertising as possible from the newspapers and by word of mouth.

And in the same bulletin:

> No matter how beautiful the screams of pain from the left wing press (resulting in hundreds of dollars of free advertising), you will have to put the name constantly before the public after the initial flurry of interest dies down.

But the spotlight of public scrutiny thrown on organizations such as this does alert the people and bring about a vigilance which can warn the otherwise unsuspecting in advance.

Third. The American people have long consigned to oblivion these merchants of hate, but the pushbutton approach to mass libel shown in the activities I

am here disclosing and which operates simultaneously in all parts of the Nation contributes to a serious erosion of truth and the growth of unwarranted suspicion concerning our national institutions and policies and our national leaders.

I call attention to the fact that Presidents have been uniformly smeared, going back to George Washington's day. Benjamin Bache and his cohorts who continually smeared President Washington in the mid-1790's in search of some treasonous sellout of the principles of democracy, reached comparably few people. Neither could the haters of Jefferson or Jackson, or Lincoln or Andrew Johnson, or Franklin D. Roosevelt or Harry Truman.

Let us remember that in all cases—and the American people should ponder this point well—those smears were by self-styled "patriots" who always found evidence of treason in the Executive Office or in some high level of government.

But, Mr. President, how many more people were reached with this rather startling example from "Let Freedom Ring" headquarters which was put on the telephone devices in February 1964:

Although the U.S. Congress has not authorized our disarmament, this is rapidly taking place illegally. Our bomber fleet is being junked, our military bases are being closed down at home and abroad, and Representative FOREMAN, of Texas, reports that 17 of our long-range radar stations have been dismantled and shipped to pro-Communist India.

Our military forces are becoming demoralized and resignations by officers were up 100 percent in 1963 as compared to 1962. We are told by a military officer, who must remain unnamed, that our atomic stockpiles are being dumped into the sea on the west coast of the United States.

At the University of Michigan a plan is being developed for the systematic house-to-house search of the entire United States for arms of any kind. The search is to be made by the U.S. Army by blocking off five States at a time, beginning in the western part of the country. The entire civilian population is to be completely disarmed by the end of 1965.

From the Herald of Freedom we quote: "The plans for the takeover of a country by the Communists provide for the immobilization of the Armed Forces, the demoralization of the police, and disarmament of the populace. Those who think it can't happen here should remember that every country, including Cuba, had an army and a navy and yet they were taken over with no difficulty."

Let freedom ring.

I took the trouble to send this scurrilous, dangerous, and perhaps seditious text to the Department of Defense for comment. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the Defense Department's detailed answer to these unbelievably wild charges.

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

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT'S ANSWER

Charge: Although the U.S. Congress has not authorized our disarmament, this is rapidly taking place illegally.

Answer: The United States is maintaining and will always continue to maintain all the military power necessary to our defense and our part in the defense of the free world. Although always prepared to discuss any honest proposals which might hold real promise of increasing the possibilities for peace, whether those proposals deal with foolproof plans for world disarmament or with plans for increased free world defense strength, the United States not only is not disarming itself, but, quite the contrary, in every area of national strength, America today is stronger than it has ever been before. The U.S. military force is stronger than any adversary or combination of adversaries in the world.

To appreciate the full extent of this force, we can contrast it to that of our principal adversary. By such a test, our strategic superiority is incontestable.

Our Strategic Alert Forces now have 1,100 bombers, including 550 on 15-minute alert, equipped with decoy missiles and other penetration aids to assure that they will reach their targets. The Soviet Union could, with difficulty, place over this country on two-way missions slightly more than 100 heavy bombers, plus 150 medium bombers capable of striking only Canada and the northwestern corner of the United States.

We now have more than 800 fully armed, dependable ICBM's deployed on launchers, almost all in hardened and dispersed silos. This number will be increased to over 1,000 by 1970.

Our Navy now has 256 Polaris missiles deployed in 16 submarines; 25 more Polaris submarines are under contruction. By 1970 we will have 656 Polaris missiles in 41 submarines. The Soviet Union's submarine-launched ballistic missile fleet is, by comparison, small and ineffective. Most of its submarines are not nuclear powered, their missiles cannot be launched from beneath the surface, and the range of these missiles is only a third of the range of our Polaris missiles.

The power of these forces will soon be further increased by the addition of the new Polaris A–3 missile and the new Minuteman II. The Minuteman II is as great an improvement over the Minuteman I as the B–52 was over the B–47. It will be more than eight times as effective against the best protected military targets as its predecessor.

Moreover, in the field of military research and development, the United States has initiated or carried to completion more than 200 new projects and new weapons systems in the last several years. Among these projects are:

The SR–71, a long-range, manned, supersonic strategic military reconnaissance aircraft, which employs the most advanced observation equipment in the world and flies at over 2,000 miles per hour and at an altitude of over 80,000 feet.

The new Nike X, which will give us the option to deploy—if the national security requires it—the most advanced antiballistic missile yet conceived by any nation.

The new A7A aircraft, which will give the Navy superior attack capability at more than double the range of the A4E that it will replace.

The EX–10, a heavy, new type of torpedo for use against deep-diving, fast, nuclear submarines.

The new Main Battle Tank, which will give our ground forces armor superiority throughout the 1970's.

The revolutionary variable-sweep winged F–111 fighter-bomber, a supersonic aircraft which has double the range and several times the payload of any previous fighter-bomber.

Finally, and conclusively, the tempo of our great, bipartisan national defense effort has consistently increased in recent years. The total national defense budget has increased from $40.7 billion in fiscal year 1955 to $47.5 billion in fiscal year 1961 (the last Eisenhower budget) to $53.9 billion in fiscal year 1965, and reached a post-World War II peak of $55.3 billion in fiscal year 1964, during the years in which the United States bought much of the missile hardware which now gives us such a decisive advantage over any possible adversary or combination of adversaries.

This Nation now has, and will continue to have throughout the future, such overwhelming deterrent power that the leaders of the Communist world know that an attack on the free world would surely be followed by their own complete destruction.

Charge: Our bomber fleet is being junked.

Answer: No part of our bomber fleet is "being junked." Our bomber fleet has been assigned a significant role in the Nation's defense and will continue to have such a role as long as national security requires it.

Today we have over 1,100 strategic bombers, a 4 to 1 superiority over the Soviets. The combat effectiveness of our bombers is increasing through the installation of the latest air-to-surface and decoy missiles to help them reach their targets in the event of a surprise enemy attack.

We expect to spend about $300 million a year in improving the overall capabilities of our B–52 force. We have already spent about $1.6 billion.

In accordance with a decision made several years ago, the older B–47 medium bomber is gradually being phased out of the active inventory, since the large measure of national defense our missile forces and newer B–52's and B–58's supply has supplanted the need for the older medium-range B–47 aircraft.

Our forward defense plans now go through fiscal year 1972. These plans include large numbers of strategic bombers at every stage.

No decision has been made about our needs beyond 1972, but we are making ample advance provision for (1) possible extension of the life of the B–52, (2) research on new manned systems, and (3) possible strategic uses of manned systems (such as the F–111) now in production.

Charge: Our military bases are being closed down at home and abroad.

Answer: This charge confuses our carefully phased program to terminate activities at military bases whose activities are no longer required for the defense effort with an unfounded and totally false notion of unilateral disarmament.

The facts are that today the Department of Defense has over 1,000 military bases, throughout the world, providing this Nation and its allies with a strength second to none.

About 3 years ago, the Department of Defense embarked on a program to identify those installations which could be consolidated, reduced in scope, or closed without any adverse effect whatsoever on our military effectiveness. As of June 30, 1964, 144 bases were affected by this program, with these significant results: $570 million annually in operating costs will be saved; over 1 million acres of land will be turned back to the private sector of our economy. Land which was once tax consuming can now become tax producing. The short answer here is that the program to terminate unnecessary operations was designed to, and is in fact, increasing our military preparedness, not reducing it.

Charge: Seventeen of our long-range radar stations have been dismantled and shipped to pro-Communist India.

Answer: On April 26, 1963, the Department of Defense announced to congressional leaders and the public plans to eliminate a number of radar installations no longer needed, and subsequently 17 long-range radar installations were closed. The appropriate responsible congressional committees have been kept fully informed of these developments.

The 17 radars in question were originally assigned as a part of our system of defense against manned bomber attack. Each was selected by the Air Force for closing after careful consideration of whether it made a useful contribution to the defense system. These 17 were no longer needed for our

defense, and their elimination was achieved without any practical weakening of the air defense we do need. At the same time the taxpayers were necessarily saved millions of dollars and the Air Force was able to reassign to useful missions the men committed to the maintenance and manning of the installations.

The radar equipment has now been removed from most of these 17 installations. Under normal disposal procedures, some of these excess radar units were rehabilitated and channeled into the U.S. military assistance program and, thereafter, were made available to a number of friendly foreign countries to aid in their air defense.

Since the Communist Chinese invasion of India posed a serious air threat to that country, some of these radars were programed for India under the military assistance program to assist that country in defending against the Chinese Communist threat.

Charge: Our military forces are becoming demoralized and resignations by officers were up 100 percent in 1963 as compared to 1962.

Answer: This statement is a gross distortion of the truth.

The facts are that only a relatively small percentage of regular officers leave the services through resignation. In the last several years, only about 1 regular officer resigned for each 100 regular officers in the force. While the percentage of resignations increased from 0.6 percent in fiscal year 1962 to 1.4 percent in fiscal year 1963, the operative factor was a freeze imposed on resignations during most of fiscal year 1962 due to the Berlin crisis. The net effect of this freeze was to force the postponement of many resignations from fiscal year 1962 to fiscal year 1963. As a result, the fiscal year 1962 resignation figures are artificially low.

Charge: We are told by a military officer, who must remain unnamed, that our atomic stockpiles are being dumped into the sea on the west coast of the United States.

Answer: This charge is totally false.

The facts are that our atomic stockpiles are not being dumped into the sea or anywhere else. The size and mix of our stockpile is reviewed annually by our top military and civilian leaders. It contains enough weapons and megatonnage to insure today, and in the future, the complete destruction of both the Soviet Union and Communist China, under the worst imaginable circumstances accompanying the outbreak of war. There should be no doubt of this in the minds of any American. There is none in the minds of our enemies.

Over the last 4 years, for example, there has been a 150-percent increase in the number of nuclear warheads and a 200-percent increase in the total megatonnage in our strategic alert forces.

The "unnamed" informer is badly confused. Quite obviously, he is yet to discover the fundamental difference between the atomic stockpile, on the one hand, and certain radioactive wastes that result in the production of stockpile materials on the other. Some of these wastes contain radioactivity at levels which require their careful and safe disposal. With internationally accepted health standards fully observed, some of this waste has been disposed of at sea, in specially designed waterproof containers.

Charge: At the University of Michigan a plan is being developed for the systematic house-to-house search of the entire United States for arms of any kind. The search is to be made by the U.S. Army by blocking off five States at a time, beginning in the western part of the country. The entire civilian population is to be completely disarmed by the end of 1965.

Answer: This charge is absurd, completely false, and reflects the hallucinations of an aberrated mind.

The Department of Defense has no knowledge of any plan or study at the University of Michigan or anywhere else even remotely bearing any semblance to the one alleged in this charge.

The right of citizens to be secure in their homes and persons from unreasonable searches and seizures and their right to keep and bear arms are both guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. These constitutional rights always have been and always will be jealously guarded by the U.S. Government and are among the blessings which our Armed Forces have fought and died to protect in three wars in the last 50 years.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, of course not a word of that was true. The Pentagon's analysis makes it clear how propagandists such as those writing the LFR scripts make full use of half-truths as well as outright falsehoods to give their message the appearance of credibility. For example, it is true that resignations of Regular military officers increased 100 percent between fiscal year 1962 and 1963. What isn't reported is the reason for such an increase—the freeze on all resignations during most of 1962 because of the Berlin crisis. This type of message is a gross imposition upon the American people and is done in such an underhanded way that it needed to be spread upon the RECORD.

Also, in the tradition of irresponsible propagandists—using other irresponsible propagandists in an attempt to document their line—the house-to-house search for arms idea appears to have been taken directly from the October 1963 issue of "On Target," the magazine of the Minutemen. The Department of Defense calls this charge "absurd" but the "Let Freedom Ring" writers apparently swallowed whole this article by the Minutemen, a supersecret group specializing in guerrilla warfare training on the theory that the Communists will take over the United States and they will take to the woods in order to defend the freedom of the country.

Mr. President, the insinuations of "Let Freedom Ring," are beneath our contempt and unworthy of our notice, but the public must be made aware that this sort of message is being distributed and used nationwide and simultaneously or it may mistake Let Freedom Ring as the work of purely local crackpots.

And unless the public understands that this sort of message depends on the use of innuendo, half-truths and invective to leave a nagging, if illogical, suspicion in the minds of the listener, it may underestimate the effectiveness of this sort of propaganda. Both the Communists and the Nazis understood only too well that the constant repetition of half-truths and outright lies over a long enough period could make suspicion of lawful, democratic authority commonplace.

The operations of Let Freedom Ring show how an infinitesimal segment of our society, using modern techniques, can implant these suspicions and these doubts throughout the Nation. This is why I feel that the formation of the National Council of Civic Responsibility and the renewed interest in the radical right among leading authors and publishers is so important.

We are quite well armed in our anti-Communist struggle with the organizations that are in being, with the awareness of our people, and with the constant activity in the Congress and outside the Congress to alert the country to the Communist danger. I thoroughly agree with those alerts. I am a party to them. I shall continue to be. But we have left our flank exposed. There is a certain amount of naivete on the part of the American people with respect to the ultrarightists. It is felt that they are in a different class, that they are just misguided patriots. The material that I have just described—and much more has been given by others—is as dangerous and as undermining and possibly as seditious as communism. One would be as much enslaved if he had a black or brown collar around his neck as he would be with a red collar. We want neither.

I believe it is high time that the American people become alert to the danger and cease accepting these extremists on the right as crackpots who have to be forgiven because they are really very patriotic even if they go overboard a bit. We should recognize them for what they are—people who are dangerous to the security and future of the Nation; just as dangerous as those on the extreme left. We should be just as vigorous and strong and vigilant against one extreme as we are against the other. This should be reflected in the activities in our committees in the Congress, both in the House and in the Senate. It should be reflected in the expression of candidates, including presidential candidates, who somehow or other refuse to recognize or just cannot bring themselves to recognize that the greatest danger of the extreme right equates with the grave dangers of the extreme left. They both must be fought with equal vigor, intensity, awareness, and alertness, as we know the greatest weapon in our country is the spotlight of public attention.

Mr. President, I believe that the American people are sophisticated and discerning enough to know a patriot when they see one, even though they do not agree with him.

I believe they are sophisticated and alert enough to know sedition when they see it, whether it comes under the symbol of communism or whether it comes under the labels of the radical right.

This is why I hope that the alarm now raised will be heeded by responsible citizens and groups throughout the country and our people will not only be made aware that we are engaged in a two-front war, but will join a counterattack against the forces of hate, fear, and irresponsibility on the extreme right as well as on the extreme left.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill be laid before the Senate for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that this conference report has been signed by all the conferees; and I ask for its adoption.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of either the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] or the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], as to what disposition was finally made of the so-called Mundt-Lausche amendment, to establish legitimate rates of interest and establish amortization repayment tables for what are euphemistically referred to as "loans" in the foreign aid program; whether a distinction has been retained between loans which bear interest and have a repayment schedule and "loans" which obviously we do not intend to recapture since in reality they are actually gifts.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Do I correctly understand the Senator's inquiry to be what happened to it?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I saw newspaper reports about it, which presumably are accurate, but inadequate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The law was left unchanged as it now stands with the exception that, whereas the law now provides that the interest rate which will be paid during the 10-year grace period, prior to the beginning of the payment of principal, is three-quarters of 1 percent, the interest for that part of the grace period was raised to 1 percent a year.

I am trying to get this information straight. It is rather complicated.

The interest rate after the 10-year grace period goes from the present 2 percent to 2½ percent per annum.

The grace period was left at 10 years, as it is in present law. It is not as set out in the Senator's amendment, which I believe provided for 5 years.

There were discussions about reducing that period to 7 years, rather than the 10 years now provided. Finally it was left at the 10-year figure.

Would the Senator like to have me discuss some of the arguments that were made?

Mr. MUNDT. I would.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Arguments were made that other countries are now coming up to this particular system of terms. In other words, I think Canada has now come up to a 10-year grace period.

I am sorry the chairman of the committee is not present.

At any rate, Canada has come up to a longer grace period. Some of her payment periods run for as long as 50 years. Other countries are coming nearer to the standards which we have.

The argument was made that if we begin to lower the grace period, we shall be defeating the very purpose of getting other countries to join in soft loans on easier terms.

There was violent opposition by the State Department to the Senator's amendment. On many occasions when the State Department raises violent opposition, it seems to have quite an influential effect on certain Members of Congress.

Mr. MUNDT. May I inquire whether the House conferees as a unit were adamantly opposed to our amendment, or whether there was some breaking of the ranks that may give us hope for future reformation?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am not at liberty to tell which members of the conference were committed to what. The House conferees agreed to the final result, and the Senate conferees agreed to it, in the majority. I do not believe there was a record vote on either side. I had some reservations, for my purposes; but the Senate conferees agreed to this result, as did the House conferees. The House Members will have to speak for themselves.

Mr. MUNDT. Were any stipulations made with respect to the time after the 10-year grace period? Ten years represents a decade. Ten years into the future, in the kind of life we live, with changes occurring as fast as they do, almost extends into perpetuity so far as some of these newly developing nations are concerned. Are there any stipulations, after the expiration of the 10-year grace period, as to the kind of amortization payments that are to be made?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The present law stands unchanged with the exception of the two interest-rate provisions. So whatever is in the present law remains in. Under the present law there is no legal termination period for these loans. The legal termination period or due date is fixed in the contract of loan made between AID and the recipient countries or groups that receive the loans. Many of those loans will have interest rates of 3 or 4 percent. They do not adhere to the minimum stipulations in the contracts. As I understand, some of the loans will go for 5 years, some for 10, some for 20. I do not know of any that go for much longer than that.

Mr. MUNDT. Some go for 40 years.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was about to say that I am informed by the staff that one or two—perhaps three or four—loans will go for as long as 40 years. But that period is set in the contract upon which the loan is made.

Mr. MUNDT. Did anything come out of the conference which would prevent, for example, after the grace period—which would leave 30 years—a deferment of the repayment of the loan until the 30 years are over, in the case of a 40-year loan, or, in the case of 30 years, beyond the expiration of the grace period? Is there any provision that there must be annual repayments?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; these are a part of the terms and conditions of the contract of loan or the specifications upon which the loan is based. Those terms and conditions are set out in the contract.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me put it this way, so that our constituents will know exactly what we have done, or, to put it better, what we have failed to do to protect the interests of the taxpayer.

Is it correct to say, so far as the present law is concerned, that it would be possible for a borrowing country to obtain the money and pay 1-percent interest on it for the first 10 years and 2½ percent interest on it for the next 30 years, and make no repayment of principal of any kind until the end of the 40th year from the time when the loan had been negotiated?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I presume it could be done, but the whole connotation of the law is that, as the law stands now and as it will stand if this proposal is adopted, there will begin to be an amortization after 10 years, because the law refers to the 10-year grace period. However, it is still a matter of contract between AID and the borrowing country or the entity that borrows this money.

Technically, it could be possible. There are no open end loans. I am not aware of any loans that have been extended beyond the original contract period. There may be some, but if there are any, I do not know of them. I believe that most of the loans that have been made are on much more stringent terms.

Mr. MUNDT. We have been in this global bucket shop business for only 17 years. Some of the loans were made for 30 or 40 years, and the question of extendability has not necessarily been raised as yet.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. So far as I know, the question of extendability has not been raised. It would be technically possible for the lending agency to renegotiate a loan contract and make some extensions. At the present time that is not the fact.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I assure the Senator from South Dakota that the bulk of the loans have been made on tougher terms than the minimum set out even in the present law.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the Senator's report. I do not wish to interrogate him further. I realize that he is a reluctant witness to a murder, that took place at midnight, of the Mundt-Lausche proposal, and that he did not participate in the assassination. I wanted to get from him as close an eyewitness account as I could.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator for his generous remarks. However, as a member of the conference I must share whatever responsibility falls upon the conferees. I was a member of the conference. A number of things went on in the conference of which I did not personally approve. However, we cannot always get our way in everything in conference. We have to do the best we can to reach an agreement on something that we hope will be acceptable to both Houses. In this case, this seemed to be the only possible solution.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from South Dakota has been a member of conference committees ad infinitum, ad nauseam. I appreciate the problems involved, especially when we are up against an adjournment date, which has been tardily arrived at. In such a case there are a great many pressures besides economics and logic.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is the little element of a majority vote, too.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. Too frequently we of the minority cannot get everything we would like to get. Under normal legislative procedures, I would suggest a motion to reaffirm the position which the Senate took by an overwhelming majority on a yea-and-nay vote, when we said that from now on to allude to foreign loans means a classification on an honest, responsible, and forthright basis, that it means a legitimate interest rate, that it means a shorter period of grace, and that it certainly means a schedule of repayment which is in conformity with economic and banking practices.

However, I shall not make a motion of that kind today, and thereby try to hold the Senate in session any longer, at a time when I doubt very much whether a quorum of Senators is within 100 miles of Washington. Probably it would not be possible to obtain a quorum in the House until the end of next week. I see no purpose to be served in trying to do that under the circumstances.

However, I serve notice now, that we will renew this fight next year. While I do not see the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] on the floor at the moment, I know that he shares in these sentiments. I note the presence of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I know he also shares those sentiments.

Mr. MORSE. I think a little fighting should be done now. I think there should be a yea-and-nay vote. I want Senators to go on record on this conference report. In my judgment, this conference report is the most unconscionable conference report that I have seen come to the floor of the Senate in my 20 years in this body.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from South Dakota is not very happy about it either, and he would vote against the conference report if a yea-and-nay vote were held. I doubt however that anything worthwhile could be accomplished at this late hour. Too many Senators are absent; too many of those still present are eager to adjourn and leave Washington. At least we will renew this fight next year to try to do something in the interest of the American taxpayers.

The time is long past when we should stop flimflamming the public by saying we are engaging in a program of economic loans when those loans are only thinly disguised grants, with 10-year periods of grace, and with the interest rate so low that every time the interest is paid we must subsidize every dollar of it because we pay much more for our own money.

I serve notice on the AID representatives and on the State Department that I shall ask for a record of achievement, not merely the arguments that are made in committee, and a statement on how many other countries are making money available on the same low terms that we are making in this great AID program, and whether we are making the kind of progress that they hopefully envision in this area.

This program is old and now has a well developed beard, and walks with halting step, after 17 years. We are no longer justified in the deception of calling something a loan that is really a grant. I should take this occasion to announce that I have been working with others for several months on a reappraisal of our entire economic oversea aid program, which I intend to introduce in legislative form at the next session, either as a separate bill or as an amendment, which will get away from the entire concept of using hard earned dollars of American taxpayers, derived from individual, privately owned enterprises, to subsidize socialism all around the world. That is basically wrong. We are taking American dollars, derived from private enterprise, and virtually giving them away in the guise of loans, sometimes directly as gifts, to subsidize nationalization and socialistic enterprises in countries where we know they cannot succeed, and when we could not make this kind of enterprise successful in our own country with the kind of sophisticated political development which we have in the United States.

I propose to offer a new approach to this subject, based on our gratifying experience with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in America. I propose to replace the subsidizing of foreign governments with foreign politicians channeling our funds through political hands into socialistic enterprises, with another concept which we could describe as an International Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lend money on economic terms softer than we would normally charge, but sufficiently high to recapture the loan rate which America has to put into its dollars; a Reconstruction Finance Corporation operation overseas which would be jointly under the direction of American directors and directors from the recipient countries; a corporation which would lend its funds to establish private entrepreneurs, private enterprises, and prospective taxpaying operations, so that we could create some basis for solvency overseas, some basis for the projection of the concepts, values, virtues, and rewards of private enterprise, some basis for a broad enough tax base so that little countries could have some degree of solvency and some degree of security. It should be a wholly different approach to a program which is beginning to fail notoriously, primarily because those without realism are administering it in such a way that there can never be a distinction between a gift and a loan; and in the second place, because those who are administering it are seeking to impose upon little, underdeveloped countries, and some large ones, socialistic schemes which cannot work there, because they could not work here, instead of helping them to develop the private enterprise that is so essential to stability and solvency around the world.

I am bitterly disappointed at the abject surrender which the Senate conferees felt compelled to make. I can understand their reasons. There was pressure for adjournment. The hour is late. The House has disappeared. Senators are far asunder. This is not a good atmosphere in which to try to correct what I believe was an unfortunate failure to stand up and bring back this important reform, which to my personal knowledge, has taken more than 7 years to produce.

I started working on it with the late Senator Styles Bridges at least that long ago in the Senate Committee on Appropriations. It has been moved from where it was, from the point where a loan did not bear any interest rate at all, to at least 2½ percent. I suppose that can be considered progress in 7 years. It is a little over one-quarter of 1 percent a year, if I calculate it correctly, or in that area. We have also moved it from where it was—no interest at all—to 1 percent for the first 10 years.

Mr. President, you know, I know, and every other Senator knows, and every foreign country knows that by the end of 10 years some of the recipient countries will have disappeared. Something will have happened to them in this fast-changing world. That money is gone. There will have been not even a single repayment, to begin with. Those remaining will have developed no methodical habits of repayment, no fiscal policies, no bookkeeping procedures.

In some countries, a new great "I Am" will have replaced the leader who is at present in charge. When the new dictator or premier or president or potentate or king walks in and looks at the record, he will say, "Am I supposed to pay Uncle Sam back all this money and all this accrued interest? I had nothing to do with borrowing it or spending it; I will do the old political Pontius Pilate act. I wash my hands. It is too bad it has happened, but do not expect me to pay these debts incurred by my predecessors whom I have removed from office. The other fellow did this. I am having troubles enough of my own."

So gone down the drain, through carelessness, indifference, bad judgment, and faulty administration will be unknown hundreds of millions of American dollars.

This Congress has failed to take the salutary step which we earlier obligated ourselves, in a yea-and-nay vote, to take.

If the troops are gone and we cannot fight the battle now, we shall have to renew the contest with increase vigor next January.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I seem to be the unchallenged winner of the booby prize in the game of foreign aid which we have been playing with the House conferees. To the best of my knowledge, I did not win enough points even to bother to count them. I did however sign the conference report and recommend that it be approved by the Senate. As a matter of fact, I have been somewhat in a state of shock in the past few days. Perhaps I owe the Senate an explanation.

It began a few weeks ago, when the Senate had the poverty bill under consideration. It may be recalled that an amendment was offered or a proposal was made to concur in a House amendment—I have forgotten which—to require every recipient who benefits from the poverty program to take a pledge of loyalty to the Government of the United States. It may be recalled that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] made a strong argument against singling out these people as those who should be suspect enough to be required to take the loyalty pledge. As I recall, I chimed in and asked the Senator from New York if he knew why anyone earning less than $1,000 a year should be automatically suspect, while anyone who received more than $1 million a year from the Government should be above suspicion.

Perhaps that was not a nice thing to say, but I said it, and it began to work on me.

Then, when the foreign aid bill came up, I thought, "If little Maria Gonzales and Timmy Sullivan, who could be getting some assistance under the poverty bill, are required to take an oath of loyalty to the Government, why should not the contractors who get millions of dollars out of the AID program, the munitions manufacturers who get more millions of dollars out of the AID program, and the bankers, who have their loans guaranteed by the Federal Government, also take the loyalty oath?"

That is why I offered the amendment to the foreign aid bill to require that all beneficiaries of the foreign aid program be required to take a loyalty oath, the same as Maria Gonzales and Timmy Sullivan would have to do in order to get benefits from the poverty program.

The Senate accepted the proposal with, I believe, only two voice votes in opposition. Then I waited for results. I thought that I would almost immediately get protests from international bankers, international contractors, and international munitions manufacturers. But lo and behold! I have not heard one of them protest the taking of the loyalty oath.

But this is where the shock took place: the intellectual community, the self-styled intellects of our great Nation, immediately began to protest. They said, "What? We take an oath of loyalty to the United States? We should say not. That is an insult. It interferes with our academic freedom"—or something like that.

The presidents of some of the big colleges in the United States said they could not take any more business from the Federal Government if they had to pledge allegiance to the United States and say that they and their institutions would not support the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force.

I really was surprised. Their organizations came in, too, and said, "No, not us." They had not protested against anyone else taking the loyalty oath; it was only themselves.

So in committee I offered a modification of the amendment to exempt institutions of higher learning and their officials from taking the loyalty oath, and the committee did not think much of that, either. I suppose they were right because, after all, I believe that 98 percent of the teachers of the country would not object to standing up and saying, "We are loyal to the United States through thick and thin." And it would not reflect upon them in any way.

So that is where we are. As of now, members of the Peace Corps must pledge allegiance to the United States. These same college people did not object when members of the Peace Corps were required to take the loyalty oath. All members of the Job Corps will have to take the loyalty oath. The Department of Justice sent us a letter, Senators will recall, when the poverty bill was before the Senate, stating that they supposed it was all right to make these people take the loyalty oath, that it would not affect them much anyway. The majority whip, it will be remembered, also said that he guessed it was all right to approve that, too; so it was approved.

Now we have members of the Peace Corps who have to take an oath of allegiance, and the Job Corps beneficiaries from the poverty program will have to take the oath of allegiance. Consultants, if they are on their own, will have to take the oath of allegiance. If they are connected with an institution or an organization of higher learning, they will not have to do so. Farmers who receive direct payments will have to take an oath of allegiance.

Of course, we all know that Members of Congress, as well as members of the Armed Forces, take an oath of allegiance to the United States. Thus, we have only this protest coming from college presidents and their association and no one else. I have just had the Peace Corps affidavit handed to me. A member of the Peace Corps takes this oath in this affidavit, which he has to sign:

> I am not a Communist or Fascist. I do not advocate, nor am I knowingly a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow of the constitutional form of the Government of the United States, or which seeks by force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States.
>
> I do further swear (or affirm) that I will not so advocate, nor will I knowingly become a member of such organization during the period that I am an employee of the Federal Government or any agency thereof.

I have not received a single protest from a member of the Peace Corps taking this oath. I do not know how it could be written any stronger. I have received no protests from any other class of people doing business with the U.S. Government against taking an oath of loyalty to the United States.

Mr. President, that is why I am somewhat shocked today. I have been in the Senate for 24 years, and to the best of my recollection I have voted for every single proposal for Federal aid to education in all grades, from elementary through the graduate schools. To the best of my recollection, I have voted for every single appropriation to carry on those programs to the fullest degree.

Then, when those people representing the benefitting institutions say to us that while it is all right for everyone else, including the poverty program beneficiaries and Peace Corps members, to take an oath of allegiance to the United States, but not for them, it puts me in a state of shock and disillusionment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall speak briefly because I know that the Senator from Oregon wishes to obtain the floor. He is most gracious to allow me to proceed.

I protest strongly in respect to the conference report against the excision of the amendment on the persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union.

It is the great tradition of our country, going back to the middle of the previous century, that such persecutions have been protested. The Senate, after much deliberation, adopted the amendment. It is my deep conviction that it would have been adopted in the House of Representatives—if submitted to a vote—as overwhelmingly as it was in the Senate where, I believe, the vote was unanimous except for one dissenting vote.

Nonetheless, it has been excised, and the language which has now been put into the conference report is, really—and I say this with all respect—not language which relates to the particular problem. Moreover, it does take the finger of blame for persecution of Jews off the Soviet Union where it belongs.

With respect to the language used in the conference report, I would not wish to say it is meaningless. I would never say that about language which asserts that the American people are against infringement of the right of freedom of worship or to condemn persecution, even in most general terms.

However, it is fair to say that this really has nothing to do with the amendment, which is in accord with and germane to the issue with the specific and precise case made on the floor of the Senate about the persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union, carried on by the Soviet Union as a matter of government policy in terms of many anti-Jewish acts, repression of the Jewish religion and of Jewish culture, all of which was specified in great detail when the question was debated in the Senate.

This situation is very much to be deplored. Moreover, it is a situation which should be protested.

It is a fact that it defies the tradition of more than a century in this country of protesting exactly this kind of act in exactly the same country. We protested anti-Jewish acts when the czars were in power, and now we have an opportunity to protest them to the Soviet Union.

One final thought appeals to me very deeply—that we justify a vast part of the struggle in respect to foreign aid, in re-

spect to the defense machinery of the United States, in terms of the struggle against communism, to prevent communism from taking over the world by infiltration, subversion, or persuasion; yet, when we have one of the most meaningful, most appealing, and most sympathetically compelling issues with the Communists—namely, the issue of freedom to practice one's religion, the issue of persecution on the grounds of faith, we forgo it for some doctrinaire idea that it should not go into this law, but somewhere else.

What more appropriate place could there be than a law which implements policy upon which all American foreign policy is based, and our determination that communism shall not take over on earth?

The one thing that Communists are trying to sell mankind on is its liberalism in terms of accommodation to the rights of man. It is the one issue they defy with the greatest of cynicism. The fact that anti-Semitism is a crime is written into the basic law of the Soviet Union; yet the Government of the Soviet Union practices anti-Jewish acts which many of us feel are tantamount to the very thing its basic Constitution asserts to be a crime. Yet, given the opportunity by a well-nigh unanimous vote in the Senate to affirm our principles in the foreign aid bill, we take it out upon the doctrinaire ground that it does not belong in this piece of legislation—which is exactly where it does belong.

For the life of me, I cannot understand where else it should go. It is a "sense of Congress" resolution. I am deeply convinced that it is the sense of the country. I believe that the excision of the resolution is shameful and unfortunate. I protest deeply that it was stricken from the bill and referred to only in the broadest and most general of terms, terms to which I could not object and would never protest against. It is right. However, it is not germane to the issue with which the Senate is dealing when it adopted the resolution by such an overwhelming majority of Senators.

Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I join the Senator from New York in the statement he has just made in regard to elimination in conference of the Senate resolution which sought to make clear our disapproval of Communist Russia's persecution of Jews.

There is all the difference in the world between the issue which was raised by that resolution and the language brought out by the conferees in regard to discrimination with respect to religious faith.

We are dealing here with a group of people known as Jews. Everyone knows what anti-Semitism is. We know what a plague of horror it has been to mankind for many centuries.

I shall speak on this subject at greater length later this afternoon, or at a later time, but I wish the RECORD to show that I join the Senator from New York in regard to his observations.

I wish to be cooperative with the leadership, but I find myself in a difficult position procedurally at the present moment.

I am perfectly willing to enter into any agreement with the leadership for a vote at a time certain in regard to the foreign aid conference report. I have been one of the leaders in the Senate against the foreign aid bill, as presently envisioned, and as it has been brought back from the conference, with most of the recommendations of the Senate stripped from the conference report. I believe we have an obligation to get a rollcall vote in the Senate.

At the same time, I want to cooperate with the leadership. I am willing to enter into an agreement to vote at a time certain—any time that the leadership wants to propose. But we ought to have a record vote on a matter that splits the Senate as this conference report does.

I want the leader to know that I am not trying to be stubborn about it. But I feel so deeply about it that I do not believe this conference report should be agreed to in this body with merely a dozen Senators on the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Oregon very much for his extremely helpful intervention.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a vote on the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill at 2:45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. May I ask a question of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] who has just come into the Chamber? I am told by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] that he would rather have the Senator from Arkansas answer the question. I have just protested vigorously against the excision of the provision with respect to the persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union from the foreign aid bill.

Can the Senator from Arkansas—and his views prevailed in the conference—give us the rationale with respect to this excision? Why was this done by the conferees? Was there any view on their part that this was not true?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The House conferees had no feeling about it in any way. There was nothing in their version of the bill that was similar to it. They thought that it was inappropriate to use this bill as a vehicle for a policy of this kind. They wanted to take the whole thing out. I thought we were obligated to retain it. We had a vote here. I thought it should stay in. This was the compromise that they were willing to make. There was a difference between the two versions. There was no effort on their part to deny the facts. They thought such a provision would be inappropriate in this bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I repeat my deep sense of protest against this excision. I believe the correctness of my position would be demonstrated by a vote in the House—which I am confident would be unanimously in favor of such a resolution. If the matter had been returned to the House, it would have been favorably voted on as decisively as it was in the Senate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I have witnessed many times in this Chamber the addition or deletion of items from bills that have come before our august body, on which we voted favorably, but in which items were added or deleted in conference.

The foreign aid conference committee undoubtedly had what it considers good reasons to strike the reapportionment provision and the Tower amendment on aid to Indonesia from the foreign aid authorization bill, but I cannot but think that such reasons were more specious than laudable. I voted against the innocuous reapportionment resolution because I felt that in its defeat the Senate might take it upon itself to put something with a little more starch into the reapportionment issue. However, innocuous though it was, the sense of Congress resolution was at least a means by which the Senate could take official cognizance of the reapportionment dilemma. It is unconscionable to me that the majority of conferees could delete this language.

The resolution as passed by the Senate would have made no requirements of the Supreme Court. That august body would have been free to trip the light fantastic through the laws of the land, the legislatures of the States, and the Halls of the Congress. The resolution simply importuned the gentlemen of the High Court to act with restraint and moderation—two words which this administration purports to favor in its political discourse—but obviously even this language did not please the conferees. It is tragic, Mr. President, that this is so, for now the States have no recourse, and they are at the mercy of Federal courts which have thus far been disinclined to show either moderation or restraint in reapportionment.

Now, Mr. President, regarding Indonesia, certainly, there is no doubt that this Nation's foreign aid funds—that is, the taxpayers' funds—have been misspent in many different ways.

I feel, however, that in the field of foreign aid, our very worst fault is the continuing failure to make a distinction between friends and enemies.

I was pleased that the Senate saw the distinction this year in one such case. I regret that the majority of foreign aid conferees apparently did not.

I refer, Mr. President, to Sukarno. On August 13, this body very clearly saw fit to prohibit further aid to one of our country's enemies, Sukarno. The vote on the prohibitive amendment was 62 to 28.

At this juncture in my remarks I digress to say that I agree wholeheartedly with the attitude of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] concerning the action of the conferees in respect to the resolution which would have censured Soviet Russia for its persecution of the Jews in that land. I endorse

everything that the Senator from New York said in that connection.

The Senate faced the fact that Mr. Sukarno is no friend of the United States. I regret the majority of conferees did not.

The conference report says nothing that the Senate did not know when it voted 62 to 28 to prohibit such aid. The conference report stated that we still have discretion to cut off aid. If the administration discretion were being wisely used, the amendment would not have been necessary in the first place. But, this discretionary power is not being used.

Where is Sukarno today?

I read from yesterday's issue of the New York Times from an article entitled "More Soviet Arms Promised Sukarno," as follows:

> The Soviet Union agreed today to supply more arms to Indonesia. However, no formal agreement has been signed by Premier Khrushchev and President Sukarno, who arrived here (Moscow) yesterday and will leave tomorrow on his way to Cairo for a meeting of the leaders of nonalined nations.
>
> Under a previous agreement on military aid, signed by Foreign Minister Subandrio in July, the Soviet Union supplied transport planes, helicopters, and other equipment for Indonesia's military struggle against Malaysia.

Premier Khrushchev met Mr. Sukarno for the second time in 2 days this morning. Their talks covered the further development of friendly Soviet-Indonesian relations and the international problems of mutual interest. I might also add that on the floor of the Senate, Sukarno was quoted as having said to the United States of America, "To hell with its aid."

Let me review briefly the facts. We now spend money to train Indonesian military and police personnel. Indonesia is at this time waging war against our British and Malaysian allies.

Sukarno continues to remark publicly he will "crush" Malaysia. Sukarno is a friend of the Communists. There can be no doubt of this. Two prominent Communist Party leaders in his country hold the rank of Minister.

As of late April there were 187 Indonesian armed forces personnel training in the United States, plus 38 police personnel, a total of 225.

Here is a breakdown of the U.S. folly:

Under the Army, 94 Indonesian trainees are at work. Sixty-one of them are scattered among such regular military career courses as engineering, adjutant general, finance, ordnance, armor, signal, medical, infantry, women's army corps, military police, chaplain, supply, quartermaster, transport, artillery, and the U.S. Command and General Staff School. Thirty-three others are in what our State Department calls civic action courses, which somehow include infantry training.

Until this year Indonesian trainees here were given guerrilla and counterinsurgency courses.

Under the supervision of our Navy, 68 Indonesian trainees are assigned to various U.S. military schools in such career courses as naval aviation, oceanography, supply, electronics, engineering, motor transport, and the Navy Command Course. Another seven are in those elusive civic action courses.

Under the Air Force, there are 18 Indonesian trainees; 10 in Air Force career courses, and 8 in civic action.

In addition 38 Indonesian police are training in this Nation. Thirteen are taking police management and internal security courses at AID's International Police Academy right here in Washington. They get special instruction in traffic, patrolling, and railroad security—all handy things to know in a dictatorship.

Eighteen more Indonesian policemen are at U.S. military schools working in telecommunications maintenance, weapons and ammunition repair, Coast Guard organizations, maintenance and operation, search, rescue, maritime law enforcement, and military police organization and operations.

Three others are studying at private institutions in the field of telecommunications. One is studying police administration at the University of Southern California; three are taking courses here in Washington under that catchall "civic action" heading.

While this U.S.-financed training goes on, our ally Malaysia is being invaded and British troops in the area killed by Indonesian military forces.

This would seem a good place for the Johnson administration to make a start at getting our foreign assistance programs out of the realm of the ridiculous and back to the realm of reason.

Of particular interest is the police training program administered by the Agency for International Development since 1954 and upon which, to date, American taxpayers have spent more than $16 million.

AID blithely admits that the training is designed to increase the competence of the 110,000-man national police of Leftist-Dictator Sukarno. We are to help train the police officers, modernize their radio communications, update their transport facilities, and improve their supply system.

American taxpayers are footing the bill for this so that Sukarno will not lose control of his island nation. That is a priority set by our foreign assistance program. It could use some prompt rethinking.

Among the major items of equipment we have sent to this "peaceful, friendly, democratic" nation are 1,800 vehicles of all types, 53 small patrol craft for sea police, 5 small aircraft for air police, laboratory equipment in the amount of $206,000, records and identification equipment in the amount of $130,000, and investigative equipment to the tune of $25,000.

Approximately $2 million has been expended to provide a radio, teletype, and telephone communication network giving Sukarno's police comprehensive coverage throughout the widespread nation.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that a New York Times article dated October 1 and entitled "More Soviet Arms Promised to Sukarno" be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

> MORE SOVIET ARMS PROMISED SUKARNO
>
> Moscow, September 30.—The Soviet Union agreed today to supply more arms to Indonesia.
>
> However, no formal agreement has been signed by Premier Khrushchev and President Sukarno, who arrived here yesterday and will leave tomorrow on his way to Cairo for a meeting of the leaders of nonalined nations.
>
> Under a previous agreement on military aid, signed by Foreign Minister Subandrio in July, the Soviet Union supplied transport planes, helicopters, and other equipment for Indonesia's military struggle against Malaysia.
>
> Premier Khrushchev met Mr. Sukarno for the second time in 2 days this morning. Their talks covered "the further development of friendly Soviet-Indonesian relations and international problems of mutual interest," according to Tass, the Soviet press agency.
>
> High military, economic, and diplomatic officials were present on both sides.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in his remarks during debate on this very amendment, the distinguished Senator from Illinois noted, as shown on page 19427 of the RECORD of August 13:

> It is now roughly 2 months since the distinguished leader in Indonesia, Mr. Sukarno, stated publicly to all the world—and it was carried by every wire service—that "The United States can go to hell with its aid."

I might note parenthetically, Mr. President, that the United States might as well go there as it has nearly exhausted its supply of earthly coffers in which to plunk American tax dollars.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill is characteristic of the difficulty Congress faces in trying to reduce foreign aid expenditures and make all aid expenditures more effective in promoting national objectives.

The conference report demonstrates once again that only when both bodies act in concert on the floor are the aid agencies stopped from writing their own foreign aid legislation. Year after year we have seen the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House march right straight down the line laid down by the State Department, the Defense Department, and AID on foreign aid policy. This conference report is evidence that the same thing has happened again this year. It only means that next year, the House floor and the Senate floor will have to see adamant and coordinated efforts made to redraft foreign aid legislation that will advance the national interests of the United States.

This conference report is largely a recital of the amendments added on the Senate floor from which the Senate conferees receded.

I ask Senators to examine their copies of the conference report. Look at the first page. The report shows that the Senate receded from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 36, 37, 38, 41, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, and 60.

The record also shows that the House receded from its disagreement to the

amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, 33, 44, and 52 and agree to the same.

That is the most unsatisfactory conference report that has ever come to the floor of this body in my 20 years in the Senate. There is no match for it in walking out on the commitments made here on the floor of the Senate by the vote of the full Senate. That is why the senior Senator from Oregon has taken the position that Senators today should stand up and be counted on the conference report by a yea and nay vote, and when they do, they will only be beginning to fight in the next few years until we bring to an end the shocking betrayal of the taxpayers of this country as found in the foreign aid program. Hundreds of millions of dollars are being wasted. Hundreds of millions of dollars are being used to foster corruption abroad in one kept government after another.

The most important items on which the Senate conferees receded were those designed to tighten the policy directives governing foreign aid. The net result is once again to accommodate administrative desires to have a free hand in the distribution of foreign aid.

I am extremely disappointed that the ban on aid to Indonesia, just discussed by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] was stricken out. Congress is literally abdicating its responsibility for the foreign aid program when it permits aid to Indonesia, headed by that irresponsible man known as Sukarno, to continue.

And it continues only on the hypothetical, vague, and desperate assumption that if we train a few military personnel in that country, they eventually will rise to positions of leadership and will follow American designs and objectives in that part of the world.

That is a part of the propaganda of the Pentagon. There is a clique in the Pentagon that is trying to exercise more and more military influence in this American democracy. Around the world they are trying to build up military oligarchies and use American taxpayer dollars to strengthen those oligarchies. I say to the American people that between now and next year we have a responsibility of citizen statesmanship to make clear to Members of the Congress that we want no more of it, and that next year we want the foreign aid bill drastically revised.

Mr. President, I do not know of a more fatuous assumption that could be devised as a basis for spending American money. The notion that we can guide and control countries by remote control is proving utterly fallacious even in South Vietnam, where we have invested more like $3 billion since the French withdrawal and we still have been unable to control events.

We continue to put this money into Indonesia as a means of influencing its military leaders, and as the Senator from Wyoming has pointed out, we get in return insult after insult from Sukarno. We get a violation of the United Nations Charter by Sukarno on event after event. We are making war in that part of the world, and the United States proposes to continue to pour more money into the assistance of that tyrant.

We think we are protecting American military interests in south Asia by so doing. But I say we are only training Indonesians who will carry out their own objectives in that part of the world, and they will not be American objectives.

If anything, more fundamental reasons for the continuation of our aid program in Indonesia are the investments of American oil companies there. American companies have invested nearly half a billion dollars in Indonesia, and the Shell Oil Co., an international company, has investments estimated at around $650 million.

Indonesia has for years made threatening noises about nationalizing all foreign oil operations, and every time Sukarno uses that blackmail threat, the American oil companies tremble, and the pressure is put on for more American aid to Indonesia.

Last year an arrangement was agreed to that permits the oil companies to continue the management and control of their holdings for another 20 years. Their exports from Indonesia amount to a quarter of a billion dollars a year in value, and while 60 percent of the profits go to Indonesia, it is obvious that in protection of their share, the companies are quite willing to have American taxpayers shell out a little "protection money" to Sukarno.

The domestic distribution facilities in Indonesia are expected to be nationalized; but the real value of the investments is in the exporting of Indonesian oil.

As they are in the Middle East, the American taxpayers are being billed—and I should say bilked—for the privilege of having American oil companies earn huge profits in foreign oil. We are constantly lulled with the theory that we have to preempt all the oil fields in the world to keep them from falling into Communist hands. I tell the American people that is a lot of baloney. The world is nearly drowning in oil. What we are really trying to do is to extend our control over as much of the supply as possible in order to maintain an artificially high price for oil on the world market. The "keep it away from Communists" line is only an excuse for the money our taxpayers are taxed to pay the local governments for the privileges they grant our investors.

This is a measure of how far foreign aid has gotten away from the theoretical objectives used to justify it. The kind of aid we are furnishing to Sukarno has nothing in the world to do with helping the people of Indonesia live better. It has nothing at all to do with raising living standards or reaching the masses of the people in any way at all.

It is strictly and purely a political gesture, from which we hope to gain privilege for American business and to forestall threats to what we consider our security interests in the Indian Ocean and the South China Sea.

Aid furnished on that basis has been a failure in country after country; it will be a failure in Indonesia, too.

Next year the House of Representatives must start with a ban on aid to Indonesia written into the foreign aid bill on the floor, and the Senate must follow suit. That is the only way this disreputable aid program to Sukarno will ever be ended.

The Senate conferees invited floor action next year, too, by compromising the Senate amendment on interest rates. The conference report states:

> The committee of conference weighed the appeal for stiffer loan terms against the more important consideration that borrowing countries not be encouraged to pursue irresponsible debt practices. Prudence requires that such nations not be burdened with unduly high loan costs until their development is sufficient to finance their debts. Any severe increase in the costs of loans would only increase the possibilities of default which would have serious consequences not only for foreign governments and international financial institutions that had loaned the money, but also for private investors, many of whom are U.S. citizens.

That is clear enough. The American taxpayers are being told more plainly than usual that they will have to continue subsidizing American private investors abroad and continue subsidizing the foreign countries that lend to underdeveloped nations at commercial interest rates and many of them do. "After all, Mr. Taxpayer, if you did not give low-interest loans to these countries they might not be able to pay off foreign creditors and private American investors." That is the message of the conference report.

Once again, action will have to start in the House next year to write a reasonable interest rate section into the bill on the House floor that the Senate can endorse when the bill reaches the Senate floor.

The money amendments made by the Senate were also quickly "ditched" in conference. The total sum authorized by the conference committee is $3.506 billion, only $10 million under the executive request. The Senate cut that request by $250 million or $266 million. Then we added an amount of $50 million for the beef amendment. So we cut it about $200 million or $225 million.

When the Senate sent it to conference, it authorized $3.290 billion. Of these reductions, only the small one in technical cooperation and development grants was retained by the conferees.

Here again, it is going to take floor action in both Houses to bring the sums spent down to reasonable levels.

The alibi that is being given in the cloakrooms this afternoon is, "Let it go through, because we have already passed an appropriation bill of only $3.250 billion."

Mr. President, this is an authorization bill, authorizing policy; and it is the policy in the report that the senior Senator from Oregon objects to, as I have done for many months past and the last 2 years. Any time it is desired to reform policies in foreign aid, such an effort will have the support of the senior Senator from Oregon, and he will be supporting the foreign aid program. But until corruption, inefficiency, and waste are taken out of our foreign aid program abroad, I will continue to vote against it.

I am satisfied that the American people, by increasing millions, are supporting the position the Senator from Oregon

is taking. Come next year, I pledge today an all-out fight against the foreign aid bill that will make my past fights appear to be mere skirmishes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senate to vote at 2:45 p.m.?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 8:45 p.m., pursuant to a prior unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it is not necessary for me to make these remarks, but I think, in view of the deep feelings of the Senator from Oregon and the very powerful argument he has made, it would be appropriate to say a few words about the aid program.

Like all other programs—either foreign or domestic, in my opinion—this program has had its failures. It has also had its successes. On balance, I think its successes far outweigh its failures.

I do not believe that the Senator from Oregon would deny that the initial effort in this field, the Marshall plan was a very great success. It went along well. Of course, the conditions then were much easier to deal with than the ones that confront us now in places like Asia, Africa, and Latin America. But, on balance, I think the program has been beneficial.

One way to get a little perspective about this matter—and I think it deserves some credit—is to compare conditions in the world today with those after World War I. World War I, up to that time, was the worst, the most destructive conflict the Western World had ever experienced. Twenty years after World War I, we were on the verge of World War II. After World War I we did not engage in the League of Nations. We refused to participate in that activity. We did not assume any responsibility for the development of underdeveloped countries. We made no effort to try to bring stability and peace into any area. We had an official policy of isolation.

Subsequent to World War II we have had the opposite overall policy both with regard to the United Nations, as compared with the League of Nations, and also in the field of aid, engaging in those activities, and trying to influence the course of events. While I do not pretend that aid alone has made the difference, still I think it is true that at present, in spite of difficulties in South Vietnam and some other difficult areas, the world is not in anything like the unstable and dangerous situation in which it was in 1938 and 1939.

If the American people will judge the situation and compare the situation carefully with what happened as a result of our policy after the First World War, and assess the role and influence the aid program has had since World War II, they will agree that it has been a bargain.

It is true that it has cost much more money than other activities, short of all-out war; but, on the other hand, when we compare the total cost of the aid program with the cost of waging war, we get a little different idea and a little different view as to whether or not an investment of this kind, compared with the outbreak of a conflict, is a good investment—aside from the cost of lives, but only in terms of dollars and cents.

The cost of World War II was infinitely greater to this country, as well as to other countries, than the cost of the aid program. It is not a perfect program. I would not challenge the statement of the Senator from Oregon and say there have been no mistakes. I am well aware that there have been. One could say that of practically every other kind of program, even domestic programs such as programs for relief of unemployment or other relief programs, which we all support. From time to time we encounter abuses, because, human nature being what it is, there is no way to prevent them.

I do not believe that the allegations of malfeasance and gross corruption, and so on, which have been made about AID, are sound. Some mistakes have been made. I have found very few, if any, instances of deliberate corruption on the part of any employees of AID. I do not think it is subject to that kind of criticism. It is a thankless job. I suppose this agency has had more directors in a shorter time than any other major activity of Government. No one cares to serve as director of this administration, partly because of the attacks that are made on it, partly because of the extreme difficulty that the administration has had in areas with which we are not very familiar and where we have had little experience in the past, and partly because Congress has put so many inhibitions upon the administration, which makes the job much more difficult than if we were to adopt only broad policies and leave the administration up to the executive department and merely review their activities after they had performed their work.

I cite one example. In the present bill I did my best, as many of my colleagues did, to keep in the bill the provision regarding giving the AID Administrator the power to upgrade the quality of his personnel. However, the House conferees absolutely refused to accept that provision. We were in a deadlock practically all day yesterday on two points—the one I have mentioned, and the other on the Sabbatino amendment. We could not make any progress, and we had to give way in order to get any report at all.

I regret that very much. Mr. Bell is a very conscientious public servant, and he would like to have the opportunity to improve the quality of his top employees, but we did not get that provision. I hope next year the Senate and the House will review that aspect of the bill.

On the whole, while I cannot say that this is a perfect program, I believe it is certainly worth while.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall take only 1 minute.

Time does not permit me to reply in detail, although the facts warrant a reply in detail.

All through the argument of the Senator from Arkansas runs the fallacy that the aid proponents have used time and time again, namely, that aid prevents war. The sad fact is that the way we are operating aid it induces war. Consider the way we are building up the war machines throughout the world. Consider what we are doing in Pakistan and India. We are supporting them with a military aid program of millions of dollars, not one dollar of which should have been granted to either country. They are building themselves up so that they can go to war with each other over Kashmir. If they go to war over Kashmir, they will be practically 100-percent equipped with American military aid.

Take the case of Greece and Turkey. In Turkey, we have thrown down the drain hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayer money to build up a military oligarchy; a tyranny, not a democracy—a tyranny operating state industries and using moral corruption throughout their manpower program.

In southeast Asia our military aid is seriously endangering peace in that part of the world. In Africa, it is sucking the United States deeper and deeper into the affairs of African countries, and I predict that if Congress does not stop it, U.S. aid programs will produce another Vietnam involvement in Africa.

It is a fallacious argument to argue that foreign aid prevents war. If we wish to prevent war, let us go in for economic aid project by project.

In preparing people for economic freedom in the underdeveloped areas, we are bringing them free government and reducing the possibility of war.

Military aid is causative of war, not productive of peace.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask for the yeas and nays on the conference report.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is now 2:45 p.m. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered, the Senate will now vote on the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 11380. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understand, a vote in favor of the conference report is a vote of "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr.

CANNON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from California [Mr. SALINGER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. SALINGER] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN].

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM].

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The pair of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). On this vote, the result is—yeas, 35, nays 15, and one live pair. This constitutes a quorum.

The yeas and nays were announced as follows:

[No. 592 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Aiken	Hart	Nelson
Allott	Hayden	Pearson
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Pell
Bartlett	Holland	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Proxmire
Case	Javits	Saltonstall
Church	Kuchel	Smathers
Cooper	Mansfield	Smith
Dodd	McIntyre	Sparkman
Douglas	McNamara	Walters
Fong	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Monroney	

NAYS—15

Bible	Long, La.	Russell
Byrd, Va.	McClellan	Simpson
Ellender	Morse	Stennis
Jordan, N.C.	Mundt	Williams, Del.
Lausche	Robertson	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—50

Bayh	Gore	Miller
Beall	Gruening	Morton
Bennett	Hartke	Moss
Boggs	Hill	Muskie
Brewster	Hruska	Neuberger
Burdick	Humphrey	Pastore
Cannon	Jackson	Randolph
Carlson	Johnston	Ribicoff
Clark	Jordan, Idaho	Salinger
Cotton	Keating	Scott
Curtis	Kennedy	Symington
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Talmadge
Dominick	Magnuson	Thurmond
Eastland	McCarthy	Tower
Edmondson	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McGovern	Yarborough
Goldwater	Mechem	

So the report was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. For future reference, so that the record may be kept straight, do I correctly understand that the announcement of the Chair on the last vote was that the yeas were 35 and the nays were 15, with one pair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Do I correctly understand that under the precedents of the Senate, when there is less than a physical quorum present, a quorum can be created by certain Senators giving live pairs with absent Senators, and that that amounts in effect to the creation of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that a quorum must be physically present. On the last vote there were 35 yeas, 15 nays, and one live pair, which made 51 Senators present, a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Then the live pair would constitute the first 50?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With the live pair, 51 Senators were present, a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Fifty-one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-one Senators were physically present, which constitutes a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. So the total number of senatorial bodies on the floor was 51?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Chair.

LOCATION OF CHANCERIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in any residential area in the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the bill, S. 646, which was reported by the conferees is, in my opinion, a fair and reasonable resolution of the problem which has confronted the residents of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Government, and the governments of foreign nations seeking locations in the District of Columbia for chancery buildings.

The bill which the conferees have reported clearly spells out the requirements which foreign governments must meet in order to locate chanceries in the District.

With certain specified exceptions, no new chancery locations may be established in residential zones. The Senate conferees adopted provisions of the House bill which would allow chanceries to be located in medium high density and high density apartment zones, subject to explicit standards of available off-street parking space, building height, and architectural design. Chanceries will be allowed to locate in all other zones, including special purpose, commercial, and industrial zones.

The House bill had included a provision allowing small chanceries employing less than seven persons to locate in all residential zones. The House receded from this position in the face of the argument so ably presented by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that such a provision might well turn out to be virtually unenforcible.

Sections 2 and 4 of the bill approved by the conferees represent a strengthening of the provision included in the original Senate bill designed to protect the rights of owners of buildings now legally used as chanceries.

Section 4 was intended to meet the specific case of a building in any residential zone when the most recent legal use of that building has been as a chancery by a foreign government. Section 4 would allow that building to be used as a chancery by another foreign government in the future. Thus, the owners of the building, who may have expended considerable sums of money in altering their building to make it suitable for chancery use, will not have to lose their investment solely because their present tenants move out. Of course, as the House report pointed out, the right to use a building as a chancery in the future "could be specifically abandoned by the owner of such property or by demonstration that, as a matter of fact, the use had been otherwise abandoned."

The conferees were unanimous in feeling that the present bill represents a fair solution to the chancery problem in Washington, for the time being. Hope was expressed that it might be possible, at a later date, to consider a more long-term solution to the problem, possibly in the nature of a special chancery area, or precinct.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. McINTYRE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like to make some legislative history. Let us assume that Black Acre in the city of Washington constitutes present nonconforming use. Do I correctly understand that there is nothing in the bill which would affect the rights of the owners of Black Acre to continue that nonconforming use so long as the nonconforming use remains the same, regardless of tenants?

Mr. McINTYRE. The Senator from California is correct. The bill goes out of its way to protect existing vested rights in the Black Acre situation. If the Black Acre owners have a nonconforming use they are entitled to certain vested rights that would not be affected by the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Even though the tenants hasten to change, if the nonconforming use is set aside for another government?

Mr. McINTYRE. The Senator is correct. My admonition to him is that a nonconforming use is a right with its own legal standing. The owners of Black Acre cannot expand upon the use. By the same token, it could very well be legally abandoned.

Mr. KUCHEL. Could be?

Mr. McINTYRE. Could be; but at the discretion of the owners.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my letter to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE] on this subject.

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

SEPTEMBER 29, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS J. McINTYRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: As you know, I have had a longstanding interest in S. 646 dealing with foreign chanceries located in the District of Columbia. One of my California constituents owns the building which is now leased to the Jamaican Government as a chancery. This building has always been used as a chancery and, although in a residential district, indeed, the sister-in-law of my constituent lives next door, it is not suitable because of its size for use as a private residence. I deeply appreciated your entering into a colloquy with me on this matter when S. 646 passed the Senate.

I have studied both the House and the Senate reports on this legislation and I feel that the provisions with regard to the right of an individual to continue a long established nonconforming use, such as is true in the case of a grocery located in a residential neighborhood prior to the establishment of a zoning law or regulation, is not clear with reference to the type of situation in which my constituent finds himself. I therefore wonder if it might be possible for you to raise this question when the conferees meet and see if some agreement could be reached in principle on this matter so that the appropriate legislative language might be drafted. I think the principle here is that a person using a building on the date of the adoption of the zoning regulations, say May 12, 1958, should be permitted to continue to use that property to the same extent and in the same manner as it was being used at that time and during the period which ends with the enactment of the bill now before the conferees. I would hope that such a continued use, as a chancery in this case, would not be subject to new provisions which would restrict the reasonable use of that property in residential areas.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, a moment ago, when the chancery bill conference report was acted on, I wished to say a word of commendation for the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE] for the fine work he did in bringing to final passage the chancery legislation, and to express my appreciation to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for the contribution he made in working out what I believe to be a very sound procedure for the location of foreign chanceries in the city of Washington.

It has been a troublesome problem for many years. It has caused a great deal of ill feeling between our country and foreign countries. I believe the formula which the bill has adopted is a sound formula and one that we can live with. It will go far toward settling this troublesome problem.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Arkansas in expressing my appreciation to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE] for working out what I think is a very sound principle to govern the location of chanceries in the District of Columbia.

It was my privilege to work with the Senator from New Hampshire as one of the conferees. I want the record to show that credit for that fine conference report should go to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE]. Every suggestion he made I thought was a very sound one and I was very glad to go into conference supporting his hand in those recommendations.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR WALTERS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it now appears that the 88th Congress will adjourn sometime this evening, and before Senators leave I wish to make a brief statement.

I desire to say a few words with respect to the distinguished occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] and his brief period of service in this body.

It has been a high privilege for me to know the Senator and to enjoy his friendship. Not in the time that I have served in the Senate has any man entered this body and gained the respect, esteem, and affection of the Members of the Senate in a similar period of time to a greater extent than has the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS]. The Senator from Tennessee has been a very valuable Member of this body. He has indicated that very rare characteristic of commonsense. Down in my home State of Georgia, we call it horsesense. It enables him to analyze legislation and to vote for sound governmental practices.

I regret very much to see the Senator from Tennessee leave this body this evening after it adjourns sine die. He has made very many valuable contributions during the period he has been here. I assure the Senator that he takes with him the affection and esteem of his colleagues.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, just over 1 year ago the Senate was bereaved by the death of one of its most prominent Members, Senator Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee. We were fortunate, however, in having the able and capable HERBERT S. WALTERS join our ranks to represent the State of Tennessee. Long prominent in the Democratic Party on the State and National levels, HERBERT WALTERS took his seat on the floor of the Senate particularly well suited to represent the people of his State and to carry on in the fine tradition set by his predecessors throughout our history and by the present senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Senator WALTERS brought with him a rare and mature insight into the needs of Tennessee and the United States along with a keen and understanding mind. We have found him to be kind and unassuming and the possessor of a spirit of cooperativeness rarely exceeded, but with deep convictions to which he holds tenaciously.

Mr. President, we bid farewell to HERBERT WALTERS with regret. We know that he will continue to find ways to serve the people of Tennessee and the Democratic Party as he has done for more than 30 years.

I am honored and happy to join the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in making my feelings known concerning the present occupant of the chair.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to associate myself with the views expressed by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia.

I wish to say publicly what I have privately said to the Senator from Tennessee. "I hate to see you go."

The Senator from Tennessee is beloved in this body, not only for his judgment and fine ability, but also for his sterling qualities of character. His service here was of peculiar interest to me. His lovely wife came from Staunton, Va., which is 36 miles north of my home in Lexington. We in Virginia have looked upon him as our third Senator in this body. We do not like to see him go.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am happy to say that I think "HUB" WALTERS has made a great contribution to the Senate since he came here. He is always able to see the sunny side—sometimes when it does not appear that there is any sunny or humorous side.

I, for one, have enjoyed his company very much.

As he goes back to Tennessee, I know he has had an experience to take back to his State. I believe that he has voted right most of the time—perhaps not every time. But he has been a credit to his State. I would like to have the people of his State know that we appreciate the fact that "HUB" WALTERS has made a real contribution during the time he has been here.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for raising this question.

It was my great privilege to serve with the Senator from Tennessee on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. We have had a large amount of work in that committee. I have watched him work. I was agreeably surprised to find that from his rich background he had drawn knowledge that is ordinarily available only to legislators who have served over a long period of time.

He is a good man and a fine gentleman. I have appreciated my service with him in the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia has done a fine thing in calling attention to the fact that the Senator from Tennessee will not be with us next year. The Senator from Tennessee has made a fine contribution to the membership of this body. He has been a very fine Senator. We shall miss him. We all wish him a very long and profitable life.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the short period that the distinguished Senator now presiding over the Senate has been in this body, I have been in rather close contact with him, from the first day that I met him. On every day thereafter, my admiration of his character and his work increased.

I had the privilege of being with him about once a week at meetings which were devoid of political ramifications, but during which meetings revelations of character were constantly made.

As I have stated, while I respected him shortly after my first meeting with him, that respect has grown in the days that I have been with him. He has been frequent in attendance. He has been stable in his judgment. He has been affable in his relationships with his colleagues. He has been a good servant of the people.

I shall miss him very much. My hopes are that intermittently he will return so that we may again have the benefit of association with him.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it is always a sad day when the occasion arises that we must pay tribute and, in effect, say goodby to those with whom we have associated in the Senate, and whom we have come to love and respect.

I believe that it is particularly sad to say goodby to a man who made it known soon after he arrived that he had no intention of attempting to run for office this year and thus to keep the seat which he now occupies, and which he has occupied so well.

It is sad that we are required to say goodby to a man—at least so far as his participation in the Senate is concerned—who, knowing that he was not going to remain here, has devoted himself to his work in the Senate with such earnestness that perhaps many others might well take an example from his actions.

It has been my pleasure to serve with "HUB" WALTERS on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Even though he knew that his term would be relatively short because of his own choice, there are few, and there have been a few on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who have attended so regularly, who have done their homework so well, and who have been an inspiration to the entire committee, as has the Senator from Tennessee.

I express my own personal thanks for the clarity of vision, fairness, and integrity with which the Senator from Tennessee has approached all of these problems, as well as the problems that he has had on the floor of the Senate. The senior Senator from Colorado and the junior Senator from Colorado—who is temporarily absent—extend the Senator our very best wishes. We hope the Senator will remember to return and say hello to us.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my friend for yielding to me. I thank him even more for his kindness and courtesy in bringing up this particular item of business.

I have had the very great pleasure of being in the circle of warm friends of Senator WALTERS while he has been a Member of the Senate.

I shall always count that as a delightful experience.

Incidentally, early in his stay here he found out that among my many interests was a love of collecting books, and particularly books about the Southland. He proceeded very quietly and, without giving me any formal notice of it, found a long out-of-print book written by another distinguished Senator from Tennessee, Senator McKellar, our late friend, about all the Senators who have served in the U.S. Senate representing

the great State which has been so well represented by Senator WALTERS during his stay here.

Aside from the question of personal friendship and my regret that he is leaving to go to an area where we shall not be able to see him so often, I wish to say that he has been exceedingly faithful in his attendance upon the Senate and in the discharge of his duties. He has been exceedingly sound in the expression of his judgment upon the many diverse items on which he has voted. He has been completely fearless in the expression of his opinions and his judgment as shown by his votes.

We shall miss him greatly. We shall not miss him, however, from our circle of friends, and we hope that he will come back frequently. I know that he will find continuous ways to serve his great State—the Volunteer State—and the great Nation which we all love so much.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I know that I express the views of my colleague [Mr. KEATING], who is unavoidably absent, and myself, in wishing a happy and long life to a most gracious and generous Senator.

We come to know people around here very well, and the intimacy of our contact and the fact that this is a hard place to get to, as JOE MARTIN once told me when I first came, only makes our experience here the more interesting and important in our lives. I know it is in the life of the Presiding Officer, Senator WALTERS, who will not be with us in the next session.

I wish to express to him the pleasure and satisfaction which we have derived from our association with him. We have observed his unfailing courtesy, sweet disposition, and lovable character. We shall miss him as a friend and a colleague. We hope that he will come to see us often. I know that I speak for Senator KEATING again, and, speaking for him and myself, we hope for Senator WALTERS a healthful life and fruitful service, as has just been said by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], in the service of his State and Nation.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I am delighted to have an opportunity to express my sentiments regarding the Senator from Tennessee.

I greatly regret that the day is approaching when he will end his tenure here. During my service in the Senate no one has come along who has made a finer impression or contributed more in such a short time as a Member of the Senate. Senator WALTERS has affected legislation and he has affected policy—always in a constructive way. He has made friends among Senators. Each Member of this body feels that he is a personal friend.

On Wednesday I heard the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] mention the attendance of Senator WALTERS in meetings of the Senate. I do not think he has missed a single one if he was in the city during the time that he has been a Senator. I have always found the Senator from Tennessee to be sincere and dedicated. When it comes to qualities of character, honor, and principle, as well as intelligence, he is superb.

I know that my colleague [Mr. EASTLAND], who happens to be absent from the Chamber at the present moment, joins wholeheartedly with me in my expression of those sentiments. I have heard him express them many times.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I join with Senators in paying tribute to the distinguished occupant of the chair at the present time.

I came to know Senator WALTERS many years ago, long before he came to the Senate. I admired him as a man and as a friend then. I was pleased when I heard that he had been appointed to fill the vacancy created by the passing of our late colleague Estes Kefauver in the Senate. From the time that Senator WALTERS made his decision not to run again, I have regretted to see the day come when he would take his departure from the Senate. I believe that no man—certainly no man during the time that I have served in the Senate—has made a finer impression on his colleagues within the short time that he has been here. HERB WALTERS is a good Senator and an able Senator. He is a good citizen and a fine friend.

I regret that my colleague is not able to be present today. I suppose all Senators know that my colleague [Mr. HILL] has had surgery. He has gone home. While he is out of the hospital and back in his home in Alabama, he is resting and recuperating. Many times LISTER HILL and I have talked about what a fine Senator HERBERT WALTERS is. I know that if my colleague were here today, he would pay sterling tribute to the fine traits that characterize this man from Tennessee. I join in expressing the hope that has been expressed by so many other Senators that when Senator WALTERS goes away from here he will not forget us and he will come back and visit us often. I know it will always be a pleasure and a delight for us to welcome him back.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. McINTYRE. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of my fellow Senators in tribute to Senator WALTERS. As a freshman Senator I have been most appreciative of his cooperation and helpfulness to those of us who assist in the duties of presiding. He assisted many times in that duty. I happen to know that to date Senator WALTERS has presided 133½ hours, which I believe leads the pack of the junior Senators who share that duty.

Even more than that, I can yield to no other Member of this body in my respect and affection for the late Senator Estes Kefauver. I think Senator Kefauver himself would have been proud of the fact that Senator WALTERS, in coming here, has been the type of individual with whom it has been so easy to work. He is friendly in his manner and he has been of real and considerate value to the Senate in all of its deliberations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Georgia and other Senators in paying tribute to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS]. He has not been in the Senate as long as some of us. However, he has exhibited very good sense and discretion. I know that all of us regret his leaving the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the present Presiding Officer, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS], that I feel I have been greatly enriched this year as a result of the friendship which has developed between the two of us.

He has been a fine addition to the Senate. I shall always appreciate the opportunity I have had to associate with him on a very personal basis. I shall look forward to a continuation of that friendship, even though the Senator from Tennessee will not be an official Member of this body. I trust he will come back to see us frequently. I shall never miss an opportunity, when I am in Tennessee, to try to see him.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am sure that my colleague, who is necessarily absent today, would like to be associated with the things that have been said about Senator WALTERS. I know that others who are not in the Chamber at this time hold him in the same affection and esteem. On their behalf, as well as my own, I salute you, sir, as an outstanding Tennessean and a great American, and express the hope that you will return frequently to visit us in these Halls.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a stanch friend who is also an admired and respected colleague. The gentleman from Tennessee is one of the most tolerant and understanding men in the U.S. Senate. He is uncompromising in matters of principle. He is a compassionate man, a true and loyal friend. He has endeared himself to his colleagues on both sides of the aisle because of his fairness and magnanimity. He is indeed one of nature's noblemen.

He has served the people of Tennessee with dedication, devotion, and with distinction. He has shown himself to be concerned with the needs of the people of Tennessee as well as of the entire Nation. By his statesmanlike service in the U.S. Senate, he has added luster to the glorious history and contribution which has made Tennessee and our Nation great. We came into this illustrious body as comparative newcomers together. We both share the pride which comes when a man has served for many years in public office in his home State and then is privileged to continue that service on the national scene. Our beloved colleague has established himself as an able Senator, making an enviable record, and presenting a challenge to whomever follows him.

My dear wife and I shall always cherish the warm, close, and affectionate associa-

tion with our confrere and his lovely wife. This association has been harmonious and congenial and very meaningful to us.

Tennessee can well be proud of this fine son in his all-too-short service in the U.S. Senate, because, to all who know him, the name HERBERT S. WALTERS stands for the highest type of manhood, integrity, and loyalty to worthy ideals. We shall miss you, my good friend.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am very sorry indeed to know that Senator HERBERT WALTERS will not be with us during the coming year. Both as a seatmate and a colleague, I have found him a wise, thoughtful, and most enjoyable friend. I remember, too, his excellent work as a Democratic national committeeman for Tennessee.

During the next Congress, I, for one, shall miss having his advice, counsel, thought, and help. I take this occasion to wish him and his wife the very best of happiness and joy in the future.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, this past summer one of the most amazing and remarkable achievements in the annals of sports happened—not just American sports but world sports as well. And the very leader of the group making this unbelievable achievement came from the U.S. Senate—from one of our very own.

I am, indeed, proud of this remarkable person not only because he is a fellow Senator, not only because he is a fellow New Englander, not only because I serve on the same committees with him, but also because of what he is himself as an individual and as a human being. I am sure that every Member of the Senate shares my pride of him and the great credit that he has reflected on the U.S. Senate.

I speak of the senior Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, for whom there is so much respect, admiration, and affection. On July 4, 1914, young LEVERETT SALTONSTALL led the Harvard crew to victory in the world's foremost rowing contest—the Grand Challenge at Henley-on-Thames of the Henley Royal Regatta in Great Britain.

The Harvard crew that was captained by LEVERETT SALTONSTALL on that July 4, 1914, won the Grand Challenge Cup for the United States and Harvard University for the first time—the first American team to do it. Rowing enthusiasts regard this as the world series of international rowing. It is easily the most coveted cup in rowing competition.

Fifty years later, on July 4, 1964, "LEV's" crew returned full strength to the scene of their great victory of 50 years past. Every member of that great and illustrious crew was present. And they stroked a half mile down the course and back again.

The people of Great Britain were delighted. Their Mother Queen presented each of the crew a specially struck gold commemorative medal marking the 1914 Harvard victory. Of this achievement, the London Times said:

> This is an achievement unique in the annals of Henley, and perhaps of any other team sport, and its celebration is to be unique also. The Grand Challenge Cup is the oldest, indeed the original, Henley trophy. Every oarsman aspires to win, and those who have done so know that there is nothing quite like it.

Mr. President, as the saying goes, "This is the kind of stuff of which dreams are made." That saying was never so dramatically appropriate as in describing this remarkable reunion.

Mr. President, this is the kind of rare thrill that makes your spine tingle—that makes you warm inside—that gives you inspiring courage—and gives you a truly deep feeling of friendship for your fellowman.

I salute Captain "LEV" and the members of his historic crew on what they did on July 4, 1914, and 50 years later on July 4, 1964, not only for the United States but literally for every human being in the world in the great hope that their magnificent achievement inspires.

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

Mrs. SMITH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I suppose we could expect it, and we do expect it, from the distinguished senior Senator from Maine that she would think of such a thing as this and be so gracious as to pay tribute to "LEV" SALTONSTALL for what was really a marvelous achievement.

As the London Times said, the Henley Regatta is everything in the rowing world. There may be many other races, but everyone wants to win the Henley.

This example of victory of a crew which was led by our distinguished colleague, Senator SALTONSTALL is, I think, unparalleled, so far as I know from following sports, in which the same team that won a major sporting event in 1914 were able, together with the same coxswain, to get back into a shell 50 years later and row on the Thames. It was indeed a tribute to the courage, faith, and friendship of these men, but it is also a spirit which our British friends particularly and greatly admire. I know from my own contacts and what I have heard that they appreciated the effort these gentlemen made in returning there 50 years later.

I pay my respect to Senator SALTONSTALL. I particularly express my appreciation to the senior Senator from Maine for being so thoughtful as to make these expressions possible today.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank my distinguished colleague for his generous words.

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

Mrs. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I think we are all proud of the senior Senator from Massachusetts, and also envious of him for what he has done in repeating his triumphal performance of 50 years ago. Naturally, he is a source of great pride to all Americans. I appreciate the thoughtfulness of the Senator from Maine in giving the Senator from Massachusetts this well deserved recognition. I still think the Senator from Maine would have made a good President.

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

Mrs. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I was not among that sizable number of Senators who had the pleasure of being sons of old John Harvard, but my observation has been that they are generally very fine citizens and great Americans. I know of none of them who stands out more in those qualities that LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

When he was Governor of his State and I had the honor to serve in a similar capacity in my own State, he entertained us in order to make us feel at home at Harvard. He put us up in Elliott Hall. So to that extent I have been close to that institution of learning.

I have known of no finer person in my public life, no gentler person, no firmer person when he had a conviction.

I am not surprised that he led his crew to the original victory, nor am I surprised that he was on hand to lead the crew to victory again in their triumphal trial run 50 years later.

I congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts, the university which produced him, and the Senator from Maine for having said these kind words today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mrs. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think there is entirely too much emphasis placed on Harvard University, because the universities of Montana, Colorado, Maine, Florida, Alabama, Tennessee, Arkansas, and many others are just as good, but those universities are not endowed with age and the traditions and prestige which is Harvard's, and rightly so. We are all one in honoring a son of that great institution. Whether in the field of athletics or in the Halls of Congress, when there is a job to be done, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL is one to do it.

I am delighted to have this opportunity and privilege to pay homage to a great man, a man who is an inspiration to us and the Nation, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleagues for joining me in what I consider to be a great accomplishment. When we speak of physical fitness, I know of no greater example of it than the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts.

WHERE WERE THEY WHEN NEEDED?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have noted with interest and approval an editorial entitled "Where Were They When Needed?" which appeared recently in the Suwannee Democrat at Live Oak, Fla., and was reprinted in the Tallahassee Democrat. Much of the fine little north Florida city of Live Oak was under several feet of water for days, as a result of heavy rainfall that accompanied the recent Hurricane Dora.

This editorial reflects so truthfully the kindly relationship between our white and colored citizens in Florida that I desire to share it with my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Tallahassee (Fla.) Democrat, Sept. 20, 1964]

WHERE WERE THEY WHEN NEEDED?

Where were they?

As every person in Suwannee County knows, this community has been the victim of unwarranted, unthinking, and unfeeling tension between the races during recent months.

We have seen agitators come into our community to insult and inflame. Several unfortunate instances have seen violence averted only by cool heads on the part of the law officials and the good people of both races of Live Oak.

Daily from the papers we read of the agitators pouring into our cities, engineering strife where there is none. Ignorant and totally imbecilic trained agitators prey upon the colored people and seek to threaten officials and the people.

In a land of law, we have a group that believes that law is only for one side. The laws they agree with must be abided by all of the people, but those they disagree with, on whatever pretext, are to be violated with riots, violence, or any other means.

And they do this because the colored people are supposedly persecuted in the South. And so in Live Oak we have had our problems with characters similar to those of Greenwich Village, where otherwise they would be cursing and defiling free enterprise, religion, capitalism, labor, management, and everyone else—while learning to be first-class dope addicts and strumming obscene tunes on a uke.

And there are the other misguided souls coming into our land like the mother of the Governor of Massachusetts. What possible business she had in St. Augustine is beyond us. We would resent bitterly the family members of Florida's Governor going to that State to cause strife and turmoil.

But they do this in the name that they are helping.

Well the big question in Live Oak today is: Where are they?

Today a large part of the colored population of this city is homeless, hungry, poorly clothed, miserable, and flooded out by the terrible storm of the past week.

Where is the NAACP, where is CORE, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, the Urban League, SNICK, and the multitude of other organizations that infest this land?

We can't find them.

And who did the colored people of Suwannee County turn to? As in all times past, they turned to their fellow citizens, both black and white.

And we aided each other.

Had it not been for immediate assistance from the Red Cross and Salvation Army, the people of Live Oak would have shared what little was left.

There was no racial strife and unrest here this week. Just folks who have for years lived and worked in harmony determined to let their faith in God, sympathy, and understanding guide their efforts to bring peace, safety, and normalcy to a battered and flooded community.

But CORE and the NAACP have aided neither. They are not to be found. Their leaders are doing nothing. They do not seemingly find it to their liking to help out their colored brethren when a disaster like this strikes. They would rather spend their time ranting and raving, rioting and looting, agitating and causing strife and turmoil.

They'll be back. On this you can bet.

We would hope that when they do, the colored people of this community will ask them a simple question: Where were you when you were needed?

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in faithful observance of the annual rites of the Congress, I submit for the RECORD a summary of accomplishments of the Committee on Foreign Relations during the 88th Congress. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed following my brief statement.

The committee has enjoyed a businesslike and profitable 2 years and I want to thank my colleagues on the committee for making this possible. As usual, high honors go to the ranking majority and minority members, the junior Senator from Alabama and the senior Senator from Iowa, but many others have been faithful in attendance and diligent in the work of the committee.

I believe it can be fairly stated that the highlights of the 88th Congress in the foreign relations field were the approval of the limited nuclear test ban treaty and the joint resolution promoting the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Of continuing importance, of course, were the Foreign Assistance Acts of 1963 and 1964, which were subjected to the most careful and searching scrutiny by Congress in many years. International financial institutions were strengthened by approving increases in the resources of the International Development Association and the Inter-American Development Bank. Relations with our good neighbors, Mexico and Canada, were improved by approval of the Chamizal Treaty and implementing legislation, of lower Colorado River flood control programs, by the presentation of a statute to Mexico, by the establishment of the Roosevelt Campobello International Park, and by planning the participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition.

The committee's study of the effectiveness of the Foreign Agents Registration Act was completed and a bill making improvements in the law passed the Senate July 6, 1964. I expect that this bill will be finally enacted in the next Congress.

All in all, the committee ended the Congress with a clean calendar.

TREATIES ACTED ON

First. Convention on extradition between the United States of America and Sweden, together with a related protocol, signed at Washington on October 24, 1961. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

Second. Additional protocol to the treaty of extradition of January 13, 1961, between the United States of America and the United States of Brazil, which additional protocol was signed at Rio de Janeiro on June 18, 1962. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

Third. The International Coffee Agreement, 1962, which was opened for signature in New York on September 28, 1962, in the English, French, Russian, Spanish, and Portuguese languages, and was signed on that date in behalf of the United States of America and a number of other countries. Approved May 21, 1963, by a vote of 69 to 20.

Fourth. Consular convention between the United States of America and Korea signed at Seoul on January 8, 1963. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

Fifth. Protocol dated at Rome September 15, 1962, to amend the Convention on International Civil Aviation done at Chicago on December 7, 1944. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

Sixth. Convention on extradition between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the State of Israel, signed at Washington, December 10, 1962. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

Seventh. Consular convention between the United States of America and Japan, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Tokyo on March 22, 1963. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

Eighth. Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water, signed at Moscow on August 5, 1963, on behalf of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Approved September 24, 1963, by a vote of 80 to 19.

Ninth. Convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States for the solution of the problem of Chamizal, signed at Mexico City on August 29, 1963. Approved December 17, 1963, by a vote of 79 to 1.

Tenth. Agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of Austria regarding the return of Austrian property, rights, and interests, signed at Washington on January 30, 1959. Approved February 25, 1964, by a vote of 66 to 24.

Eleventh. Protocol modifying and supplementing the convention between the United States of America and Japan for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Tokyo, on May 7, 1960, supplementing the protocol signed at Washington on April 16, 1964. Approved July 29, 1964, by a vote of 84 to 0.

Twelfth. Protocol between the United States and Japan, signed at Tokyo on August 14, 1962, modifying and supplementing the convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income signed at Washington on April 16, 1964, as supplemented by the protocol signed at Tokyo on March 23, 1957, and as modified and supplemented by the protocol signed at Tokyo on May 7, 1960. Approved July 29, 1964, by a vote of 84 to 0.

Thirteenth. Convention between the United States of America and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg for the avoidance of double taxation of income, the prevention of fiscal evasion, and the promotion of trade and investment, signed at Washington on December 18, 1962. Approved July 29, 1964, by a vote of 84 to 0.

Fourteenth. Text of amendments of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, adopted by a Conference of Contracting Governments convened at London on April 11, 1962. Approved February 25, 1964, by a vote of 88 to 0.

Fifteenth. International agreement regarding the maintenance of certain lights in the Red Sea. Approved February 25, 1964, by a vote of 88 to 0.

Sixteenth. Protocol amending the interim convention on conservation of North Pacific fur seals, signed at Washington on February 9, 1957, which protocol was signed at Washington on October 8, 1963, on behalf of the Governments of Canada, Japan, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States of America. Approved January 30, 1964, by a vote of 80 to 0.

Seventeenth. Protocol, signed at The Hague on October 23, 1963, modifying and supplementing the extension to the Netherlands Antilles of the convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of the Netherlands for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes. Approved on July 29, 1964, by a vote of 84 to 0.

Eighteenth. Supplementary convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Sweden relating to income and other taxes signed at Stockholm on October 22, 1963, modifying and supplementing the convention and accompanying protocol for the avoidance of double taxation and the establishment of rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of income and other taxes, signed at Washington on March 23, 1939. Approved July 29, 1964, by a vote of 84 to 0.

Nineteenth. Protocol of the Prolongation of the International Sugar Agreement of 1958, dated at London, August 1, 1963. Approved January 30, 1964, by a vote of 80 to 0.

Twentieth. Partial Revision of Radio Regulations, Geneva, 1959, and the Additional Protocol signed at Geneva on November 8, 1963, by delegates of the United States of America and other countries represented at the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference held at Geneva October 7 through November 8, 1963. Approved February 25, 1964, by a vote of 88 to 0.

Twenty-first. Protocol between the United States of America and Greece, signed at Athens on Februray 12, 1964, modifying and supplementing the convention of February 20, 1950, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on the estates of deceased persons. Approved June 23, 1964, by a vote of 83 to 0.

Twenty-second. Protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949, which protocol relates to harp and hood seals. The protocol was signed at Washington under date of July 15, 1963, for the United States of America and 11 other governments. Approved June 23, 1964, by a vote of 83 to 0.

Twenty-third. Supplementary convention to the extradition convention of October 26, 1901, and the supplementary convention of June 20, 1935, between the United States of America and Belgium, which supplementary convention was signed at Brussels on November 14, 1963. Approved August 6, 1964, by a vote of 91 to 0.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

First. S. 284, for the relief of Ethel R. Loop, the widow of Carl R. Loop. Private Law 88–297. Approved August 30, 1964.

Second. S. 745, to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system. Conference report agreed to by House September 30, 1964.

Third. S. 777, to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees. Authorizes $20 million for 2 years. Public Law 88–186. Approved November 26, 1963.

Fourth. S. 944, to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes. Public Law 88–399. Approved August 4, 1964.

Fifth. S. 949, to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended—63 Stat. 734–736. Amended and passed Senate December 6, 1963.

Sixth. S. 1512, to authorize one additional Assistant Secretary of State, and for other purposes. Passed Senate July 16, 1963.

Seventh. S. 1627, to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control of Laos—ICC—as provided in article 18 of the Protocol to the Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos. Public Law 88–468. Approved on August 20, 1964.

Eighth. S. 1917, to provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other designated officials. Public Law 88–493. Approved August 27, 1964.

Ninth. S. 2136, to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended. Amended and passed Senate July 6, 1964.

Tenth. S. 2213, to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency. Amended and passed Senate, December 6, 1963.

Eleventh. S. 2214, to amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association. Public Law 88–310. Approved May 28, 1964.

Twelfth. S. 2394, to facilitate compliance with the Convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed August 29, 1963, and for other purposes. Public Law 88–300. Approved April 29, 1964.

Thirteenth. S. 2455, to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended. Public Law 88–285. Approved March 17, 1964.

Fourteenth. S. 2464, to establish the Roosevelt Campobello International Park, and for other purposes. Public Law 88–363. Approved July 7, 1964.

Fifteenth. S. 2905, to provide for the appointment of a Commissioner General for U.S. participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition, and for other purposes. Public Law 88–586. Approved September 11, 1964.

Sixteenth. S. 3074, to give the consent of Congress to the construction of certain international bridges. Passed Senate August 5, 1964.

Seventeenth. H.R. 5207, to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes and to amend the Philippine War Damage Claims Act of 1962. Public Law 88–94. Approved August 12, 1963.

Eighteenth. H.R. 7044, to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission. Public Law 88–240. Approved December 23, 1963.

Nineteenth. H.R. 7405, to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to vote for an increase in the Bank's authorized capital stock. Public Law 88–178. Approved November 13, 1963.

Twentieth. H.R. 7406, to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes. Public Law 88–259. Approved January 22, 1964.

Twenty-first. H.R. 7419, to authorize the conclusion of agreements with Mexico for joint construction, operation, and maintenance of emergency flood control works on the lower Colorado River, in accordance with the provisions of article 13 of the 1944 Water Treaty with Mexico, and for other purposes. Public Law 88–411. Approved August 10, 1964.

Twenty-second. H.R. 7885, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended and for other purposes. Authorizes $3.6 billion for fiscal year 1964. Public Law 88–205. Approved December 16, 1963.

Twenty-third. H.R. 9009, to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended. Authorizes $102 million for fiscal year 1964. Public Law 88–200. Approved December 13, 1963.

Twenty-fourth. H.R. 11380, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. Conference report agreed to, October 2, 1964.

Twenty-fifth. H.R. 11754, to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations,

and for other purposes. Public Law 88–414. Approved August 10, 1964.

Twenty-sixth. H.R. 12259, to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of nationals of the United States against the Government of Cuba. Amended and passed Senate September 8, 1964.

Twenty-seventh. H.R. 12342, to authorize certain retired and other personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries. Amended and passed Senate September 2, 1964.

Twenty-eighth. Senate Joint Resolution 60, providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization. Public Law 88–65. Approved July 17, 1963.

Twenty-ninth. Senate Joint Resolution 72, favoring the holding of the Olympic games in America in 1968. Public Law 88–124. Approved September 16, 1963.

Thirtieth. Senate Joint Resolution 120, providing for the recognition and endorsement of the 17th International Publishers Congress. Public Law 88–298. Approved April 17, 1964.

Thirty-first. Senate Joint Resolution 162, extending recognition to the International Exposition for Southern California in the year 1968 and authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the several States of the Union and foreign countries to take part in the Exposition. Public Law 88–496. Approved August 27, 1964.

Thirty-second. House Joint Resolution 324, extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States. Public Law 88–95. Approved August 12, 1963.

Thirty-third. House Joint Resolution 405, to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property. Public Law 88–69. Approved July 19, 1963.

Thirty-fourth. House Joint Resolution 778, to provide for participation by the Government of the United States in The Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International—Rome—Institute for the Unification of Private Law, and authorizing appropriations therefor. Public Law 88–244. Approved December 30, 1963.

Thirty-fifth. House Joint Resolution 779, to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, relating to membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission, so as to authorize certain appropriations thereunder for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965. Public Law 88–263. Approved January 31, 1964.

Thirty-sixth. House Joint Resolution 1145, to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Public Law 88–408. Approved August 10, 1964.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

First. Senate Concurrent Resolution 58, to print 5,000 additional copies of hearings on Executive M, 88th Congress, 1st session. House amendment agreed to by Senate October 28, 1963.

Second. House Concurrent Resolution 343, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the enforcement of the provisions of article 19 of the United Nations Charter. Passed Senate on August 20, 1964.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS

First. Senate Resolution 25, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine, investigate, and make studies of matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration. Agreed to March 14, 1963.

Second. Senate Resolution 26, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to continue its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals. Agreed to March 14, 1963.

Third. Senate Resolution 152, to print as a Senate document the study entitled, "Problems and Trends in Atlantic Partnership—II." Agreed to June 17, 1963.

Fourth. Senate Resolution 168, accepting an invitation to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Association to be held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaya. Agreed to July 11, 1963.

Fifth. Senate Resolution 240, to print as a Senate document, with additional copies, the second annual report to the Congress on the implementation of the Humphrey amendment. Agreed to April 16, 1964.

Sixth. Senate Resolution 277, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine and study the foreign policies of the United States. Agreed to February 10, 1964.

Seventh. Senate Resolution 339, authorizing the sending of observers from the U.S. Senate to the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Jamaica. Agreed to July 23, 1964.

Eighth. Senate Resolution 369, to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "East-West Trade—A Compilation of Views of Businessmen, Bankers, and Academic Experts." Agreed to September 25, 1964.

Ninth. Senate Resolution 371, to print as a Senate document a report on the implementation of the Humphrey amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act. Agreed to September 25, 1964.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS

As of October 1, 128 nominations for appointments as Ambassadors, officials in the State Department, and so forth, had been confirmed as well as 3,863 nominations in the Foreign Service.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations sundry nominations have been favorably reported. I ask for their immediate consideration, and move that the Senate go into executive session.

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

REPRESENTATIVES AND ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE 19TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the following nominations to the 19th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Representatives: Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois; Russell B. Long, U.S. Senator from the State of Louisiana; Frank Carlson, U.S. Senator from the State of Kansas; William C. Foster, of the District of Columbia; Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York.

Alternate Representatives: Charles W. Yost, of New York; Franklin H. Williams, of California; Mrs. Gladys A. Tillett, of North Carolina; Richard N. Gardner, of the District of Columbia; Charles P. Noyes, of New York.

Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, of New York, to be the Representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, vice Sydney R. Yates, resigned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objections, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Chief Clerk read the nominations of John W. Bowling, Robert A. Hurwitch, John A. Lacey, and Walter J. Mueller to be Consuls General of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 3, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Chief Clerk read the nominations of Robert L. Walkinshaw, Thomas E. Walsh, and John C. Weisert to be Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 4

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert L. Dowell, Jr., to be a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richard Noyes Viets for appointment

as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry other nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

FOREIGN SERVICE RESERVE OFFICERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service Reserve.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

FOREIGN SERVICE STAFF OFFICER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George J. Stanger, a Foreign Service staff officer, to be a consul of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Senate return to legislative session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TRIBUTE TO THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would not want to have the Senate adjourn sine die without expressing my very sincere thanks to the people of Montana. I believe everyone in this body is greatly indebted to the people of Montana for sending to us the senior Senator from Montana, our majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD].

I am looking forward to continuing my service in the Senate next January under the leadership of our majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD.

It is quite appropriate to use as a descriptive term when one speaks of MIKE MANSFIELD the word "noble." I consider him to be a noble man in the true sense of the meaning of that term.

I have a right to speak about the Senator from Montana, because undoubtedly I am one of those in the Senate who from time to time present to him some problems of leadership. This is always true when a leader must deal with someone who frequently finds himself supporting or advancing a minority point of view.

The graciousness of the majority leader, the complete fairness and impartiality, and his insistence that minority views be given the same fair treatment in the Senate as majority views has endeared him to all of us.

I want the majority leader to know that as we adjourn sine die tonight he will be leaving Washington to take up his campaign for reelection in Montana. I know that will not be too difficult a task. He will do it with the heartfelt appreciation and best wishes of every Member of this body.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, no longer is there any doubt that this Congress has been one of the most productive in the history of our Nation. In my opinion, this Congress has been the most productive of this century—certainly of this generation. It has variously been called the Education Congress, the Conservation Congress, and the Accomplishment Congress. It has been most definitely an Accomplishment Congress, even if in these closing days of the session Congress finds it difficult to accomplish its own adjournment.

Mr. President, if any single person can properly be called the architect of this achievement record, it is the able, distinguished, and beloved majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD. His unfailing patience, his indomitable good humor, and his quiet persistence have served all of us, and have been the blueprint for the fine record of this Congress. Thanks to his design, a "can-do" Congress has emerged as a "did-do" Congress.

Mr. President, it is with complete sincerity that I voice my respect and my admiration for the majority leader. I extend to him my sincere congratulations. He has earned the praise of all us; he certainly deserves it. Every one of us is richer for his efforts, and so is the Nation.

McNAMARA'S WAR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have permission to insert in the RECORD certain material in the form of newspaper editorials and usual material, including a sampling of the correspondence that I have received in support of my position against McNamara's war in South Vietnam and in support of my position in opposition to foreign aid.

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

[From the New York Times, Oct. 2, 1964]

WHAT ARE OUR WAR AIMS IN SOUTH VIETNAM?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 1.—The Johnson administration is once more reviewing its policy in Vietnam and once again it is deeply divided about how to proceed.

There is general agreement at all levels of the Government that the political instability in South Vietnam is increasing. The division is between those Johnson aids who want to expand the war into Communist North Vietnam with the direct participation of U.S. troops, and those who believe the risks of such a policy outweigh the advantages.

It is easy to understand why this division runs so deep. What is not so easy to understand is why the administration is pressing a review of the policy at this time. While the political situation in Saigon is said officially to be deteriorating, the administration insists that there is no danger of collapse there in the foreseeable future, and Ambassador Maxwell Taylor has stated this week that the Communist military assault on South Vietnam is further from success now than ever before.

PROVOKING AN INCIDENT?

If this is true, it is difficult to understand why some prominent officials, a few weeks before a national election, should be talking so openly about expanding the war, and not only advocating but almost lobbying for such a course of action.

It is even possible now to hear officials of this Government talking casually about how easy it would be to "provoke an incident" in the Gulf of Tonkin that would justify an attack on North Vietnam, and thus, according to this thesis, enable the United States to bring strong military pressure on the Communists there to let up on their pressure on South Vietnam.

President Johnson himself is not engaging in any such blithe conversation on the subject. On the contrary, he has been emphasizing that the United States is merely there to assist the South Vietnamese to preserve their own freedom.

"We don't want our American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys," he said this week. "We don't want to get involved in a nation with 700 million people (Communist China), and get tied down in a land war in Asia.

"So what are we doing? We are staying there and supplying the South Vietnamese with some of the things that we have. We have 20,000 men out there advising and helping them but we are not about to start another war and we're not about to run away from where we are."

At the same time, the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, William P. Bundy, put the emphasis another way this week in Tokyo.

"Expansion of the war outside South Vietnam, while not a course we want or seek," he said, "could be forced upon us by the increased external pressures of the Communists, including a rising scale of infiltration."

These two statements, both reflecting official attitudes often expressed here, illustrate the ambiguity of U.S. policy in that peninsula. For months and even years, this Government insisted that American troops and material were in Vietnam merely to help that government help itself. It was emphasized that the war was their war and that everything depended on South Vietnam's ability to unify itself and use American help effectively.

As South Vietnamese unity and military efficiency have declined, however, the United States has gradually begun to restate its aims and to emphasize that "the United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace, the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia."

In short, what started as a limited commitment to play a subsidiary role, has gradually become a U.S. commitment not only to maintain the peace and security of South Vietnam, but of the whole of southeast Asia.

This larger commitment has been endorsed by a congressional resolution, and it has encouraged not only those who want to expand the war into the north but those here who think they see a clever way of doing this by "provoking an incident."

There is, of course, always a lot of casual talk here while major policies are in dispute, but this is an odd time and an odd way to

proceed on anything so important as risking a war with China.

It clouds an already complicated and devilish dilemma with suspicion. Last week we were told by unidentified officials that U.S. pilots were authorized to chase any attackers into North Vietnam or even into China. Today, for the first time, the U.S. destroyers involved in the last Gulf of Tonkin incident were identified, not by the Government, but by a letter from an Iowa sailor aboard one of the ships to his parents back home in Dubuque.

Nobody can be very dogmatic about what should be done about the agony of Vietnam, but the Nation is entitled to a clearer definition of our war aims there and specifically to an assurance that our ships are in the Gulf of Tonkin to end the war and not to "provoke an incident," that might expand the war.

SEPTEMBER 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Here are my efforts to thank you and to let you know that you are appreciated for the honest and courageous stand on Vietnam and the part the United States is playing there.

Last week a mother told us, several of us, how worried she was because her son was a soldier, a plain soldier in Vietnam and she had not heard from him for 2 weeks whereas he usually wrote every week. But Vietnam was the most terrible place for him to be and she felt so helpless. We told her to write to President Johnson and our Washington Senators.

It will soon be United Nations Day. So I hope more will admit the sense of your position and the need for the U.N. to take over.

The fact that we are so senseless about China, the real China doesn't help matters.

Thank you and may you have the strength and courage to continue in your good work.

Sincerely,

MRS. PAULINE SWANSON.

SEATTLE, WASH.

MESS IN VIETNAM

The deepening frustration of the U.S. position in South Vietnam calls for a more penetrating analysis and report than those given by Ambassador Maxwell Taylor in Washington last week.

Although Gen. Nguyen Khanh remains as Premier after the bloodless military coup and countercoup, and the State Department boldly asserts its confidence in him, it is obvious that his power was weakened, if not destroyed.

The student and Buddhist riots which forced Khanh to give up the dictatorial powers he proclaimed for himself and to promise a new constitution and free election of a civilian government revealed the basic instability of his rule.

The army revolt which forced him to flee Saigon confirmed his lack of authority in the armed forces. Although the army generals backed down and withdrew their troops because air force generals insisted on restoring Khanh to his seat, this left Khanh little better off. Now it is the air force that has Khanh under control. Reportedly, eight younger generals demand widespread civilian government and military reforms.

What makes Ambassador Taylor and the Washington playcallers look so ineffective is that the army action against Khanh over the weekend apparently came as a complete surprise. While General Taylor was reassuring the administration and congressional leaders that the Vietnam situation was improving, Malcolm Browne, of the Associated Press, was reporting strong hints of another coup, which occurred on schedule.

If rioting in the streets or a splinter movement of troops and tanks can send Khanh and the other members of the ruling triumvirate scuttling into hiding, there is obviously no leadership on which the United States can depend for prosecution of the war against the Vietcong Communists.

Former Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge reported limited success in interesting friendly Western nations in making at least a token contribution to the anticommunism fight in Vietnam. Such support is unlikely to be provided after the events of the past weekend.

The failure of U.S. policy to achieve noteworthy progress against the Vietcong forces and the instability of the South Vietnam Government are an embarrassment to President Johnson as the election approaches. His Republican opponent, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, has not, however, offered any reasonable plan to improve the situation. It's a mess and no one seems to know the way out.

LEMONT, ILL.,
September 30, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Hardly a day goes by but that I read an excellent quote from your speeches against continuation of the Vietnamese war in some newspaper or magazine. I am so grateful to and for you and Senator GRUENING.

I am grateful, too, that you considered my support for your stand on this Vietnam issue to be of sufficient weight to share one of my letters with your fellow Senators. I do hope it helped to strengthen your own stand. It has just come to my attention that you included my letter in your August 21 speech in the Senate. If you have any extra copies of the speech, I would appreciate very much having three or four of them.

Perhaps you will be interested in the enclosed copies of my letters (1) to President Johnson, and (2) to the Washington Post editor.

My very best wishes for your good health to enable you to continue your humane and principled stand for a peaceful settlement now of the South Vietnamese war.

Very sincerely yours,

MARY PHILLIPS.

LEMONT, ILL.,
September 30, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Each day the war continues in Vietnam, innocent people die, and danger of escalation of the war grows.

The latest news re "hot pursuit" into the airspace and waters of China and other nations bordering Vietnam is disturbing indeed.

Please listen to learned, reasonable, experienced, and responsible leaders like Senators MORSE, of Oregon, and GRUENING, of Alaska, and start immediately to negotiate a settlement in Vietnam.

I realize you are too busy campaigning to read letters, but I hope some of your aids will have a moment to read the enclosed copy of my letter to the Chicago Daily News and report to you that many people expect you to ignore the "soft on communism" accusation of Senator GOLDWATER and to settle the Vietnamese war peacefully and now.

I am campaigning in my humble way for you, but I could put more enthusiasm into it if you would stop the slaughter of innocents in Vietnam. I think I am not alone in this feeling.

Very sincerely yours,

MARY PHILLIPS.

LEMONT, ILL., *September 29, 1964.*

EDITOR, WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Recently, WILLIAM MILLER, Republican candidate for Vice President, was asked: "If elected, what will the Republicans do about the war in Vietnam?"

Mr. MILLER replied that after conferring with the Pentagon, State Department, military advisers in South Vietnam, and the South Vietnamese Government, they would conclude the war.

His reply is ambiguous. Just what does he mean by "conclude the war"? How? He did not say he would confer with the leaders of the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam, nor the governments of North Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, nor any of the 14 nations which negotiated a settlement with France in 1954. Does he mean he would decline to confer with them? Was any war ever concluded without conferences with the other side? Or does Mr. MILLER foresee only a military solution?

If so, it would be appropriate for him to look back 10 years: France had spent 7 years and 7 months fighting the dirty war in Vietnam. She had lost 100,000 of her sons killed or missing, with another 140,000 wounded. She had spent $5 billion (of which the United States contributed 2 billions). Yet she recognized there was no military solution. She met with representatives of 14 nations at a conference in Geneva and negotiated a settlement.

It is time for Mr. MILLER—and President Johnson and Senators HUMPHREY and GOLDWATER—to recognize, as France's President De Gaulle did, that there is no military solution. It is past time to begin preparations to reconvene the 14-nation conference, or to call on the United Nations to negotiate a conclusion of the war in South Vietnam.

Very sincerely yours,

MARY PHILLIPS.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
September 27, 1964.

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

DEAR MR. MORSE: We sincerely appreciate your recent remarks concerning U.S. foreign policy, particularly in Vietnam.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN HENNINGS.

SEPTEMBER 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This morning's news accounts of the President's alleged post-Tonkin "hot pursuit" orders only indicate how close to war we are. They reflect a decade in Indochina of ineptitude, shortsightedness, tomfoolery, and illegality, on our part. We, the people, have been for 10 years insulted by the lack of straight talking about the realities of life and death in southeast Asia. We must have a political settlement and we must bring China into the U.N. and the conference table before it is too late.

Respectfully,

ALBERT LEVY, M.D.

SEPTEMBER 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Not too long ago, my husband and I read portions of your speech that was made to the Congress regarding Vietnam. Sir, it is with heartfelt thanks that I write this letter to you. As never before have we ever read or heard the true facts before. We regret that this speech was buried in the back pages of the daily newspaper and not on the front page where it belonged. It is truly disheartening to know that out of the many political representatives in our Government, you are the only one that will and do present the truth about U.S. activities in Vietnam. Your knowledge and intelligence regarding this subject, sir, are second to none. To us, Senator, you are 10 feet tall.

My husband and I only wish that you were our Senator, so that we could cast a vote for you to say thank you.

Sincerely,

MRS. ARTHUR LIVIERI.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
Milwaukee, Wis., September 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please add my letter published in the local paper to the impressive outpouring of support and tribute testimonials of which have filled many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Yours was the one small voice of conscience—with GRUENING—that I am sure a later generation of wiser Americans will treasure and honor. The reactionary right is on the warpath in American and on foreign policy it is difficult to express publicly prudent judgments. My wife and friends have questioned the wisdom of my exposing myself in such a sensitive issue but I told them: I must follow Senator MORSE, who has done an infinitely braver thing than I, we have only to follow in his path. All honor for leading the way.

Yours,

MANUEL GOTTLIEB,
Professor of Economics.

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, Aug. 14, 1964]

AUGUST 10, 1964.

DEAR EDITOR: Bravo for Senator MORSE for his trenchant criticism of American conduct in the Tonkin Bay crisis. We risked nuclear holocaust to force the removal of Soviet missiles placed 90 miles away from our shores. Has not America given equal affront in patrolling with hostile military craft waters used extensively for coastal, fishing, and island shipping in a bay fronted entirely by unfriendly nations whom we do not recognize. The movement in such waters of hostile military craft hazards the risk of incidents as the history of international politics abundantly shows. In any incident military craft must always defend themselves when attacked or obstructed. Ours are reported to have so done with wide disparity between damage suffered and inflicted. When such incidents recur the powers involved are obligated to seek to assess the situation and intentions of the other side through direct negotiations. If such negotiations are unavailing, then our obligations under the U.N. Charter requires that before undertaking direct military action that complaint in the United Nations be made of the offending behavior so that the appropriate investigation and factfinding can be made and remedies devised. We are not without friends in the U.N. and our cause there would not have been a forlorn one. Incidents need to be investigated carefully since the history of diplomacy shows how frequently governments will stretch the bounds of truth or will devise what in candor we once described as "coverup" stories when incidents are reported or interpreted.

But even before a U.N. investigation was commenced under cover of darkness and while labeling North Vietnam the "aggressor," we launched a devastating air attack. Neutral investigation is now hampered because some or all of the evidence on the North Vietnam side has been destroyed. Let us hope that the destruction of the North Vietnam PT boats, which could badly hurt an invasion fleet, will not be the precursor of an Inchon-style invasion just as the unannounced attack on Castro's air fields was the precursor of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion.

MANUEL GOTTLIEB.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 27, 1964.

SENATOR MORSE: At the time of the first Gulf of Tonkin crisis, and the passage of the joint resolution endorsing American attacks on North Vietnam, I was serving in the Army and did not feel it proper and in keeping with my position and its function to express open opposition to the policies of the President. Having, however, finished my period of military service, I want to thank you, Senator, for voting and speaking against that resolution. I also hope that you will continue to speak against the ever-growing war in Vietnam. Since you are, so clearly, a courageous and honest man (and there seem to be so few), I am sure you will, and I only regret that I cannot help in returning you to the Senate again and again.

I enclose a letter I have written to Senator FULBRIGHT, which I believe expresses some of my feelings with regard to the joint resolution and the Vietnam war.

Once more, sir, I want to thank you for the difficult position that you have taken in the Senate, and express my regret that I am unable to help you.

Yours,

AIVARS I. TRUSIS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 27, 1964.

Senator FULBRIGHT:

For many years it has been my hope that the first time I feel it necessary to write to a U.S. Senator it should be to express my approval. Therefore, it is with a measure of sadness as well as alarm that I write to you, Senator, with regard to our war in Vietnam.

One is, I think, justified in asking: Will the war in Vietnam be still further expanded after November? If the answer is Yes—and there is little to indicate that such is not the intention—I wish to register my protest. It may perhaps be pointed out that such a protest is more properly expressed through the ballot, but since we—in the fashion of the Roman Republic—have come to endow certain members of our Government with what appear to be virtually dictatorial powers, I find no choice but to register my protest outside the more normal democratic process. I am sure you will grant me, Senator, that if the power to make war at some future time is conferred on a man by acclamation—be that man a President of the United States, or be he a Cuban Premier—voting becomes a puerile business. Has it perhaps been claimed that such an acclamation was justified by extraordinary circumstances? May democracy be suspended at a time of crisis? If such a justification is offered, and it has been offered, one may well ask: when, in the last 25 years, has there not been a crisis? If the suspension of democracy is justified by extraordinary circumstances, then let me point out that democracy is quite damned, because it is itself an extraordinary circumstance. Need anyone be reminded of that? Amazingly: it appears, Yes. What justification, Senator, do you offer for the U.S. Senate rendering its constitutional power to declare war a vacuous formality, a trivial matter to be dispensed quickly and lightly? Someone else will declare war for you, under circumstances that are still in the future; what an amazing sense of responsibility of an august and responsible institution. Perhaps something will be said about the need for unity, or for a show of unity. But since when, sir, has unity in error, folly, and cowardice been honorable and necessary? The categories of my questions must be out of fashion; I must surely have missed some momentous turn of the world.

The questions that I have asked lead me directly to others with regard to our friends in South Vietnam. Given the dictatorships—military and civilian—that flourish in that area, that we tend with a care that would melt a gardener's heart, could you explain, sir, through what distortion of the common meaning of words may it be said that we and our assorted friends are engaged in fighting for freedom? I do not understand. Does the explanation lie in the fact that we are fighting Communists? I would be quite satisfied if communism, and only communism, were slavery, but slavery is both older and younger than communism. Since I was born in a country which was occupied, and reoccupied, both by Nazi Germany and by Soviet Russia, I no more than you, Senator, need be reminded that anti-communism does not necessarily indicate a love of freedom. Do you feel, as does Senator GOLDWATER, that if it takes "a dictator in order to keep communism out, then I don't think we can object to that"? It is sometimes said: If we do not stop communism in Asia, where will we stop it? I ask you, Senator: If we do not object to a dictator in Vietnam, where will we object to having one? France suffered corruption through the methods it employed in Indochina and in Algeria. Why are we not subject to a similar corruption? What justifies us in aiding one dictatorship rather than the other, one slavery rather than another? That a nation which claims to have dedicated itself to establishing a free world should, nevertheless, aid a ruthless series of dictatorships is a spectacle that surely deserves a great and extraordinary explanation. But except for the courageous protests of a few Senators, I hear nothing but acclamations and observe nothing but a herd instinct. The spectacle is too pathetic to even sustain anger.

And finally, sir, I am amazed that you, who so often has shown both courage and intelligence, have not opposed (instead of guided) the acclamations, and have not daily called for an end to the disgraceful war in Vietnam.

Surely, sir, surely that war cannot be in the interest of this Nation.

Yours,

——— ———.

NEW ZEALAND,
September 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my appreciation for the outstanding work you have been doing in the field of foreign affairs and defense policy.

You seem to be an anomaly—an honest man in a sea of corruption and sold-out men. Thank God there is at least one left—Senator MORSE who is not afraid to name a Nazi in NATO or a U.S. escalation as such, in the Gulf of Tonkin.

Please consider me your South Sea constituent—loyal to the democratic ideal as you alone seem to have been proclaiming it, and to the general principles of reason, truth, honesty and American traditions, in international relations.

As I see it, certain forces within the United States of America have preserved the German General Staff—the whole apparatus of Nazism—now whitewashed as "a good and reformed ally of the United States of America." Hogwash. As is well documented in Heusinger and the Fourth Reich, and The Old Nazi and the New Germany, the same old Hitler crowd are calling the shots in West Germany, and perhaps, have U.S.A. unsophisticated generals under their tutelage. Heusinger and his staff did get into NATO and presumably know most U.S.A. defense secrets. Thus they may be in the position of being able to use or abuse the entire apparatus from the top down.

Having studied the ideology of the German General Staff and its modus operandi, I would say their strategy would be to get the United States of America into a limited nuclear war in the Asia-Pacific theater. This would serve to make the United States of America hated for 500 years as you say, and would also clear the way for an overt takeover by the German General Staff of the West German political apparatus. In the anarchy, the General Staff would take the calculated risk of moving into East Germany, on the grounds that neither the United States of America or U.S.S.R. would dare risk striking each other for fear of bringing on mutual annihilation.

However, the United States of America in devastating China with nuclear bombs, would make itself a pariah among nations—thus serving two other powers: The Soviet Union and Germany. Every other nation will look good in comparison to the United States of America after it does its job on China.

In anticipation, West Germany is establishing various relations with Red China—to better serve its purpose as an "innocent" ready to pick up the pieces and the resources of the area. What perfidy.

The general Nazi influence has established a snowball of anti-Communist hysteria in the United States of America which now seems to be self-perpetuating, and will fulfill the destiny planned for the United States of America by the German General Staff. The captivation of the American mind by the anti-Communist credo cannot be overestimated, as it is by this tactic alone, by which the Germans can direct the United States of America to achieve its objectives. The Germans have a traditional genius for warfare—and as you well know, anything goes to achieve the desired objectives.

Thus if Heusinger and his kind can use the United States of America to serve their ends—wonderful—the Fourth Reich may yet come to be.

Another tactic might be to precipitate United States–U.S.S.R. mutual incineration (perhaps through sneak attack on one or the other nation), leaving Europe relatively untouched. This would allow the Germans to pick up the pieces in the aftermath—play the benevolent big brother to both powers, and secure the German dream of world domination.

I would say that so long as the United States of America can be agitated to pray at the anti-Communist altar, they will inadvertently serve the German purposes. You can't preserve nazism intact, and expect it to serve anything other than itself. That is the major flaw in U.S. strategy since World War II, when it preserved Hitler's intelligence and general staff apparatus. They must have started laughing in the late 1940's.

However, what we probably have now is a thorough infiltration of the American power elite by those serving the German purpose—those so conditioned to the anti-Communist religion, that they are willing to destroy every good thing America ever stood for in the world. Democracy, free speech, civil liberties, free thought, all of this must go to defeat the enemy. So long as outside agents direct (and pay) these cynical and opportunist "defenders" of the free world, America will continue on its self-defeating course—creating or paying off foreign dictators and waging wars against the disenfranchised. One might well ask, How many U.S. dollars given to Chiang Kai-shek, have found their way back into the right pockets to make U.S. policy? The same goes for Trujillo and Franco and Batista in their day. As Walt Rostow says in his new book of nonsense it is the stability and anti-Communist qualities of dictatorial regimes which make their freedom and democracy so attractive to the United States.

What I believe is that the United States must become sane and develop its policy before it gets caught in the trap of committing a strategic limited nuclear war in the Asia-Pacific theater. It must come to see that winning the cold war and the cause of humanity so far as communism is concerned is to democratize Communist regimes by contacts and trade and cultural relations. If they can only become prosperous, the totalitarian nature of the Communist regimes will disintegrate as their people move toward self-expression. This kind of thing is impossible under dictatorship of any kind including nazism, which the German general staff will reimpose (under another name) if they can.

Given the technological explosion—cybernetics—automation et al., humanity in total, could easily build a very viable world, once it managed to break through in the human and national relations sector.

How can the United States be persuaded of this before it is too late?

How can the United States be got off the anti-Communist kick and onto the real issues and problems—giving help to the oppressed rather than arms to their oppressors and dictators. That is the question—the major question which the United States must not confront at all costs if it is to continue to serve the ultimate interests of resurgent nazism.

Things are very confused now in international relations. Too many in the United States of America feel they are serving freedom and democracy by serving people like Chiang Kai-shek, Franco, Salazar, Heusinger and the like. Then there is Diem and Khanh in South Vietnam. This is pure scandal and inexcusable.

Sometimes I wonder if the Nazis have taken over the whole U.S. State Department, FBI, CIA, and Pentagon. What is the real reason that Hoover was given an extension of office in the FBI? I shudder at the guesses that occur to me.

And the Kennedy assassination and its mysteries, what a colossal act of criminality, that seems to be getting buckets of whitewash thrown on it—but never enough to account for the outstanding unanswered questions, and contradictions.

I write to you in this vein because I believe in your integrity. To me you represent all that is good in American traditions and I shudder to think that America may soon be converted into almost an exact opposite of what it stands for—to better serve the foreign dictatorial masters and domestic lackeys which serve them, and the brainless military-industrial-political combine feeding aimlessly on the arms industry.

I was born in Yonkers, N.Y., and spent the first 8 years of my life in the United States of America before my family went to Toronto, Canada. My great-grandmother used to converse with Emerson, and somewhere back there I was related to the Adams family. Not that that gives me any particular merit—but only to show that in terms of forebears, I have a right to proclaim my definitions of what America should stand for and where it is going wrong today.

Given the present situation the only thing I can do here is to publicize your views, in hopes that allied Governments may apply the brake on U.S. war policies, rather than collaborate in the doom of both the United States of America and themselves. I've been doing this. I am reproducing your article in the recent issue of Progressive magazine, "Humpty Dumpty in South Vietnam," and will distribute it. Certain political cretins in New Zealand call you an irresponsible maverick, because you are trying to prevent America from committing genocide in Asia. They have fluid on the brain and acid in their bowels and I am opposing them.

I would appreciate it if you could help this effort by having your speeches sent to me airmail. I will see that relevant material is disseminated in both New Zealand and Australia. It is true enough that I am dealing here with a political wasteland so far as international affairs is concerned. Nevertheless it is my philosophy that one must go on trying right up to the end—having faith that reason and self-interest will prevail over propaganda.

Yours very sincerely,

LAWRENCE F. J. ROSS.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A little time has elapsed since the Gulf of Tonkin episode transpired, yet our spirits remain grim and a heavy sense of total disenchantment weighs on our minds—all because of the dangerous course of hostilities our administration chose to follow regarding the Vietnamese policy.

We, in our circle of peace-loving kith and kin, brand GOLDWATER the unbridled jingoist. Now we find ourselves disenfranchised votewise. Where is our peace champion?

It seems that outside of a handful of other Senators your voice, Senator MORSE, is the only voice of sanity, soundness, sincerity, and truth in Washington. All else from our point of view is sheer madness.

While we love our Nation with a passion, we will voice dissent with policies which are mendacious, which humiliate us in the eyes of the intellectual world, and which do violence to our hearts and minds. I assure you the compassionate, humane and goodhearted Americans will not close ranks and rally 'round the flagpole simply because the McNamaras, the General Taylors, the Rusks, the Goldwaters—and, yes, the Johnsons, say so.

We are dismayed beyond words and certainly wonder why Americans are fighting and dying in far away Vietnam. Why have billions been poured in and millions more being apportioned to the contemptible dictators from Bao Dai, Diem and Khanh? Is the lot of poor wretched humans there bettered one iota—or only embittered beyond endurance? We're preserving no freedoms for anyone. There isn't a principle to die for. There is nothing but sham. Mr. Johnson's appealing, sober and heartening remarks of March 23, 1964—"The people of the world, I think, prefer reasoned agreement to ready attack * * *" now have a sick and hollow ring.

More from his speech—"And this is our objective—the quest for peace and not the quarrels of war. * * *" I wonder if that is why our "lily-white ships of peace" bullied their way to the waters of Tonkin? Senator MORSE, your explanation of that incident had the ring of truth.

"In every trouble spot in the world this hope of reasoned agreement instead of rash retaliation can bear fruit." (L.B.J.) Preserve us from the poison we're reaching for.

I would say to the President that war is not unknown to me. I have partasted of the bitter fruits of battle for 4 years. I know firsthand of the bestiality, lunacy, and grisliness of murdering one another, for I fought as a paratrooper in World War II with the 11th Airborne Division. I am sickened as to what it does to men. I have a great real fear that we Americans are rapidly becoming as calloused and hardened to wholesale slaughter as were the Germans when Hitler and his insane Nazi gang were bullying the world. No informed American can say, as do the (German) simians of today: "truly, we saw no evil, we heard no evil, and we spoke no evil under Hitler."

Senator MORSE, we toss you verbal bouquets and encomiums for your courage in resisting the jingoes.

We appeal to you to do all you can to turn the Vietnamese war problem into one of peace.

With warmest handclasps, we are,

Cordially yours,

MILTON THOR.
IRENE THOR.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

SEPTEMBER 22, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You will be interested in the enclosed "nomination" of yourself for President, appearing in the contributions column of the September 17th issue of the San Jose Mercury.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT C. JONES.

Editor: After finally acquiring a copy of our current bestseller, "The Invisible Government," and applying the knowledge gained therein to the month-old Gulf of Tonkin episode, a more clear picture begins to unfold.

The second attack upon our destroyers was a well organized, even if "spur of the moment," operation of the CIA to make an excuse to involve our more active support of the South Vietnamese commando raids against North Vietnam. Very likely the operation had the full knowledge of President Johnson for he is briefed daily on CIA operations and situation analysis. The retaliation measure to Congress was probably planned in advance also. It is of everlasting credit to Senators MORSE and GRUENING that they smelled a very old and rotten herring in the whole episode and selflessly fought and voted against the blank-check retaliation measure. * * *

In the meantime, it is my sincere conviction that Senators MORSE and GRUENING are the only two public citizens of our Nation who are morally qualified to become President and Vice President of these United States.

ELTON R. MAAS.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Just a few lines Mr. MORSE to let you know how strongly my family and friends support your brave stand against America's role in South Vietnam. We endorse all your statements. Please keep up the work of bringing our Nation back to some kind of sane foreign policy.

For your information, although you may know this, shipments of a chemical named "Vacate" have been leaving the bay area recently for the American Ambassador in Saigon. As a longshoreman I see this. Besides a warning of what the chemical can do to animals and people, the label on the container said: "a nonselective herbicide * * * toxic to all types of vegetation and may render the entire treated area totally or partially unproductive for one or more years. * * * Diamond Alkali Co., Cleveland Ohio."

This is the way we fight this war. (I assume this is some of the chemical used to strip foliage.) We kill the vegetation and make the soil useless. We are certainly on the same level as the British and French imperialists of other days.

Please keep trying to bring these facts across to the American people.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

DICK SCHAEFER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

AUSTRALIA,
September 17, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

DEAR SIR: My husband and I would like to congratulate you on your lone courageous stand over the recent Vietnam crisis. Your compassionate and farsighted views were shared by many thousands of Australians.

As the elections are now very close I know you must be very busy but as your name is now known in Australia could you possibly write a letter to the editor of "The Sydney Morning Herald," one of our main newspapers about peace and cooperation.

Next month in Sydney the Australian Congress for International Cooperation and Disarmament is being held from October 25–30, sponsored and being worked for by intelligent, loving, concerned people who want a future for their children not chaos. The newspapers are doing everything possible to kill it before it begins by the usual ways.

Greetings from my family to yours.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. JUNE MASON.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
September 21, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to thank you for your brave stand on the congressional resolution on Vietnam. Indeed, the present general strike in South Vietnam shows the wisdom of your position on Vietnam.

In the next Congress I sincerely hope that you will continue the struggle against American intervention in the Vietnamese civil war and that you will work for the repeal of the draft which threatens all students like myself.

Yours in peace,

STANYAN VUKOVICH,

P.S.—Please send me any literature which you have on file on Vietnam.

LOUISVILLE, KY.,
September 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

SIR: Tonight I heard your interview on radio, ABC's program "From the Capital." It was certainly a worthwhile experience. It is good to know we have Senators with your courage and zeal and one who truly works for peace. I regret I cannot vote for you and hope to hear you again.

Miss RUTH HUNT.

LINCOLN PARK, MICH.,
September 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We heartily congratulate you on your stand on Vietnam.

Last night I bought a copy of your August speech (reprint from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) and it was lost before I read it.

Please send me a copy if you have any left.

Sincerely,

D. SPEIR.

LOS ANGELES,
September 19, 1964.

The gratitude of the American people and the world should be given to you, Messrs. WAYNE MORSE and ERNEST GRUENING, the "Castor and Pollux" of the American Senate.

ANNAMARIA BERGMAN.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,
September 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: When I first came to Washington over 10 years ago I heard you speak at the Quaker meetinghouse, and I still recall how impressed I was by the force of your intelligence.

During the past several months I have been following your discussion, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of the vital issues of foreign and domestic policy that face us today. A few moments ago I read your well-reasoned attack on those who would undermine our liberties by sapping the power of the Supreme Court. I write merely to say that the country is fortunate to have a man of your courage, intellect, and experience in the Senate.

Your place in history will far overshadow that of the Goldwaters who have temporarily risen to the surface of American life.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY J. LARKIN.

BIG SPRING, TEX.,
September 21, 1964.

DEAR SIR: I listened to a radio interview this evening in which you spoke. I wish you to know, for what it is worth, that when you speak with such candor and conviction on matters of foreign policy and United Nations membership, there is someone in this part of the country for whom you speak. The ideas you express and your willingness to express them provide a renewed measure of optimism and hope for our society. I am far from your bailiwick, but I trust that your constituency will perpetuate the voice which you provide in our Government.

Again, thanks for speaking out from what seems to be a publicly unsupported viewpoint for us whose voices don't carry as far or as clearly. I wish that I had your opportunities; and if your efforts and those of your colleagues who seem to have some hope and respect for all humanity can keep the world livable for a while longer, then perhaps I shall.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH DAWES.

MORRISTOWN, N.J.,
September 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you for the position you have taken in regard to the war in South Vietnam. It is not a popular position you have taken, but one which reflects your intelligence, ethics, and love for democracy.

I am in complete agreement with you in wanting our Government to call for a reconvened Geneva Conference, to negotiate a settlement with appropriate international guarantees and under U.N. peacekeeping supervision.

Sincerely,

Mrs. PEARL SWANGER.

SEPTEMBER 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your State of Oregon should be proud of having the only Senator who voted against the Johnson Vietnam resolution. You are so right to fight this act of brinkmanship which carried us perilously close to full-scale war in southeast Asia. Of course, North Vietnam concluded that there was a relationship between the American patrol boats and the South Vietnamese boats bombarding their islands. As you said, it was the only conclusion they could draw.

Please know that you have admirers of your courageous stand against "crisis" maneuvering. You are the only real statesman, and I wish you could be President.

Sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. RODNEY T. HOOD,
Franklin, Ind.

P.S.—I hope you will read page 3 of the September issue of Progressive magazine. (L. B. Johnson has many good ideas, but in foreign affairs he needs much more expert help.)

September 23, 1964.

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

HONORABLE SIR: While I am writing belatedly on your excellent and courageous statement on Vietnam, I would like you to know I have spoken about it repeatedly.

It is for this reason I write today. I was most alarmed to read Secretary Rusk's warning about the Gulf of Tonkin. The sheer arrogance is most dismaying.

What would have happened if the situation were reversed?

I appeal to you as a Democrat to convey this alarm to the President and the Secretary of State.

I have been campaigning for President Johnson and Senator HUMPHREY. It is most difficult to answer "Who is warmongering?" Who is rattling the sword when we strut and shoot in the Gulf of Tonkin?

Must we concede to Goldwaterism and lay the basis for the war the Democrats say they are avoiding?

I have a deep respect for your leadership. I understand the need to play down some aspects of the situation because of the campaign but elections are not held in vacuums.

Please carry on.

Respectfully yours,

TOBEY SCHEIN.

HOBOKEN, N.J.,
September 15, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I recently read, in someone's home, a little of one of your speeches to Congress on Vietnam and would like very much to have two copies of this—one to study and one to pass on to friends.

This was a reprint of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 5, 1964, volume 110, No. 151.

Many of us are very much concerned over U.S. foreign entanglements. Personally, I must say reading "The Invisible Government" (CIA) hasn't helped a bit to palliate uneasiness.

Thanking you, I am,

Very truly yours,

BARBARA TOMPKINS.

CINCINNATI, OHIO,
September 7, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wish to congratulate you on the brave stand you have taken in reference to our position in Vietnam. I hope and pray you will continue until others begin to see the course we are taking.

May I ask you to send me copies of your speeches in Congress on Vietnam and our position in the Far East?

Thanking you for your trouble, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

BEULAH K. ARNDT.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for responding to our request concerning your Senate speeches on the Vietnam issue. The material proved very useful in our meeting with the managing editor of the Evening Bulletin here.

You might care to know that the editor admitted his Washington bureau had erred in not covering your floor speeches and said he would have the situation corrected. We will be keeping an eye on the paper when you take to the floor again.

Meanwhile, we are now investigating the performance of the Inquirer, which is even less likely to give coverage to proposals to avoid war. Can you furnish us with the dates of your speeches following August 13, the last date on the list you previously provided us with? You will recall that the list gave the speech dates and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page references.

Again, thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. WINGELL, Jr.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
September 21, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to assure you of our support in regard to your stand on U.S. policy in Vietnam. We admire your courage and appreciate your repeated efforts to bring the facts to the American people.

Sincerely,

LOUISE ENGEL.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please keep on working for negotiated peace in Vietnam. I am sure that thousands, who do not bother to write you, feel as I do about this and wish to thank you for your fight for it.

Courage and success.

Yours truly,

GENEVIEVE HAMLIN.

AUGUST 16, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR W. MORSE: We thank you for your speaking up on our role in Vietnam. I and many Americans agree with you. Please continue to fight, and the President shall stop the war, and bring our boys back.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. E. ALTMAN.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1964.

DEAR SIR: We recently heard about the stand you took in the Vietnam crisis. We would like you to know we admire you very much. It is a remarkable thing today when anyone dares to stand up for his convictions.

Mrs. DORIS COOLEY.

GERMANTOWN, OHIO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
September 18, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for sending me the printed form of your speech, concerning the congressional resolution to support our President's actions in the Tonkin Gulf incidents. It was with great interest that I read your comments on this matter, for I too have had grave misgivings about our Government's policies in southeast Asia.

You, Senator MORSE, are serving as the conscience of the U.S. Senate. Both Senator GRUENING and you, are to be commended for standing up against great odds in renouncing the use of forces in Vietnam. It is my only hope that others in Congress will also decide that it is time to alter our futile and dangerous policy of backing unpopular governments—a policy in the name of "fighting communism" that actually promotes communism. Perhaps, after the election, the administration will find the courage to work for a realistic solution to the problems of Vietnam.

You are performing a great service for all mankind, for the crises in southeast Asia endangers the peace of the entire world.

My very best wishes to you,

DON BECK.

GERMANTOWN, N.Y.,
September 15, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As we see more clearly each day how little the group in power in Vietnam represents the people there, and how anxious the generals were to escalate the war before the opposition to them became as open as it now is. Truly we must thank you again for helping to keep the country from going even further than we did during that shameful action at the Bay of Tonkin.

I hope you will be in a position to make a further speech using the present developments there to show the need for a negotiated peace. If such a speech is in the offing can I order 100 copies in advance to mail out to a group of people here. If not could I still have that many of the speech you made during the Bay of Tonkin bombings. There is a growing sentiment for a negotiated peace here, shown even in newspaper editorials and letters to the editors. We hope to enlarge that and make it more vocal by getting a Quaker speaker out who knows the area—and by circulating as much information as we can on the matter.

With sincere thanks for the service you have done the Nation and the world on this vital matter.

Yours truly,

VIVIAN ROSENBERG.

SEPTEMBER 14, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Having just finished reading the transcript of your speech of August 5 before the Senate, I wish to express my feelings of complete agreement with the views you have so courageously stated in said historic speech, which our newspapers and magazines have practically ignored or merely mentioned in a single paragraph.

It so happened that my reading of your speech coincided with the happenings in Vietnam over the weekend and which merely have confirmed once again the utter futility of our intervention in that country and our support of the shaky regime now trying to rule South Vietnam.

Permit me to extend to you, dear Senator MORSE, my best wishes and my feelings of genuine admiration for your courage in keeping alive the fight for a review of our policy of unilateral intervention in southeast Asia.

Respectfully,

D. A. VONK.

VIRGINIA, MINN.,
September 12, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to express my agreement with the statement of Helen Mears in the first letter in the Nation, September 4, 1964: "All honor to Senators WAYNE MORSE and ERNEST GRUENING for voting against the joint congressional resolution that, in effect, endorses our Government's past and continuing intervention in southeast Asia." You show that the voice of sanity and humanity is not completely stilled.

Truly yours,

TRUMAN GRIFFIN.

SEPTEMBER 12, 1964.

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

GENTLEMEN: We wish to let you know how completely we agree with the stand you gentlemen have taken on the Vietnam situation. Keep up the good fight and let us know what we may be able to do to help.

Sincerely,

MARY and TOM LASATER.

SEPTEMBER 23, 1964.

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

My heartfelt thanks, congratulations to you for your stand against Vietnam war and reapportionment foes. You do credit to our Nation. A long life to you.

My best wishes.

D. C. SHOULTZ.

SUNNYVALE, CALIF.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
September 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We desire to commend you for your intelligence shown in your analysis of the U.S. aggression in both North and South Vietnam.

We definitely oppose having our American Armed Forces in southeast Asia and hope that you will continue your fight against the hopeless situation in that area.

Very sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. FRANCIS D. REIDER.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
September 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to say again how much I appreciate your courage and vision in opposing our worse than useless activities in South Vietnam. And as long as our war vessels are in the Gulf of Tonkin, perhaps helping in the South Vietnam raids, dangerous incidents will develop.

More power to you.

Sincerely,
GEORGE L. COLLINS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
September 9, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have been listening to your views about the war in Vietnam for some time and have just read excerpts from your recent talk in Los Angeles on this subject. We want you to know that we, in this household, strongly favor the idea of placing the matter before the United Nations. It does not look as though we can ever work a miracle to inspire the people of Vietnam to pursue their war to a successful finish.

Another suggestion was put forth in a recent editorial in the Christian Science Monitor. It was to the effect that we send political experts rather than military ones to that country to help the people set up a stable government.

You have our support in anything you can do or say to convince the administration that you are right about Vietnam.

Very truly yours,
PATRICIA R. WILLIAMS
Mrs. C. D. Williams.

REDWOOD CITY, CALIF.,
September 3, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just finished reading your statement on the "Gulf of Tonkin Incident" which your office was kind enough to send me. I must admit that I had come to rather similar conclusions as regards our policy in southeast Asia, however, I have been unable to firm these up due to lack of information and poor newspaper reporting. It is my intention to send your statement along to the Christian Science Monitor to which I subscribe, and which I think was remiss in not printing one sentence of your statement.

It is very encouraging to me that we have men in our Senate who will speak out with a firm voice on such an unpopular issue. This is not easy and I am sure that you must be bearing the brunt of your courage right now. However, it served to convince me that some of the sparks our Founding Fathers invested into our Nation are still alive.

Yours very truly,
HELEN J. BURKE
Mrs. Richard J. Burke.

AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND,
September 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I wish to record my admiration of your consistent opposition to the tragic American policy in southeast Asia. A policy which is dragging the world steadily toward a nuclear war. As far as I can tell, yours is the only sane voice to be heard speaking on Vietnam, in America at present. This is, of course, bearing in mind that our "free" New Zealand press has not seen fit to publish any more than a brief synopsis of your opinions and nothing of your speeches in the Senate.

Please accept my best wishes for success if you are involved in the forthcoming elections. Perhaps a resounding Democrat victory will inject some reason into American foreign policy.

Yours faithfully,
W. S. HUGHES,
The University of Auckland.

ASHEVILLE, N.C.,
September 4, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I would like to express my appreciation for your fight to save the United States and to try to inform the people. I know it's a thankless task and pretty lonesome up there with only Senator GRUENING and possibly a couple of others to scotch for you.

I'm sorry that all we of North Carolina have done is send a couple of "gutless wonders" to the Senate.

I hope you and Senator GRUENING will continue in the Senate for many more years.

Again thanks for your stand on Vietnam and all other business of the Senate.

Yours sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. J. R. STILL.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
September 16, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In William Winters Comments of September 7, 1964, he wrote of you speaking in Los Angeles to the "Californians for Liberal Representation," about the U.S. involvement in Vietnam, and reading the excerpts in quoting you, and also hearing your views on radio.

And your admirable stand, with only one other, Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, against all the Senators and Representatives in regards to southeast Asia.

We, my husband and I, feel that perhaps some of your most timely articles would be printed in the magazine Frontier, 1434 Westwood Blvd., Los Angeles 24, Calif. They are much in accord with the people that are concerned with all the "glossing over" of almost every worthwhile phase of our present-day truths, and dressing up deceits of all kinds.

We stand up for your honest appraisals, and trust that more people will seriously consider them.

With our sincere best wishes,
Mr. and Mrs. WAYNE S. HUFF.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
September 15, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The ILWU Joint Legislative Committee is proud that your voice was heard in the Congress on the position of the United States in Vietnam. We commend your courageous stand against the escalation and extension of the war.

Even Ambassador Taylor has indicated that there will be no military solution to the situation and that only a political solution is possible.

We feel sure you will continue to be the spokesman for a peaceful solution to the situation in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM CHESTER.
KEITH EICKMAN.

BLANCHARD, MICH.,
September 18, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I must tell you how I admire you for voting against our intervention in southeast Asia. I wish I could be as proud of our Michigan Senators.

Sincerely,
Mrs. HELEN DECKER.

WEST NEWBURY, MASS.,
September 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Put this on the "Yes" pile of your letters re your communication to the Washington Post on Wednesday (or was it Thursday?). Robert Trumbull in his recent "The Scrutable East" wonders whether high officials of the U.S. Government really believe the nonsense they try to sell to the public. I am not particularly surprised that Dean Rusk finds it possible to voice pronouncements which he cannot possibly believe, but I am deeply distressed at Adlai Stevenson's deterioration over these last few years. Twelve years ago I was arguing that he would bring a new dimension in character and maturity to the Presidency. I dislike being wrong.

Of course, we must negotiate about Vietnam, and presumably through the United Nations. But negotiations will be quite useless if we enter them in any spirit other than one of wanting to redress the disgraceful injustice which we have wrought over these past two decades. Perhaps, ignorance has played a larger part in it than malevolence, but the result was the same.

I am unwilling to believe that most Americans would not agree with you if they were not hopelessly ignorant about Vietnam—as indeed about Asia and many other modern problem areas, geographical and other. There has been a failure in our education, not so much in our schools and colleges as in the postclassroom media of education, which have not kept up with our dynamic world. We need right now a national educational effort at this level, utilizing all the possible media. This is the problem that educational thinkers ought to be directing their attention to, not only to crowding more and more of personnel and subject matter into classrooms. Only with something of this kind are we going to have any hope of reaching national decisions in a democratic manner.

Please don't lose hope; keep at it and keep it up.

Sincerely yours,
MORTIMER GRAVES.

SEPTEMBER 15, 1964.

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

HONORABLE SIR: Please accept our thanks and congratulations for your courageous and forthright stand on the dangers of our involvement in Vietnam.

Your words are words which need to be said, and lend courage to others who feel the same way.

Please do not feel discouraged. In time (we hope it will be "in time") the majority of the American people will recognize the validity of what you say and will rally 'round.

Sincerely,
FRANCIS G. FINK.
VIVIAN I. FINK.
CHRIS FINK.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.

SAN JOSE, CALIF., *September 16, 1964.*
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although it is very belated, I wish to applaud your stand on the Vietnam situation and your negative vote on President Johnson's "predated declaration of war."

It is such a crying waste of manpower, money, and as you pointed out, we have no business there.

Once again, you seem to be the only man in the Senate representing my viewpoint.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

MOLLY OBERBILLIG.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 18, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your continued bravery on Vietnam issue will earn you a purple heart from the people someday—we will have peace there before long if we all keep up the hard work that you, GRUENING, MANSFIELD (at times), have done. But now we have a more serious problem, that of GOLDWATER which should involve our strenuous campaign activities. For without large moves by the Senators to defeat him we will be faced with a McCarthy era. We should go back to our communities and speak opposing him, uncovering the San Francisco arrests, scare tactics, etc.

How can the public vote with authority when they do not have facts about 'Frisco, about Vietnam or about Kennedy's death. We must lift the curtain of untruth—reminds me much of "1984."

Your example of switching party affiliation should be followed widely now that THURMOND has done it (we got rid of him, thank God). I have asked Rocky and JAVITS to consider it.

Please keep up vigorous campaign with colleagues when session ends.

With hope, faith, respect,

ROLAND A. HIRSCH.

SEPTEMBER 16, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I have just read your speech opposing the joint resolution on Vietnam, and should like to offer my congratulations on your stand. I was able to learn of your speech only through copies of the August 5 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which are being distributed by Students for a Democratic Society. Again, I admire your actions very much, and am generally in accord with them.

Yours,

BARRY TANNER.

DETROIT, MICH.

September 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: Though I am never likely to have an opportunity to vote for you, I am one of those for whom you have provided representation. Surely, I am one of many who live outside your State of whom this is true.

As a mother of two children, I look with despair at the photographs of peasant Vietnamese women carrying their bandaged children—casualities at the hands of their own countrymen and ours in this grim "defense of the free world." I hope you will continue your lonely struggle against this misguided and futile war.

I also applaud you for your remarks regarding the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. I consider your position a true defense of the free world.

Yours truly,

MARY J. DEWEAVER.

OTTER LAKE, MICH.,
September 7, 1964.

DEAR SIR: So very late I write to thank you for your remarks on Vietnam—May 18. Especially remarks re U.N.

I wish to say I agreed then, and I agree now, with what you said. I deeply regret that so few of our elected officials respect their constitutional responsibilities, and so few, and so late, do constituents appreciate and respond. Thanks.

ARTHUR E. SPENCER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
September 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you and encourage by support, your stand on the Vietnamese war. I am ashamed to have to read in the local Philippine press that our Ambassador to Vietnam feels it imperative for the United States to sustain its military presence in Vietnam, because if we "lose" Vietnam we might be pushed back to Hawaii; and furthermore if we lose this war we are conceding to the Communists the victory of a war of "liberation." This imperialistic cant is horrifying to all American ethical standards. It is a disgrace to be identified with a country whose actions so blatantly oppose its beliefs. I do not want to believe that our country has sunk so low, or that we have become so narrowminded and bigoted in the pursuit of our beliefs. The easy military answers of our strong country do not serve as useful models for an emerging Asian nation.

Living on a military base which sends men daily to the war in Vietnam, I am overcome with the tragedy of this absurd mission. The boys admit that they do not understand, but they are trained to obey. In personal conversations they have spoken of the joy of combat, and at the same time readily conceded their ignorance as to who it was they were killing. The Vietnamese, they say, all look alike to them, and anyone makes a good target. These senseless killings must not go on—neither for the joy of sport nor to save face for a nation strong enough to admit a mistake. It must by now be blatant to a fool that the succession of military dictatorships do not represent the people.

So I add another voice to the clamor for political and legitimate settlement, realizing full well that perfection is not the reasonable goal for a newly born and torn nation.

Respectfully and sincerely yours,

ANNE LABOUISSE FARNSWORTH.

MOUNTAIN LAKES, N.J.,
September 18, 1964.

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

Congratulations on your letter to Washington Post concerning Vietnam policy. Keep up the good work.

PAULINE MAAS.

SOUTH PASADENA, CALIF.,
September 16, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Yesterday you were quoted as asking what the Johnson-McNamara policy is regarding Vietnam.

Obviously, it is very simple. McNamara's policy has always been "Spend all the American dollars you want to, kill all the American boys that are over there, but don't under any circumstances harm one of my computers."

And after every setback McNamara is willing to hold a press conference and display charts which show, he says, how the South Vietnamese are really winning. These, of course, are the same charts he used many, many months ago to demonstrate that the war in Vietnam was practically won and the American boys would be coming home soon. What he neglected to point out then was that the American boys would be returned gradually, in coffins.

Remember when McNamara used these same charts to show Ford stockholders that the Edsel had swept all competition from the highways?

REID BYRON.

BERKELEY, CALIF,
August 30, 1964.

DEAR SIR: Though I am not a member of your constituency I feel your pronouncements on foreign policy have been speaking for me.

Thank you for your forthright and courageous views.

Yours truly,

JERARD P. REILLY.

ELLENSBURG, WASH.,
September 15, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Just a word to commend you for your stand on the Vietnam mess. Most of us don't believe the reports given us by those in Washington. I always have a sneaking notion, that the young men we were told were sent to Korea lately weren't sent there at all, some of mine were sent and I don't like it.

Today is our primary election, maybe we can do something about things we don't like.

I am enclosing a cartoon on foreign aid. I surely laughed at it, but it is pretty costly laughing to us taxpayers. Thank you.

MRS. OLGA JOHNSON.

OTTAWA, ONTARIO, CANADA.
September 15, 1964.

Senator W. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The conflict in South Vietnam has been, to me, the cause of a great deal of anxiety. I regret the suffering visited upon the people; I fear that the enemies of our various ways of life have gained by exploiting the terror and cruelty that is taking place; and I wonder whether the existence of the problem may help GOLDWATER and other extremists shortly.

The fact that Canada was appointed "policeman" in Geneva in 1954 but has not fulfilled this obligation is a source of some humiliation to me.

If you would have someone in your office send me any informative material you have available, I would be most thankful. I would also appreciate prices and sources of published matter. Thank you.

Yours truly,

JOHN KARI.

SEPTEMBER 11, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: There is nothing more important to our way of thinking than the elimination of this chicken-manure monkey business in Vietnam.

In the National Guardian of August 15, 1964, we read a report of your statement in the Senate against the resolution granting the President advance approval on all steps he deemed necessary to repel any attack on U.S. forces in southeast Asia.

If it wasn't so serious, it would be funny; these great, big PT boats coming down the coast to attack our teensy, weensy destroyers and aircraft carriers.

You have the advantage of being permitted to address the Senate in protest regarding this and many other stupid acts that are being forced on the people by a process which refuses them any voice in the matter whatsoever. The voices of the small group

of the American public, who are informed well enough to know what is going on, has no medium of expression.

There are many phases of Government I would like to discuss—the foreign aid, civil rights, unemployment, social security, etc., but I feel one point will help to settle most of the problems of the above subjects, and that is, that the Congress of the United States should take up its option to buy back the Federal Reserve System for $148 million dollars and thus eliminate more than $10 billion in interest per year on 1¼ trillion dollars of debt.

There are many Americans informed well enough to know that Oswald did not kill Kennedy. The Lane and other reports make this quite clear, regardless of what the Warren's committee report is going to be.

There is no good reason why the churches should be permitted to enter the various fields of business and still be exempt of taxation. It is quite obvious that millions of people, who do not support any church, are being forced to pay a higher tax, because church property is exempt.

Although we do not pay an income tax, we are forced to pay every other tax, and our total income is a social security check of $76.80.

The Cuban refugees in Florida receive more than this. and they haven't contributed a dime. Frankly, my wife and I are losing our patience with this so-called land of the free and home of the brave, where the Congressmen can vote themselves a bigger raise than we get—take it out of our taxes, and we have no right to decide one way or the other.

We are heartily in support of your stand regarding every phase of Government, as far as we know what is. You make more sense than any other Senator we know.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. J. M. GROSS.

MENDOCINO, CALIF.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
September 7, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: As a leader of national standing I direct this observation to you.

Recent events in South Korea and Vietnam suggest that the spirit of dictatorship still prevails over democracy. These two examples of American intervention afford us no indication of the real purpose of America foreign policy.

We are against something, presumably communism, but what are we for? We say we oppose all forms of totalitarianism including fascism. Yet we support outright dictatorship in Spain and countenance it elsewhere. In considering the American image, in a world in which we wish to remain prestigious what really is our policy? Do we have any means of expressing the positive, democratic idiom? Can the Peace Corps serve this purpose?

Respectfully,

MAX G. FRANKEL.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is with the greatest concern and urgency that I write you concerning the situation in Vietnam. This is a civil war, probably more nationalist than Communist inspired. Military intervention will not stop communism which has fed on war. There must be a political solution, difficult as it may be, because a satisfactory military solution is impossible.

Will you please do all in your power to initiate a reconvening of the 14 Nation Geneva Conference to decide the issue of Vietnam? You are aware, as your actions indicate, that this hot spot could erupt into a thermonuclear war, and that must not happen after we have made the splendid progress of at least the limited test ban treaty.

Thank you for your efforts in this direction—I am aware of your endeavors toward negotiation rather than force.

Many thanks.

Respectfully yours,

EVELYN WALTERS.

HILTS, CALIF.,
August 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I want you to know I've always admired you, but after hearing you on "Face the Nation," and discuss the controversial, ticklish problem of South Vietnam, I admire you even more, because you showed courage and I believe you are correct.

It is funny how people often refuse to accept the truth, believing only what is tasteful to them.

Keep hammering away at the public, and to those in Washington, because although you are facing many obstacles, it is important that you carry your message to the people.

I believe in the United Nations, and we have to work within its framework, we have to set an example, and live up to our own principles and ideals.

We can't for example, pick up our "marbles and go home, because they ain't all our marbles." The United Nations wasn't intended as a tool just for example, the United States, but now is a good time to use world opinion in our favor, if we just use it.

Red China must be admitted as soon as possible. To refuse her, to ignore her, is to court disaster.

Being a proud American first, a proud Oregonian second, I am proud to have a strong voice representing our great and most beautiful State, such as that of U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon.

Keep up your good work.

Respectfully yours,

EUGENE L. NELSON.

ERWIN, TENN.,
August 4, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Regarding your talk last night on Washington cloakroom about our foreign policy in South Vietnam, I wish to applaud you for your marvelous courage and forthrightness. It is almost unbelievable to hear any politician speak out so bravely, in this age of conformism and fear and misinformation from the publicity media.

Your ideas on this subject are, as Mark Twain used to say: "The truth with the bark on." I greatly envy Oregon State for having such a courageous Senator and also the State of Alaska for their Senator GRUENING. Please keep up your unequal fight.

Very sincerely,

ELIZABETH SEEMAN.

DAVENPORT, IOWA,
September 5, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I listened to the interview with you over CBS radio via WJR, Detroit, on September 3.

Your idea of giving the United Nations responsibility for the situation in Vietnam seems eminently sensible to me, and I hope you will succeed in getting the administration to consider it.

I also agree with your view as to the proper role of a congressional investigating committee in cases like the Baker case, namely, that violations of statutes should properly be handled by the criminal courts.

With best wishes,

WILLIAM T. EVANS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 6, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is all too seldom that Americans are privileged to hear a great statesman on TV and my one regret is that "Youth Wants To Know," coming as it does on Sunday afternoon, may not have had enough exposure. Would that this program could be repeated at a prime evening time.

I have long been convinced that our program in Vietnam is indefensible. Your lonely fight—and that of the Senator from Alaska, is a sorry commentary on the caliber of the men in Congress who so basically misrepresent us in Congress. The abolition of the mouthing of the Lord's Prayer by children in our public schools can stir them to frenzied action but alas they are never so stirred by the moral teachings of the Lord they profess to serve.

I have always admired you for your courageous and often lonesome stand on many important issues. Most of all I am thankful for your perception, your brilliance, and your unswering dedication to fighting for the things that you—and unfortunately so few of us on the outside, know to be just and to be right.

Thank you again Senator MORSE.

Sincerely and respectfully,

ILYANA B. BROMBERG.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Though I am not of your State, I wish to congratulate you on the first truly clear picture of the Vietnam situation I've read. I'm referring to your article in Progressive.

Normally, I do not write letters but I have sent several on this matter to the Senators of our State and others. This is merely a note to support you.

I simply do not understand why we are there?

Most sincerely,

MARILYN P. KLUGE.

FORT LEE, N.J.,
September 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to congratulate you on your courageous, rational stand against current U.S. policy in regard to Vietnam. I particularly enjoyed your article on the subject in last month's Progressive.

Sincerely,

FRED FLAXMAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
September 4, 1964.

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

HONORABLE SIR: I have just read reports of your speech of August 5 regarding U.S. involvement in Vietnam. The local papers that I read on vacation gave no indication of your position which I heartily endorse. I particularly feel that the questions you raised should be answered by the executive and legislative branches of our Government and the newspapers and their columnists.

If still available I would appreciate one or more copies of your speech criticizing a predated declaration of war.

Please accept my deepest thanks for acting in our country's best interests.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY LEVY.

SEPTEMBER 2, 1964.

Senator MORSE:

I am writing this letter in appreciation of your fine work in the Senate recently. In particular I would like to encourage your further actions and debates upon our action in Vietnam.

Your arguments in defense of a different foreign policy—I hope an effort and emphasis on social and economic aid to worthwhile people—are wholeheartedly encouraged by me.

Thank you.

LAURENCE RAPHAEL.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
September 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: We wish to commend you on your position on Vietnam and strongly endorse it as the only position in keeping with morality and with reality.

We are recommending that position to our Senators, and to the President.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN J. RUNNINGS.

MONTEREY, CALIF.,
September 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for being Senator MORSE. We consider you our representative, as do, we are sure, people in many other States. We are proud and grateful that you are willing to represent us.

Your article on Vietnam which appeared in the Progressive impressed us with its concisely reasoned approach to the problem and provided excellent material for discussions. Newspaper coverage of your stand has been scant.

We were heartened last week by a half-page ad appearing in the San Francisco Chronicle, sponsored by a group of Bay Area citizens. Their ad quoted your statements on Vietnam extensively and endorsed them fully. We are of course contributing our small bit financially, and writing to the President and our California Senators.

We feel certain that there are human beings everywhere who are applauding your efforts as do we.

Sincerely,

FRED S. MCFARLAND,
ELIZABETH J. MCFARLAND.

ROSLYN HEIGHTS, LONG ISLAND, N.Y.,
September 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing this note to let you know that I am in full accord with you in your views toward Vietnam. I believe that you are the only Senator who realizes the only way of securing peace in Vietnam, and I would just like you to know that you have my support.

Yours very truly,

JAMES ALAN PALEY.

POLAND, OHIO,
September 6, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I just heard you speak on Meet the Capitol Press, and I compliment you on your outspoken opinions of what we should do about our foreign policy and on Red China. I agree with you. Something should be done now. And to keep Red China out of the United Nations is only throwing oil on the fire.

Keep up the good work.

Understand I am not upholding for communism. I want no part of it. But for the white man to think he can control all of Asia is absurd. I am white, also. My forefathers came over over 200 years ago.

Trust the Lord to lead you in your very responsible work.

Thanks.

W. L. BENTUR.

AUGUST 30, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Having heard the news on radio last night and nothing since of your charges that the *Maddox* was in North Vietnam territorial waters also that it was the first to fire has prodded me to write and ask you to please pursue this to the fullest capacity it would take to bring this ship back to the States. As a wife of a member of the crew I feel that this ship is being used now in a capacity that is highly smelling of politics. How can we expect the respect and trust of other nations if we cannot own up to taking the responsibility of our own actions. We cannot base our future on the hopes that other nations will commend us for being strong and powerful when we let a false pride rule our Nation. Myself and other wives of crewmembers have been of course anxious and in trying to find a logical answer for being kept without information as is routine in circumstances such as this. Your charges were the suspicions we had been trying to suppress. If this ship is being detained for any reason except for the legitimate cause of the good of our Nation, certainly a second thought should be given. Hoping that you will be making a sincere effort to clarify this I'll close.

Sincerely,

Mrs. R. E. LA LONDE.

SCARBOROUGH, N.Y.,
August 31, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have been wanting to thank you for your valiant and lone fight for a more sane and moral intelligent policy toward Vietnam. As Democrats and Democrats who profoundly wish a JOHNSON-HUMPHREY victory in November, we are greatly disturbed and cannot see how our Vietnam policy can be defended or changed without backtracking on so much that we have said.

You have been one and I guess the only one, beside Senator GRUENING who supported you who has dared to state the facts, and who has had the intelligence to see the situation.

Since every paper, including the New York Times, blanketed out your speech in the Senate, could you send me several copies. I would like two for our local libraries and one for our Friends meeting and two for our mother and son who support you warmly and would vote for you any time anywhere if we all had the chance. Ten copies if they are available.

Bless you for your courage and statesmanship. Can you help to get us back on the right track?

Very sincerely,

LESLIE and ALICE BALASSA.

SEPTEMBER 7, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God for a man like you. We need more. Your talk on South Vietnam that the United States has no business in South Vietnam is so right.

It must be hard to hold onto solid beliefs amongst an almost solid wall of auctioneers and back scrubbers.

I'm for you 100 percent. Maybe even if there is only one intelligent voice—the people will hear and respond.

Talk about the Iron Curtain, what about the darkness of news kept from the American people.

Here we call ourselves a free people—but we are not permitted to know what is really going on. Also medicare in other small poor countries—but not for the so-called free people in the United States. We are told medicare is socialism—Hogwash.

Sincerely,

PEGGY KLEMPNER.

SEPTEMBER 7, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to take the time to congratulate you on your magnificent and almost lonely stand on South Vietnam.

You are one of the few courageous Americans who is saying the correct and honest thing, as time will pass the country will know how right you are. We need this piece of real estate with its one million and a half per day like a hole in the head.

It could be the start of another stupid Korea.

At any rate keep up the good work. God knows I appreciate it. I know other people do even though they do not take time to write (and they should). I wish to God more people like you were in Congress representing us.

God bless and keep you—

Sincerely,

FRANK PERONNE.

SOUTH YARMOUTH, MASS.,
September 1, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Yarmouth Meeting of Friends (Quakers) commends the caution and concern about the possible expansion of the war in South Vietnam shown in your courageous vote against the resolution approving U.S. attacks on North Vietnamese bases. We hope that you will continue to insist that our Government seek constructive, nonmilitary solutions to the admittedly complex problems of southeast Asia.

For and behalf of the Yarmouth Meeting of Friends.

DAVID W. DOUGLAS.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
September 1, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you and Senator GREUNING on your negative vote on the congressional resolution giving the President a free hand in military operations in southeast Asia.

Sincerely yours,

MORTON BERLAND.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
August 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing not only for myself, but for many others who feel the way I do and who want to congratulate you for the stand which you are taking on the issue of South Vietnam. Please keep up the fight to try to bring some sort of reason to other Senators and Representatives.

Because I am terribly concerned over what is happening in South Vietnam and the danger that the war may escalate into World War III, I have written to my Senator, and to McNamara, Rusk, and President Johnson urging them to begin a negotiated settlement in South Vietnam. If you have any suggestions for further action which I as a citizen can do, I would be very pleased to hear from you.

Thank you from the bottom of my heart for speaking out against this preposterous position in which we have placed ourselves.

Keep up the good work.

CAROL C. PANNY,
(*Mother and Teacher*).

DOWNEY, CALIF.,
August 30, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your view of U.S. activity in Vietnam, as reported in the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner of today's date, seems to me deserving of commendation. This has long been my opinion, also, and I am most pleased to find that someone is speaking out against the policies of the Dulles brothers and the Pentagon, which, in my opinion, can lead to no good.

You are doing a good job. We are sorry not to be constituents.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN N. VONRAAPHORST.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
September 8, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was one of the fortunate people who attended the meeting at the Ambassador Hotel, in Los Angeles, at which you spoke.

I admire your honest, outspoken analysis of the Vietnamese situation, and agree that our country should pull out of that country.

Please continue your admirable work in and out of the Senate.

Yours sincerely,

ELEANOR PITT.

THE MALIBU DISCUSSION AND ACTION GROUP,
Malibu, Calif., September 7, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Malibu Discussion and Action Group's topic for discussion in the month of August was Vietnam. After a brief account of Vietnam's history from 938 A.D. to the present, and a discussion of current conditions in Vietnam, handicapped by the general shortage of unbiased information on the subject, we turned to the problem of the alleged attack on the U.S.S. *Maddox* and the United States bombing of North Vietnamese territory.

After considerable dialog we reached a consensus of opinion and decided that our "action" for the month would be to write to you and our other representatives as well as the President concerning the following points:

1. We oppose escalation of the war into North Vietnam.

2. We feel that Vietnam should be neutralized and free elections should be held in North and South Vietnam under U.N. supervision. We should not rely upon military means to settle social and economic problems.

3. We feel that the response of the United States to the alleged attacks upon our fleet in the Tonkin Gulf was out of proportion to the alleged attacks and was dangerous to world peace.

Sincerely,

SARAH HUGHES DIXON,
Secretary.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

SENATOR MORSE: There are many questions in my mind concerning the position of the United States in southeast Asia which I hope you can clear up.

First. Why did the United States get so deeply and financially involved in the war between the French and the Indochinese when it was clearly a war for independence?

At the end of this war when the French were defeated they agreed to sign the Geneva Accords of 1954. Why did the United States object to signing this agreement?

If I am correct, some of the stipulations of this agreement were the withdrawal of foreign troops, an election by the people 2 years after the signing of the agreement and the eventual reunification of the two Vietnams. Why weren't these conditions carried out and why, instead, did our Government support the Diem regime and each succeeding government, and allow them to seize almost complete dictatorial powers, while we were presumably "defending the freedom" of these people?

ALBERT GORE, Senator from Tennessee, stated on the "Today" show that we have three choices in Vietnam:

(1) To start a major war.

(2) To pull out completely.

(3) To support the present government and try to stabilize it while rallying the people behind it.

Do you feel we are truly following the third course? If so do you feel we will ever have the support of a people who have been aiding the success of the guerrillas and even overwhelmingly supporting and joining them? If these guerrillas are the enemies of these people why are they able to get such great support from the people?

Finally, is the military strategic position of Vietnam so important as to warrant the spending of $2 million a day which we are pouring into the war effort and the many men we have been losing there, not to mention the death and destruction the war has been causing the Vietnamese people.

If this position is so crucially important, do you see any chance of our being able to defeat the guerrillas? If so, how, outside of a complete war and a possible world war III?

I would appreciate answers to these questions.

Thank you.

JULIE GROSS.

REDWOOD CITY, CALIF.,
September 9, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I just heard that you were one of only two Senators who voted against the recent North Vietnam resolution, August 6. It is very comforting to know that some of you will hold out for what you think is right even against such a great majority and in an issue of this kind, where voting against might seem to cast shadows on your "Americanism" even. It is truly comforting to us down on this level who feel powerless in these issues.

I am curious to know why you voted against this particular matter. I know why I would vote against it and I hope that I might not sound too longwinded that you might be able to wade through it in view of your very busy days.

1. If we believe, as the President said recently, that all nations should be allowed to set their own course, then why don't we allow it in the Vietnam area?

2. Why should we send millions to South Vietnam (which caused the problem at hand, in North Vietnam) when we need the money here at home to "fight poverty"?

3. Then about our destroyers getting into trouble 10,000 miles from home—well, if my children had rocks thrown at them by bullies on the next block, I hope I have instilled in them the sense to come home—not attack and get into more trouble.

4. The French failed to settle problems in Vietnam—do we think we can succeed in that area (whatever "succeed" means)?

5. It is really a Communist versus free-world fight? Or is it a case of some diverse peoples, struggling through adolescence and wanting to avoid some of the pitfalls or mistakes of the not completely perfect Western World society?

6. Are governments such as that of Diem and now the present one so "democratic" that they are worth so much effort, sweat and blood—American and native?

7. Were our ships really in international waters and if so were they not menacing a sovereign nation?

Why go on. There are so many more reasons I would want to give. I would like to know what your reasons were for taking such a lone stand in this matter. I think maybe I can find a copy of your early August speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and it should contain most of them. Further, I hope you will tell me that many other Congressmen feel the same way you do, even if they did not have the strength to stand as you did. I would be really worried if you are practically the only one in Washington who takes such a view. You see, I take it upon myself to write to any Congressman who makes some statement that I call constructive, to commend him on such action. I feel like this is exercising as much democratic action as a citizen can in such a large complex society. We cannot all get together to decide on issues as they might have done in an early Greek society. Of course if the Greeks did get together, democratically, over 50 percent of the population was excluded even then—the slaves.

When is all this madness going to end? When are we going to stop saying we want peace as we continue to clobber, figuratively (Cuba) and actually (North Vietnam and a large portion of the people of South Vietnam) small defenseless countries?

I'm glad there is one Senator WAYNE MORSE but we need more.

Sincerely,

JACK L. SELK.

LEWISTON, IDAHO,
September 15, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to offer a few words of thanks for your stand, stated in the press recently, in favor of some measure of international law to replace the jungle of power politics.

In his inaugural speech, President Kennedy referred rather eloquently to an American effort to establish world law. Later, however, there was the Bay of Pigs spectacle and events in Vietnam and elsewhere tended to overshadow any effort to establish law and order and our foreign policy slipped again into the ugly world of power politics.

I would like to have copies of your speeches on the subject of world affairs if these are available.

Very truly yours,

MORTON R. BRIGHAM.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
September 16, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have been wanting to write to you for many months now to let you know how much I admire you, but I could never seem to find the time. Now that I have a cold I have the time. In my opinion you are one of our most honorable and courageous Senators, if not the most courageous. Even though I do not always agree with you, I always respect you. I hope you will spend many more years in the U.S. Senate. The country certainly needs you.

Since I am a New Yorker and may never get a chance to cast a ballot for you, I think it's only right that I send this letter.

Sincerely yours,

SHELDON HELFAND.

WATERFORD, CALIF.,
September 15, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you for your lonely vote on the resolution supporting our violent action in North Vietnam.

Intellectually, I have supported you in your efforts to change our emphasis in southeast Asia.

Why we have to repeat the blunders of the French I do not know but I do know you cannot stop communism by brute force as we seem to feel.

It is appalling to countenance this wastage in southeast Asia when one-third of our citizens are in serious need and our best efforts should go toward building the U.S.A. into a working democracy where all can feel that they have a stake and a function in our society.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL R. TYSON.

ATLANTIC CITY, N.J.,
September 3, 1964.

Hon. SENATOR MORSE:

DEAR SENATOR: I just received your No. 8 report and as I have become disgusted with the handling of Vietnam mess your letter only convinced me of how wrong we are to continue sending men and money when we simply do not understand the people.

Last year we were told dreadful things that the late Diem was supposed to have permitted. The good accomplishments, and there were many such as increasing rice production and increased rubber output and established a manufacturing base or was about to do so.

Hospital beds were established in nearly 4,000 rural health centers, primary schools were doubled, and university scholars were increased from 2,900 to 17,000.

This was done by the man our Nation was willing to have removed and what a disgrace.

His widow was treated shamefully by our press, radio, etc. Here was a woman who well knew the enemies of her husband and her country.

Yet a man like Lodge was too dumb to know what was going on right under his nose—and imagine running him for President. How dumb can we get?

I have been a Democrat ever since women got the vote but this year I am voting Republican and my entire neighborhood is doing likewise.

If this administration is proud of its accomplishments, that is more than I am, and GOLDWATER may give them more than they would believe.

I do not know if you ever bother to read mail from the likes of me but I feel I know you and I have always enjoyed the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you send me as well as the newsy articles.

At present I am reading "The 480" by Eugene Burdick. It is a novel of politics and many of our Government men are mentioned in it.

Mr. Burdick should be quite an authority as his background of world traveler, lecturer, and professor of political science makes his stories sound possible.

I want you to know I appreciate your taking the stand you do on Vietnam. I wish more statesmen were like you.

Again thanking you I am,

Sincerely yours,

COLUMBIA CONOVER.

SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA,
September 7, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: Senator WAYNE MORSE' forceful article about Vietnam in the August Progressive impels me to tell you of my disapproval of U.S. policy in Vietnam. The article, together with disturbing reports of political and social unrest in South Vietnam (Buddhist and Catholic fights; the unseating of the Government's leader, Khanh, by student riots) strongly suggest that American policy has been misguided in Vietnam and that it should be rethought and reaimed now.

Our military involvement in South Vietnam violates the U.N. Charter of which we are signers, and the spirit of the Geneva agreement which we did not deign to sign. We are, then, working against the very world order which you proclaimed as the ultimate aim of U.S. policy before the bar association in New York in your recent speech. To the Vietnamese, apparently, and to the other inhabitants of southeast Asia we appear as the imperialists, having taken over the power and the prerogatives of the French when their position in Vietnam became untenable.

A report in today's paper written by Ray Cromley tells of this newspaperman's conversation with a group of friendly Vietnamese in Saigon. When asked their opinion of the U.S. shelling of the North Vietnamese boats, these Vietnamese lawyers, engineers, and architectural students did not answer directly, but in turn asked newspaperman Cromley their own questions: "It all depends on why the North Americans bombed North Vietnam ships. Did you do it to help us, or because of your own domestic political needs? Are you here in order to help us, or in order to pursue your own purposes and ends?"

I urge you to reassess and redirect our policy in southeast Asia to make it an expression of our most valued ideals. Freedom—which we Americans do cherish—for the people of southeast Asia must mean that they direct their own destiny with aid and assistance neither from us nor from anyone else unless it were disinterested help from an impersonal international body. Let us give a boost to world law and to the deepest meaning of freedom by a new policy for Vietnam and southeast Asia.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. CHESTER M. PATTERSON, Jr.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to tell you how important a figure you have been in my life. I have been terribly bitter and disillusioned with American foreign policy. Your voice alone, along with a few other brave and moral men in our Government, let me believe that all is not corrupt, ignorant, or naive in America's thinking.

I admire you greatly, sir, on your Vietnam stand. This cannot, in any way, erase the guilt I feel as an American, for the murder of innocent Vietnamese citizens and the useless slaughter of misinformed American servicemen.

I pray more Americans hear your sane pleas.

Personally, I wish you good health and a long life. You are the hope of America and the world for peace.

My humblest good wishes,

BRENDA SIEGEL.

GREATER NORTH HOLLYWOOD
DEMOCRATIC CLUB,
September 10, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: We of the Greater North Hollywood Democratic Club consisting of 95 members, have unanimously passed a resolution to endorse your position in the Senate resisting the dangerous policy of putting unprecedented war power in the hands of a single person.

We particularly compliment you in your resistance of the overwhelming pressure.

We want you to know that there are many people who feel as we do who have not yet expressed themselves as yet.

We are certain that the ground swell of those with the same sentiment as yours and ours will begin to appear in the near future. It is not the nature of the American people to want to push their weight around.

Our Democratic fairplay heritage will surely come to the fore soon and we are certain you will not be so lonely in your position in the future.

Hoping to hear more from you in the Senate,

Best regards,

Sincerely,

GEORGE ANTON,
President.
SABINA H. MARFIAN,
Corresponding Secretary.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 15, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you and commend you for your wonderful speech at the City Club yesterday. I am encouraged to see quite a good report of it on page 1 of today's Oregonian. To some extent this Oregonian report breaks the news blackout which they have maintained on what is being done in the name of freedom in South Vietnam.

Since we met you at the airport on Friday, July 10, I have talked with several people about finding ways to get the facts of the southeast Asia problem to the people of Oregon. Retired Reed College Professor Charles McKinley, who is active in the Council for a Livable World, believes that you, with other Senators, could write letters or guest editorials to some of the liberal newspapers outside of Portland. He suggested: the East Oregonian at Pendleton, the Medford Tribune, the Eugene Registrar Guard, and the Oregon Statesman at Salem.

I believe the Portland Reporter would print a letter from you. And after yesterday's speech I think they might be happy to print a guest editorial from you.

Not many people belong to the City Club, but large groups read the Reporter, especially the letters. The speech was broadcast at 10:25 p.m., so many people missed hearing it. I would like to have your opinion on the above suggestions.

Sincerely yours,

IONA B. TANNER.

SYRACUSE, N.Y.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Many thanks on your contribution of thoughts on the war in South Vietnam. Please keep your voice loud on this undeclared war and denote efforts to its end through U.N. effort.

Thanks.

Mrs. JAMES D. HUNT.

LEWIS COLLEGE,
Lockport, Ill., September 2, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to take this opportunity to praise your criticism of our policies in Vietnam, especially the issue of our bombing raids over North Vietnam. In an article in this week's New York Times, you stated our destroyers were operating 3 miles off the coast. Were you quoted correctly? Most of my friends, nearly all in fact, disagree with me over the morality of the bombing raids. I am sorry to say that your and my feelings on this issue are in a distinct minority; only one other faculty member here that I have talked to has indicated agreement with your stand. This is why I am taking this opportunity to indicate my

support and to urge you to keep up your distinguished criticism.

I would appreciate any additional information you find important, if you have the time.

Thank you for your consideration, and keep up good work.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH M. MCFADDEN,
Assistant Professor, History Department, Lewis College.

OMAHA, NEBR.,
September 5, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: From the enclosures you may readily gather why I have the highest regard for you as a public servant, why I consider you one of the most courageous statesmen, and not mere politician, of our fair land, and why I am asking of you as many copies or reprints of the interview of Capital Room of recent days as you can spare or you can hustle up for me for local distribution. Also at least one copy of some of your latest speeches on U.S. foreign policy and particularly its position in South Vietnam.

Thanking you in advance, I remain,

Sincerely and civically indebted,

HARRY G. MENDELSON.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.,
September 21, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my agreement with your speeches on Vietnam. If you have a mailing list for copies of these speeches I would appreciate being added to it. The details in the press are very sparse.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS R. HALPERN.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
September 23, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Your excellent speech of August 5, explaining your position on our involvement in South Vietnam has just come to my attention. You have explained the situation so clearly and in such detail that I wonder how the State Department can continue to maintain its rigid policy of "no negotiation at the present time." That such is the official policy is made clear in a letter I received within the week in answer to one I had sent to the President urging negotiations of some kind.

The only hope seems to be in a wiser public, not only aware of the dangers but willing to speak up. I hope you still have copies of your speech. If you have I should greatly appreciate your sending me about 50. I could easily distribute that number to friends in the Baltimore branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and to others less concerned.

We are grateful for your voice in the Congress.

Yours sincerely,

E. LUCILE BURNS.

CHEVY CHASE, MD.,
September 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have watched with leaping dismay the ignoring of a life-and-death issue in the present campaign; namely, the maneuverings of our forces in the Tonkin Gulf. You are the only public figure who, to my recall, has had the decency and intelligence to speak out on the provocative acts performed in our name.

The Goldwater approach to these matters is, of course, impossible, but the behavior of the administration certainly leaves much to be desired, especially in the most recent mystery fusillade of our destroyers. There appears to be an attempt by the administration to sweep it all under a rug.

A few days ago I attended a political meeting at which were present both party candidates for Senate and Sixth District of Maryland. Not a single office seeker challenged or even mentioned in his prepared remarks the posture of the United States in the Tonkin Gulf. When questioned about this, the Democratic candidate for Senator replied in effect, that what we were doing there was justified by the supposition that we were preventing India from falling into Red hands, and that we really showed them when the ships were attacked (applause, etc.).

To me it is deplorable that administration candidates feel so politically sleek that they can appeal to jingoist sentiments—exhibiting an attitude that is just as trigger happy as many of the notions of GOLDWATER.

This election ought not to go by default to an administration which pours an anodyne on questions of foreign policy. I strongly support your attempts to raise life-and-death issues, and I beseech you to continue these efforts to, in effect, prevent the ultimate calamity.

Thank you for your kind attention,

ELLIOTT SCHIFFMANN.

BRONX, N.Y.,
September 6, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I want to congratulate you on the stand you took today before the panel of youngsters on the WABC network with regard to our actions in South Vietnam.

I have always felt about this matter as you expressed it, but the public and the newspapers do not seem to be aware of it. If only the taxpayers in our Government could be informed of this waste they might rise up against these unnecessary expenditures.

The whole trouble with all these things is apathy and ignorance. Thanks that we have one Senator who has the courage and principle to expose these failures.

Wishing you success in your fight for the right, I am,

Yours very truly,

SAMUEL DANZIGER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am tremendously impressed with the wisdom of your statements, your opposition to our intervention in Vietnam. This note to you is a trifle belated.

However, I wanted to express my commendation to you for your courage to maintain your convictions. Enclosed is a note I have written to the President.

Sincerely yours,

(MRS.) ANN ADAMS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 22, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Today the news discloses that students are demonstrating in South Vietnam against the dictatorship. This reaffirms my understanding that great numbers of South Vietnamese are not interested in fighting the North—for their own government is oppressive and their living conditions unsatisfactory.

For the United States to risk large-scale war by our continuous intervention in that area appears to be entirely in error. We spend a million dollars daily and involve the lives of American boys uselessly.

I truly believe that the issue is between the haves and have-nots. If hunger and want were eliminated in the world, communism could be no threat.

I was deeply impressed with Senator MORSE'S lone, courageous stand and in his public utterances regarding the Vietnam fiasco.

Sincerely yours,

(MRS.) ANN ADAMS.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
August 20, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to thank you for the thoughful, statesmanlike speech you made on the floor of the Senate on August 5, 1964, in relation to the situation in Vietnam.

As you are probably aware, my newspaper, Philadelphia Bulletin, along with most other newspapers only printed small excerpts of your speech. Only yesterday, I had the opportunity of reading a major excerpt of your presentation. It is very frightening to me that in a body like the U.S. Senate, there should have been only two voices, yours and Senator GRUENING, speaking in opposition to the U.S. resolution to advance the war in Vietnam.

Please do not lose heart at your apparent lack of support in the Senate. I feel convinced that if the majority of the American people had the opportunity to read and think about the points raised in your speech they would be completely behind you.

I thank you as a U.S. citizen and as a mother, for trying to protect our land and our children and trying to make us face reality in a nuclear world.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. LILLIAN MILLMAN.

P.S.—I would appreciate a few copies of your entire speech which I plan to mail to responsible leaders in my community.

PULLMAN, WASH.,
August 18, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: Never since the days of Altgeld, Norris, and Marcantonio have the American people been treated to the courage displayed by you in your struggle to inform them of the facts concerning Vietnam.

Only one newspaper carried the major portion of your text regarding President Johnson's request for a predated declaration of war in southeast Asia: That was the National Guardian. The Guardian has carried your speeches, as well as those of Senator GRUENING. In fact, Senator GRUENING was even moved to write a letter thanking the Guardian for carrying his speeches, which were ignored by the New York Times.

Since the Guardian is a weekly, I have missed some of your speeches. Would it be possible, therefore, to send me copies of those concerning Vietnam. What would be the possibility of receiving bulk copies? If this is not possible, may I please have two copies of each?

Finally, sir, excuse my presumption, but have you considered using your franking privileges to inform the American people of the disastrous and futile road we are traveling in Vietnam. Normally our mass media carries the voice of dissent so the people may make up their minds. However, in this case the mass media have abdicated their responsibility. Some of us here at the university have even considered putting some of your speeches in the papers by buying the space. This cost is, as I am sure you realize, quite high. Again please excuse the presumption, but have you considered personal

appeals to the papers by you and/or Senator GRUENING to print your texts.

I have ultimate confidence in a well-informed electorate. However, the task of informing them can be, as I am sure you've known for quite a while, quite formidable.

Very sincerely yours,

JOSEPH E. MORROW.

STROMNESS, ORKNEY, SCOTLAND,
August 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Allow me to congratulate you on your courageous stand on peace in Vietnam.

It is tremendously inspiring to us in Britain that a voice of sanity is heard in a country which we think is engaging in a hopeless and quite illegal campaign in a foreign country, far removed from any direct threat to the security of the United States.

Far from containing communism, U.S. activities foster it, as was amply proved in China. History will also prove that the single opponent in the Senate, of present-day policy, was right and all the others tragically wrong.

Surely you speak for millions of, at present, inarticulate Americans who are beginning to think along similar lines, and these are the hope of humanity. May their united voices halt this madness before it is too late.

But what a welter of blood and tears must the world endure before the truth dawns.

Yours sincerely,

G. S. ROBERTSON, Jr.

BELLEVUE, WASH.,
August 31, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would appreciate a copy of your Vietnam speech, if you are able to supply me with same. From the few quotes I have seen, it seems to be very good.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

BETSY HAY,
Mrs. D. E. Hay.

FEBRUARY 9, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I should just like to extend my congratulations on the stand you have taken on U.S. policy and actions in Vietnam. The facts clearly indicate that the United States should be blamed more than any other country and now seems to be prepared to plunge the world into nuclear war if this is necessary to retain in power, dictators who have little to recommend them beyond an attitude of anticommunism.

Communism can be contained only if a constructive policy is formulated to appeal to the people of Vietnam. After Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee, and Ngo Dinh Diem we would hope that America might look at the facts as they are rather than as one would desire them to be. Intervention in a civil war, using leaders at least as responsible as the Communists, can solve nothing and can lead only to disaster and to the triumph of communism.

Despite the Australian Government policy of support for the U.S. actions, many people here are bitterly opposed to America's actions on the grounds of morality, risk, and indeed commonsense. Neutralization offers the only way for the United States to withdraw with honor from Vietnam; it also could provide a means of insuring that Communist expansion might be checked.

We feel that the United States can always go home from southeast Asia; Australians have no option but to remain in the area. By allying itself with the U.S. policy, the Australian Government shares the guilt—but not all of us agree with the Government.

I do hope you do not mind my writing to you but I wanted to express my congratulations and extend my best wishes to you in what must be a difficult time.

Kindest regards.

Yours sincerely,

G. J. MORROW.

BURBANK, CALIF.,
August 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Congratulations on your refusal to give the President a blank check for the Vietnam crisis.

Why are we Americans forced to dig and probe in the dark to show us the light on the truth regarding our foreign policy and many other major issues?

We totally disapprove of a nation within our Nation using the U.S. governmental machinery in pursuit of its own ends.

Our concern about Otto Otepka is deep. We are wondering why his statements are not checked out.

Sir, the Communists have seen the Americans as fun loving—easy-going people, that will give the devil himself the benefit of a doubt. They have seen us being pushed and shoved around and take it. But they haven't seen our tempers when our spirits are riled up and Heaven help them if they ever do. We do not like the idea of them forcing us to war to gain them more strength, but we will not stand idly by if they try to take over our Nation.

In the Senate, Mr. FULBRIGHT, on August 20, 1964, read an article written by Walter Lippmann called "Why Not Victory." We believe it to be a most unintelligent article.

Quote: The only way to defeat the guerrilla is to put much larger numbers of men on the ground, in the jungles and in the swamps and on the plains, and in the mountains. As against Africans and Asians, white men cannot win such wars. What is more, white men including the Russians, will not mobilize the large enough masses of men required for this kind of warfare. Unquote.

How does Mr. Lippmann think the Indians fought?

I'm sure our generals are intelligent enough to handle their business. Mr. Lippmann should keep his nose out of it.

Why does Mr. Lippmann include the Russians? Everyone knows the Communists hold Russians captive, they wouldn't care to fight for Khrushchev, and the Communists haven't got the guts to stand up in an even fight, that's why they crawl in on their bellies like slimy, sneaking snakes and rob people of their country by the lowest forms known to man. Their cowardly fear causes them to murder people by the millions in countries they hold captive. They are so cowardly they will not even admit they are Communists.

They serve well the cause of their father the Devil. They cannot confess to follow the way of God; they are taught there is no God, only materialism.

There is only God or the Devil to follow.

If our Government would stop pouring billions into the pockets of criminal leaders whom all countries hate, then there would be no need of us going to war. Let them have their revolution among themselves.

God bless you.

Sincerely,

MARGARET MCLEOD.

P.S.—How can they start a war when they don't have enough wheat to feed themselves?

GLENDALE, CALIF.,
September 24, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: I frequently read in our papers where you are exhorting the administration to get out of Vietnam and stop the tremendous outlay in men and materials.

Red China is reported to say that as we send in men and supplies to Vietnam and its neighbors she will continue to block any progress we make.

The thing that amazes me is that our so-called leaders think we can prevail against the Communists who apparently are able to supply large numbers of troops to fight a war that our citizens do not want and who did not vote for the project.

My best wishes in your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

FRED D. GIBBS.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
September 24, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We wonder if those boys who are now dying in South Vietnam deserve more than some of our politicians who are going about our country telling folks, "You never had it so good." This slogan is a mockery, a travesty, to those boys who are in that war way up to their necks. The Vietnamese Government has no stability and this administration is making the same mistake France made in Indochina. Your position in reference to it is to be admired and encouraged.

Most respectfully yours,

W. S. BUCHART.

TACOMA, WASH.,
September 22, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend your actions in support of the Supreme Court decision on legislative reapportionment.

I also wish to express support of your little publicized statements on Vietnam and the improper involvement in that country.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. NAOMI ELLISON.

SEPTEMBER 15, 1964.

Thank you for speaking out about the deplorable situation in Vietnam. I too believe the people should be informed.

Your courage is appreciated by many.

Sincerely,

Mrs. CONSTANCE JUSTESN.
BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.

U.S. VIETNAM POLICY ATTACKED

The 1954 Geneva agreement ended the long French colonial regime in Indochina, and theoretically brought peace and stability to the area on the basis of the establishment of three neutral independent nations: Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. Every major country, including the United States and Communist China, signed or otherwise indicated acceptance of the Geneva agreement. The agreement provided for withdrawal of all foreign military troops and aid, as well as national elections throughout Vietnam by 1956. The United States put Diem in as ruler of South Vietnam and did not permit these elections.

The agreement failed in its purpose. It is an unfortunate truth that the United States bears the major responsibility for the failure of the Geneva agreement in Vietnam, for our own Government has been and still is spending billions on military aid in South Vietnam and many millions more to support U.S. troops fighting in South Vietnam. We then and now militantly oppose any and all proposals for neutralization of Vietnam. Our policy in South Vietnam is a unilateral violation of an international agreement which we agreed to uphold. This alone is sufficient reason to reconsider our policy. But there are still other important reasons why this country should end its military involvement in Vietnam.

1. The military involvement has led to a real danger of a general war in Asia and possibly to a nuclear war.

2. It is a policy that cannot lead to a meaningful victory.

3. It is a policy that wastes lives and drains the resources of the American people in a cause that is not in the best interests of our people.

The facts are that we are not fighting for freedom in South Vietnam, and South Vietnam is not threatened by outside Communist aggression. The facts are that we have intervened in a civil war on the side of the reactionary clique that controls the Government of South Vietnam, a clique that included Diem and now includes Khanh.

The governments we have sponsored in South Vietnam, first under Diem and now under Khanh, are led by people who worked for the French colonial administration or who remained aloof from the struggle against it.

This should help explain why 30,000 (according to AP reports) poorly armed guerrillas in South Vietnam now control 60 percent of the country and why they are consistently able to defeat the modern well-armed 400,000-man South Vietnamese army and its supporting group of 17,000 highly trained U.S. military "advisers." Commonsense says that this couldn't have been done unless the Vietcong had a large degree of popular support.

What is U.S. policy in this situation? Our Government insists that North Vietnam and Red China can call off the Vietcong, despite the fact that it is not Chinese troops or North Vietnamese troops that compose the Vietcong. Neither is the Vietcong dependent upon supplies from North Vietnam and China—not when it is in control of most of the countryside and when 90 percent of its weapons come from captured U.S. stock by our own admission. Talk of extending the war to North Vietnam and China is dangerous and foolish. It would mean a war that we could win only at immense cost, and, if we won the war, we would still be no closer to our objective of building a stable non-Communist government for South Vietnam.

What we need in South Vietnam is a program that can win popular support for the Saigon Government. There is no guarantee that this can be done, but before it possibly can, one all-important first step must be taken. The civil war must be ended. There is a kind of arrogance in stating over and over that we will fight forever—make any sacrifices—to crush the Vietcong. It is the people of South Vietnam who will be making the sacrifice, and they are tired of war. Their land has been constantly ravaged by war for a quarter of a century, and their allegiance will go to the party of peace. United States policy in South Vietnam is now self-defeating because it offers nothing but war on into the indefinite future.

The stock answer to critics of this Nation's role in Vietnam is to imply that we would give the area to the Communists. The fact is that our present policy, if it doesn't kill us all, is bound to do just that. In the words of Senator MORSE regarding Vietnam, "we should never have gotten in, we shouldn't have stayed in, we should get out now."

Let us look at the issue of South Vietnam from a different perspective. We should see it as a deadend, as a diversion of this country's energies from the real problems. How do we best promote freedom: By building "strategic hamlets" in South Vietnam or by ending racism in Mississippi? How do we promote prosperity: By using chemical defoliants and napalm in South Vietnam or by attacking poverty in Appalachia? How do we promote our security: By attacking North Vietnam and China or by bringing automation under social control?

It is in this context that we look at Vietnam and see this country spending $2 million every day to maintain General Khanh and his crew while programs to uproot racism, to eliminate poverty, and to secure a better life in this country go begging. Let's put the important things first, and let's begin by taking the Vietnam question to the United Nations and withdrawing our military aid in South Vietnam.

JOE URIS,
RON SUBOTNICK,
and others of the W.E.B. DuBois Club.

AUGUST 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your forthright stand on Vietnam, and your honesty in oppposing President Johnson's resolution. Many of us here in New York agree with your position on this matter.

Unfortunately, the newspapers did not reprint the text of your speech. I came across excerpts in the National Guardian—a complete page.

Would it be possible to get a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of your speech? Arguments fly back and forth here and it is important to have facts to back them up.

Your position and Senator GRUENING's are like a breath of sanity in a mad world. The hypocrisy and self-deception of our country over Vietnam shocks and saddens me. It also frighten me—as a nonbeliever in brinkmanship.

Thanks again. We need your courage and objectivity.

Sincerely,

JULIA YARROW.

AUGUST 17, 1964.

SIR: I have seen excerpts of your remarks of August 5, 1964, on the resolution granting the President extraordinary powers relative to southeast Asia. There is an overwhelming merit in the essence of your remarks and I should appreciate copies of them, if possible. Please send 1 copy to W. Jones, Brooklyn, N.Y.; and 10 copies to W. Jones, Bakers Local No. 3, Long Island City, N.Y.

Thanking you in advance,

Fraternally,

BILL JONES.

AUGUST 15, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read a few statements made by you recently and your views interest me. They seem to come close to my own feelings and thoughts on world affairs, human rights, etc. Although I am not part of your constituency, I would like very much to know more about you.

Would you send me whatever material you may have available, including reprints of any recent speeches, so that I may learn where you stand on major issues facing our country and, more importantly, our world.

Before writing directly to you, I requested this information from the League of Women Voters who referred me to an organization called "Americans for Constitutional Action" in Washington. I wrote to them requesting the above information, but the only thing they sent me was rather reactionary material. So, I must make the request of you.

Thank you for whatever information you may send.

Sincerely yours,

MURIEL BERGER.

AUGUST 13, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on the stand you took with regard to our intervention in North Vietnam. I would appreciate your sending me as many copies of your speeches you made in recent months, as possible. I would like to distribute them among our friends, and also to neighbors up and down the block. People are interested to keep the peace in southeast Asia, but unfortunately don't take the time to write to their representatives in Washington. Maybe getting acquainted with your speeches will help.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

SYLVIA R. PRIMACK.

NEW YORK, N.Y.
September 14, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Not one more American boy should die. Vietnam policy incredulous, inconsistent, indefensible. Negotiate United Nations.

CARLTON N. HENDRICKSON.

SEPTEMBER 8, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: Please be assured that your stand on Vietnam is right and that there are (there must be) many who agree with you besides me. The Holy Roman Empire ruled the world and ultimately went down to its doom. It was too big a job and history says they decayed. The British Empire ruled the seas and the sun never set on her possessions. It was too big a job for her. In all history where might alone was accepted for right that country (nation) was doomed.

Senator FULBRIGHT's statement to the Nation, after the U–2 incident, covers it completely. There's no evil which a nation will not embrace to fulfill its ambition, and thereby dig its own grave.

For a long time we have had a double standard of national morality—one for ourselves and the opposite for others (examples: (1) the Suez affair and England, France, and Israel; (2) Quemoy, the islands off China coast and Formosa versus China; (3) Cuba).

We spread the umbrella of our protection around the robots we appoint in lands thousands of miles away, if our national business interest pocket nerve is affected; and we care little whether we support dictators and bloody, self-seeking despots, all in the fantastically hypocritical name of freedom. This especially applies to the Koreans and now to Vietnamese.

I love my country too much to stand by watching and hurting while our reputation for truthfulness and for moral strength is so easily recognized by the intelligent in all lands, as a fraud.

Tragically it seems it never is so bad it can't be worse, which is the only reason I am for Johnson and Humphrey.

Even if I don't write you daily, and if the great New York Times doesn't seem to believe your news is fit to print, believe me I am greatly indebted to you.

Respectfully,

Rev. MORLEY WOLFE.

OSSINING, N.Y.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
September 9, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was with sincere pleasure and great admiration that I read your speech concerning your stand against U.S. intervention in the internal affairs of southeast Asia.

It is a great relief to know that there are at least two courageous, outspoken, thinking men in the Senate of the United States.

To you, sir, and to Senator GRUENING—thank you.

Sincerely,

ELIN M. BELSKY.

UPLAND, CALIF.,
September 8, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Offices,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have long been an admirer of your forthright position in major

issues, never more so than now, your courageous statement on Vietnam is a service not only to our country, but to all mankind. If politics is the art of the possible, then statesmanship does the impossible. Your fine work is real statesmanship.

Please accept my heartfelt support and sincere best wishes for the widespread knowledge of your position by all thinking citizens. I trust more of our lawmakers and Government officials will understand and favor it.

Blessings,

PAUL S. DELP,
Professor of Philosophy.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
September 2, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I extend gracious thanks for the hearings you sent me concerning the foreign aid bill. Since the bill is currently shelved, it will probably return to the floor fairly soon, when it does, I hope you succeed in any attempts to cut the appropriations.

Concerning the Vietnam situation, I am slowly realizing that your position, which I formally scorned, now seems to be the correct one. I consider myself an "all or nuthin" man on foreign policy. Since we cannot obtain all, we had better settle for "nuthin."

In addition, I send congratulations on a dedicated and devoted job in the Senate. Since I am fairly conservative, and seem to consider you a leftwinger, I find it difficult to compliment you. However, a Senator who excels himself beyond the ordinary solution to problems, and a Senator who inserts articles in the RECORD which criticize him, and a Senator who red rosingly engages in a filibuster, only to delay, not to thwart voting, can't be all bad. I hope you continue your successful work in the Senate, we need you.

Since I always enjoy reading any speeches or articles of the senior Oregonian, I would be honored and delighted if you could possibly send me your newsletter. Surely anyone who passes over the writings of Senator MORSE, misses the foremost work of art of America's most distinguished Senator. Please include my name on your mailing list.

Faithfully yours,

GEORGE OTTE.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.,
September 4, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is long overdue; like many who are "for" you, I have put off writing while those "agin" are busy. Your record as a person and as a Senator, your objectivity in evaluating the American foreign policy and its position in the Far East, command the respect of all thinking persons. You deserve the full support of every citizen, not just that of your constituents. We are indebted to you for your stanch and almost singlehanded opposition to events of the past few weeks.

It is my great hope that you, and others like you, will be able to continue speaking out for commonsense.

Sincerely,

DAVID D. HEWES.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
September 4, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read with great interest your statements regarding American foreign policy. I am particularly concerned about our position in Vietnam. It is my belief that we should withdraw from Vietnam, and let this entire problem be referred to the United Nations.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. KATHERINE G. FLYNN.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,
September 8, 1964.

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

My heartfelt thanks for your courageous stand against our involvement in southeast Asia. Please hold firmly to your convictions because you are right. Our involvement is a form of imperialism backed by powerful minority groups of financial and industrial oligarchy whose only aim is profit and no responsibility toward making our world better for all mankind.

W. G. ROMINGER.

JULY 12, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to praise and give you some small encouragement on the courageous stand you have been taking on the southeast Asian situation. Men like yourself and Senator GRUENING offer some hope to the growing number of us who are appalled and sickened by U.S. policy in this area. Perhaps the final straw for many was the realization that this country was aiding and abetting a government (the South Vietnamese) which systematically traffics in the most brutal torture. It reveals only the deepest moral nihilism to attempt to excuse ourselves by saying that that is the way things are done there. It is impossible to believe that a government which is so dependent upon our strategic and tactical support could not be forced to discontinue this practice if pressure were applied.

I am a student at the University of Michigan. I do not belong to any political party nor am I a "professional" anti-American, or ultraleftist. I do think it is worthwhile for Members of the Congress and the administration to know that many younger people are beginning to find their Government's acts immoral and abominable. Almost against my will, I am becoming quite cynical about American policies and motives. It is difficult not to though, when Members of Congress and the President continue to insist that we are defending the free world at the same time our largest selling national picture magazine is running color photographs of favorite torture techniques of the South Vietnamese troops while our "advisers" look calmly on.

I do not believe that my thoughts on this situation are foolishly idealistic, emotional or naive. It is no doubt true that atrocities are the byproduct of every war, though one could argue that there is something particularly repulsive about a government which engages in the torture of the women and children of its own civilian population in order to sustain itself. What many members of our Government do not seem to realize is many many people are beginning to be rather certain that we stand for nothing better, and perhaps something worse than the Communists. We become what we do. If we are willing to blithely accept the formula of the end justifying the means, we have made a dangerous and perhaps fatal step. Good luck to you and thank you for the small glimmer of hope.

Yours truly,

PATRICK CONNOR.

ONTARIO, CALIF.,
August 22, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We the undersigned registered Democrats of southern California wish to protest the foreign policy of our Government in southeast Asia, and specifically our present policy in South Vietnam.

We agree wholeheartedly with that great statesman, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, when he says, as he has time and time again on the floor of the U.S. Senate, "We should not have got in, not have stayed, and should get out now." We also agree with the Senator from Alaska, ERNEST GRUENING, who says, "The time has come to cease the useless and senseless loss of American lives in an area not essential to the security of the United States."

Let us stop a $2 million-a-day war that nobody wants. We urge you, President Johnson, along with the State Department, to call a halt to this dirty war in South Vietnam. A continuation of our present policy in Vietnam could lead to a devastating nuclear war that no one could win.

Let's not make Vietnam another Hiroshima.

Sincerely yours,

M. D. ALLEN.

LOS ALTOS, CALIF.,
September 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Perhaps because I am not a constituent of yours, I have never been moved to write you a letter, though I have been an admirer of your many courageous political acts over the years of your service in the Senate. But it would be criminal for me to delay longer in writing to tell you how much I appreciate your attempts to keep a flicker of intelligence alive in our dealing with the situation in Vietnam.

If anything is true, I am afraid that it is the terrible fact that our involvement in Vietnam is even less honorable than the picture you have detailed for the American people. I can understand the reasons of political expediency that have led a consummate politician like Lyndon Johnson to his present position concerning Vietnam. What alarms, saddens, and disgusts me is the failure of so many of your colleagues to join you on this issue—men who for the most part do not have President Johnson's excuses for their actions. I can only hope that you represent the voice of conscience and good judgment that is only temporarily stilled in men such as Senators FULBRIGHT, MCGOVERN, and other (dare I add HUMPHREY?).

I hope that you will eventually see your views vindicated against the current conformity and in spite of the fairly uniform press suppression of your damaging criticism of our war in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

R. D. LAKIN.

FRANKLIN, OHIO,
September 15, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Some weeks ago I understand you took a stand against the action the President took on the Vietnam crisis. I think you were right in doing so and I wish to commend you for doing so and to thank you for doing so.

Yours very truly,

DOROTHY SILVERS.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I cannot express how greatly you should be commended for your stand on Vietnam.

May we please also urge that you introduce in the Senate the concurrent resolution introduced in the House that opposes M.L.F. We know you must also be opposed.

Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. V. K. ULMER.

SEPTEMBER 16, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I would like to commend you for your forthright statements about American participation in the war in Viet-

nam. When intelligence and honesty about our role are so rare, your voice is particularly appreciated.

Sincerely,

MRS. ELAINE EDGELL.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This card is to let you know how much I appreciate your stand on Vietnam and to congratulate you on taking this stand.

Please take a similar stand on the resolution in the House at this time opposing M.L.F. I feel that you also must oppose this.

MRS. LEON JACKSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
September 18, 1964.

DEAR SIR: Hope your speeches on involvement in South Vietnam are being published in the newspapers.

Please send me your speech of Monday, September 16, 1964, where you point out the withholding of the "facts about the war."

Thank you very much.

The American people should be proud of your voice in the Senate for warning that this path might lead to a third world war.

Thank you again.

JOSEPH SIEGEL.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
September 17, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to commend you and thank you most sincerely for your courageous and honest stand against our participation in the civil war in Vietnam. You are right. I hope that you will have more colleagues joining you, if they too can find the courage.

Sincerely,

SUSAN ADAMS.

MOSMAN, SYDNEY, N.S.W., AUSTRALIA,
September 1, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to hail you, as history certainly will do so, as a brave and honest man for your stand on Vietnam. Nor can it have been any easy thing to do, your Government having the attitude it has on this question.

What you do is doubly important. Too often a country is judged by the actions of the government in power at the time and other peoples tend to forget that what is done is often against the wishes of many. It is a good thing to be reminded that there are people of good will everywhere and if we band together and fight for justice surely justice will prevail in the end.

We in Australia are very concerned about the question of unhappy Vietnam, not only are they among our neighbors but our present Government slavishly follows what yours decrees, which makes statements like yours so very important.

Thanking you and wishing you every success in your courageous stand.

Yours very sincerely,

DORA ARMYTAGE.

MARYSVILLE, WASH.,
September 2, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to applaud long and loud for the stand you took in regard to Vietnam.

Very sincerely,

MRS. CLAIR KUHNLE.

BAR HARBOR, MAINE,
August 31, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to express my thanks to you for your perseverence and fortitude in the defense of your stand on recent world problems, particularly the festering Vietnam issue. My respect for you is furthered by the fact that you belong to a very small minority in the most influential Government body, the Senate.

I find myself a voice in the dark and subject to much criticism aimed at my defense of my own ideals, as I'm sure you must. But still, I strive to convince people through discussion of what I believe to be the truth, though whether I accomplish anything or not is a question. This, then, is the reason that I wish to urge you, as a person honored and respected by many, to continue on your present course, advocating a reversal in a policy which will inevitably reach a dead end.

Sincerely yours,

W. EDWIN KALISS.

P.S.—I am 16 years old, and am entering the 11th grade.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
September 1, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: If you have made a Senate speech on the recent Saigon riots and the collapse of the Khanh regime, or if you intend to make such a speech presently, I would appreciate a copy.

I would think that the complete failure of U.S. policy in Vietnam must be evident to many of your colleagues by now. Can you perhaps convince FULBRIGHT that we are not successfully stabilizing the situation, and that those requirements of strength which he thought ought to precede involvement of the United Nations are never going to be fulfilled? That, in fact, in his discussion with Senator CHURCH (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 23, 1964) his claim to a practical point of view has hardly stood the test of time.

The chief hazard now will be the tendency to send U.S. ground forces into action. Is it possible to get large chunks of the Ridgway report on Indochina (1954) into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? Much of it must apply as well now as it did then.

Best wishes,

R. D. CAMPBELL.

WAYNE, N.J.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: After the news tonight on TV, I have sent the following night letter to President Johnson:

Why should there be U.S. bombers over North Vietnam? Do we or don't we believe in the United Nations? What democracy are we supposed to be protecting in South Vietnam? With a son in the Air Force, I have more than average concern. For a long time, I've read several papers daily, searching for reasons to support our policies and the only reasons I can find do not do us credit.

Thank you for your forceful TV appearance this week.

Sincerely,

FRANCES ZANG.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 6, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just heard your interrogation by certain youth on TV.

I have strongly favored your and Senator GRUENING's fights over the last 6 months on our (the United States, that is) role in South Vietnam.

I am in general agreement with what you said today.

But I was disturbed by your suggestion that we remain in South Vietnam if we have SEATO members' troops alongside "us."

SEATO is fortunately dead, so there is little likelihood of your suggestion being realized.

I am disturbed by your implication that our presence, in our present role in South Vietnam would be tolerable, even desirable, if we were only one of many interveners.

For we are interveners in a civil war in which S. Vietnamese who want South Vietnam to be run by Vietnamese are rebelling against a puppet government.

I had thought that your objection to our involvements there was based largely on this fact.

Your insistence upon bringing the U.N. into this could easily produce another Korean sham operation, although it is true that U Thant is a different man from Trygve Lie.

Nor it is apt to cite the U.N.'s and our role in the Congo, which has brought Tshombe back.

Let us put South Vietnam back into the hands of the original international committee of 1954, although the United States did not sign.

But, let us get out.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT MELTON.

RED BANK, N.J.,
September 7, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an 18 year old who is subject to be drafted into the Vietnam war should it get worse, I applaud your efforts to end our involvement there. I see no reason why American boys should die in support of a bloody dictator. If the people of South Vietnam don't want to fight the Vietcong, why should American boys? I agree with you that the U.N. should be sent there as a peacekeeping force.

It is certainly pitiful that only two U.S. Senators stood up to protest our bloody role in Vietnam. It is also pitiful and shameful that the American people seem to be willing to go to war over Vietnam. Don't let your critics bother you Senator MORSE. A large number of people are behind you. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mr. DENNIS BENTHAM.

NORTH MANCHESTER, IND.,
September 11, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed you will find a copy of "Memo on Vietnam" by David McReynolds and A. J. Muste, which we regard as a most vital presentation of little known facts on this distressing situation. We hope you will be concerned enough to read this leaflet.

We also call your attention to the testimony given in recent symposium on Vietnam by such qualified persons as Stanley Millet, professor of political science, who taught for 2 years at the University of Saigon; Robert Browne, economist, who spent 6 years with the U.S. aid program in South Vietnam and Cambodia; Arthur Dommen, UPI correspondent in Vietnam for 2 years; also published reports by Dr. David Arnold of Princeton University who served 14 months with the USIA in Saigon.

It seems to us that the Pentagon and the CIA are too often taking critical situations out of the hands of the State Department. We regard this as a serious threat to democracy and world peace. It is likewise "un-American" in the truest sense. We feel that under no circumstances should war be extended into North Vietnam. Red China obviously has legitimate interests which we must not fail to recognize.

Earnest consideration should be given the neutralization of the whole Indochina area under international supervision. Present times give ample indication that we can no longer deal with independent nation-states but must resolve our conflicts in relation to the total community bound together by

mutual dangers as well as mutual hopeful possibilities.

We appreciate the responsible conduct of foreign affairs which has in many instances characterized the Kennedy-Johnson administration supported by moderate and liberal members of both parties. We admire the forthright position taken by Senator WAYNE MORSE on the Vietnam involvement. We are aware that irresponsible jibes and needling of the Goldwater team increase the pressures on the present administration to extend this shameful war. However, we urge you to use your influence to firmly support responsible statesmanship and to keep this from becoming a political issue.

Most sincerely yours,

HARVEY M. LANDIS.
LOIS L. LANDIS.

MEMO ON VIETNAM

(By David McReynolds and A. J. Muste)

The situation in the states that formerly composed French Indochina (Laos, Cambodia, North Vietnam, South Vietnam) would be confusing enough without the help of the U.S. Government in consistently misrepresenting the facts. The United States officially holds that it is in South Vietnam solely to protect the independence and freedom of that nation—one troubled by a Communist insurrection physically supplied by and politically directed from North Vietnam and, more basically, under the domination of the Chinese Communists. Regarding Laos, we take the position that all would be well if the Pathet Lao—the pro-Communist forces—did not continually violate the political agreements regarding the neutrality of Laos. Finally, we express pained surprise that Cambodia accuses not only South Vietnam but also the United States of aggressive acts.

THE BACKGROUND

These American-made pictures are seriously misleading. To understand the current situation one must go back to the U.S. theory of "containing" the Chinese revolution by building around it a ring of military bases and alliances. In part this had been achieved through treaties with Pakistan, the Philippines, South Korea, and Japan, and through support of Chiang on Taiwan and the retention of Okinawa as a U.S. military base. But India and Burma remained "weak spots" in this "chain of iron." It was for this reason that the India-China border dispute provoked the keen anticipation in some areas of American opinion that it would push India into open military alliance with the West. An attempt was made to "plug the Burmese gap" by maintaining for some time a band of Chinese Nationalist troops on Burmese soil along its Chinese border. (This was entirely a CIA operation of which most Americans are still not aware. After extremely sharp protests by the Burmese Government, the CIA finally abandoned the airlift of supplies to these troops who had, in any event, taken to growing opium for the narcotics trade and were embarrassing the CIA.)

In this context of "containing" China, the French withdrawal from Indochina in 1954, following defeat by the Communist-led Viet Minh under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh, meant that a huge "hole" had suddenly appeared through which Chinese influence might flow into southeast Asia. The United States became involved almost immediately. We had previously supplied some $3 billion of military aid to the French for their Indochina war, and Richard Nixon had urged direct U.S. involvement to prevent the triumph of the Viet Minh (an idea vetoed by Eisenhower). With the French out, Cardinal Spellman and others prevailed upon Ngo Dinh Diem, a devout Catholic living in the United States, to return to South Vietnam to head the Government. In October 1955, he took control from the discredited Bao Dai and the war ended with the signing of the Geneva accords. Under these there were to be internationally supervised free elections in both South and North Vietnam by July 1956, leading to a unified all-Vietnamese Government.

The United States did not sign the Geneva accords but had pledged not to violate them. Urged on by the United States, however, Diem flatly refused to arrange for the free elections: everyone close to Vietnamese affairs knew that Ho Chi Minh, a national hero, would easily win in both North and South Vietnam.

Initially Diem had some success in establishing control over South Vietnam. There were significant land reforms and he achieved at least some popular support. But increasing repression of the Buddhists, growing corruption in Government, refusal of Diem to conduct the free elections, all led to a resurgence of guerrilla war by what we know as the Vietcong. Like the Viet Minh before, it is not simply a Communist force, as Americans have been told, but the organizational focus for most of the resistance groups. The Communists are active within the Vietcong and give it its political direction, but they are a minority.

Against this armed rebellion, and in direct violation of the Geneva accords, the United States began a vigorous military support of the Diem regime. For a time the violation was thinly disguised by calling the troops advisers and claiming that the military supplies were merely permitted "replacements" for existing supplies. But the fiction has long since worn off. Despite the repeated American assertions that "masses" of war material are "pouring in" from North Vietman, the hard fact remains that the only power which has intervened in any significant way in South Vietnam is the United States. On March 6 of this year, Pulitzer Prize winning reporter, David Halberstam, of the New York Times reported, "The war is largely a conflict of southerners fought on southern land. No capture of North Vietnamese in the south has come to light and it is generally believed that most Vietcong weapons have been seized from the South Vietnamese forces." A later report in the Times by a member of the U.S. military force there indicated that 75 percent of all weapons seized are of American manufacture, and clearly had been captured earlier by the Vietcong from Government troops. The remaining 25 percent of captured weapons were largely homemade rifles. We are in the ironic situation where we both violate solemn international agreements by supplying weapons to the South Vietnamese Government, and are the major source of supply, albeit indirectly, to the Vietcong itself.

The Diem regime fell in 1963 and was replaced first by one military junta and then by another, the current one headed by General Khanh. There has never been a free election, nor is any planned: the present Government does not have the support of its people. Walter Lippmann wrote in the Washington Post on April 21, 1964: "The truth, which is being obscured for the American people, is that the Saigon government has the allegiance of probably no more than 30 percent of the people and controls (even in daylight) not much more than a quarter of the territory." Even the U.S. "military advisers" come very close to admitting this. The Observer, official U.S. Military Adviser Group newspaper in Saigon, reported on January 25 of this year that a ranking spokesman for the American mission "conceded that some 4 to 5 million people support the NLF (National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong) in varying degrees, though not necessarily through choice or sympathy, but rather by fear and coercion."

Thus, far from confronting a massive intervention of Communist troops and supplies from North Vietnam or China bent on overthrowing a popularly based democratic government in the south, the United States is engaged in a unilateral intervention on behalf of an undemocratic and unpopular government which cannot even attract support of its own people. An indication of this is that the Vietcong, with an army of only 25,000 regulars and 60,000 to 80,000 irregulars, has been able to take control of three-fourths of the territory of South Vietnam despite a government army of 500,000 men, backed by complete control of the air and equipped with the latest materials.

LAOS

All contending forces in Laos are discouraged by the unwillingness of the people to do any serious fighting despite all the equipment they have been given. Clearly, CIA and American policy have been as fully "aggressive" as the Pathet Lao. Over a year ago the CIA, unsatisfied with a neutral government, proceeded to overthrow it in an effort to set up a rightwing regime, but the Pathet Lao quickly won so many military victories that the United States retreated and managed to reestablish a neutral government. Within the past 3 months the rightwing generals, either instructed by the CIA or, at best, thinking they were doing something the Americans would approve of, again overthrew the Government, and again the Pathet Lao struck back and won much territory.

There should be some sense of realism about Laos. First, none of the native factions like fighting nor are they disposed toward brutal solutions of any kind. They are simply not properly "civilized." Laos is a mountainous area, with little economy of any kind, in which no one (except Americans, Chinese, and Russians) wants to fight. (One American economist returned from Laos to say, "It's fantastic, really quite impossible, but the Laotians simply don't have an economy. I've never seen anything like it.") Further, from a military standpoint it doesn't really matter who controls Laos. It is not geographically the military "key' to anything. No one is going to launch a major military action in any direction through Laos itself. With a situation where the people are gentle, the economy nonexistent, and the terrain impossible, and where all three Laotian factions would probably make peace among themselves very quickly if the Americans, Chinese, and Russians would simply get out, we ought to realize that in terms of a world power struggle Laos simply isn't a factor, no matter who "controls" it.

CAMBODIA

The Cambodian situation is more complex. Unlike Laos and North and South Vietnam, there has been no guerrilla movement in Cambodia. The Government is stable and popular with the people, and the leader, Norodom Sihanouk, seems from all accounts to govern wisely. Sensing that the United States is finished in South Vietnam, he has cut his ties to the United States and begun to orient his policy toward what he considers the new political reality in the area—China. He insists the United States is seeking his overthrow and, while the United States has elaborately denied this, one must conclude from a survey of the CIA record that very possibly secret agents are searching for (1) an assassin and (2) a replacement for Sihanouk. Whether or not this is the case, it it clear that South Vietnam has repeatedly violated Cambodian territory—one such incursion, with an American "adviser" present, bombing a village and killing a number of civilians. The United States and South Vietnam have both charged Vietcong use of Cambodia as a major supply base—in the face of Cambodian denials and the lack of evidence. But there is overwhelming evidence that South Vietnam has violated the borders of Cambodia. The tragedy is that, given a stable and popular government in

Cambodia, the United States continues to attempt to coerce it into an open or overt alliance with the West in violation of the Geneva accords, and at great peril to the stability of Cambodia itself. The goal of military containment of China blinds the United States despite experience in Laos and South Vietnam, to the enormous value from any standpoint of a stable neutralist government in Indochina.

THE NATURE OF THE WAR

Because this paper aims at political analysis as distinct from moral denunciation, we will avoid documenting at length the outrageous nature of the American war in Vietnam. But it is important for Americans not to lose sight of this aspect which is central to any discussion of Vietnam. The documentary evidence from non-Communist sources, including the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Post, etc., is overwhelmingly clear. We have either used or caused to be used torture on prisoners, both military and civilian; napalm bombing and machinegunning and artillery shelling of villages on the chance they might contain elements of the Vietcong; and mass detention of the peasantry in the "strategic hamlets" which amount to little more than concentration camps, complete with guards and barbed wire and even special moats. (Here, too, there is irony. In a number of instances the Vietcong had willingly sent women, children, and the elderly into the "strategic hamlets" where, despite the lack of freedom, they would at least be safe from Government napalm bombing and would have enough to eat. This has freed the men of the Vietcong for greater concentration on the war. As one U.S. military adviser bitterly commented after this tactic had become obvious, "all we are doing is babysitting for the Vietcong.")

The American Government had for long denied that it was engaged in napalm bombing and strafing of the villages. The degree of "governmental lying" on this and a host of other matters finally provoked so moderate a journalist as James Reston of the New York Times to complain that the Government, by its suppression of the facts and by its contradictory statements, was making it impossible for the American public to know what was going on. When the Pentagon finally admitted napalm bombing, Reston praised the disclosure, commenting that, after all, everyone knew such weapons were in use and previous denials only made the Government look silly. It is worth quoting from an editorial in the Saigon Post on January 10, 1964. This journal is not an organ of the "left" since no "left" is permitted to exist in South Vietnam, and all papers, in any event, are under tight Government censorship. With these two facts in mind, the following is even stronger than it appears to be: "In many instances peasant grievances are the result of tactical errors committed by well-meaning commanders. Cases have been reported of wanton bombing or shelling of entire villages where, it was later learned, only a handful of Vietcong had been detected. Sometimes these grievances are explained away as the consequences of war. The merciless destruction of unharvested ricefields under a column of armored personnel carriers, or the scorched earth of napalm bombing are examples of this type of grievance."

THE MIRAGE OF MILITARY VICTORY

We are trapped in a situation where no traditional military victory can be won in South Vietnam regardless of how many more troops and how much more equipment is poured in. The Vietcong have now begun to engage in open attacks along more normal lines of warfare instead of limiting themselves to hit-and-run tactics, indicating increased military power and organization. Americans should keep in mind that the French put 400,000 well-trained and determined men into French Indochina, that these men were backed by some $3 billion of U.S. aid, that French casualties finally reached the appalling figure of 172,000 (with at least one-quarter-million Vietminh casualties), and that at the end the French had to sue for peace. It is incredibly naive for Americans to think that with a force of 15,000 "advisers," plus money, plus a demoralized and disheartened government army, success can be achieved where the French had failed. After 10 years of the current war and the killing of countless rebels, the Saigon government has lost control of most of South Vietnam.

A look at Algeria will further indicate the hopelessness of the U.S. position. There the French had excellent supply lines, overwhelming military superiority, and a large and long established French population. They had an army of 760,000 in the field and these were backed with $12 billion during 8 years of war. The top strength of 60,000 FLN men was cut down to 7,000 by the time of ceasefire. The French even built a half-million-dollar electronic fence to keep FLN forces from crossing into Tunisia for sanctuary. Despite all this, the French were finally forced to withdraw.

In contrast, the United States must ship its men and supplies some 8,000 miles and fight in a jungle where the enemy can melt away even when completely surrounded. This is a war where vast seapower is meaningless, where total air superiority can be used only to bomb civilians because the Vietcong cannot be spotted. Any hope for a U.S. victory is the closest thing yet to a military impossibility.

EXPANSION OF THE WAR

The frustration of trying to win a war incapable of being won, the Government's distribution of deceitful information, and an adolescent faith in being able to "lick anybody" make it easy for the ignorant and irrational to talk of expanding the war to North Vietnam or even to China. We would, of course, oppose such extension on pacifist grounds. But from a military viewpoint such extension would make sense only if the Vietcong were indeed being trained and equipped by the North Vietnamese and the Chinese. Despite statements by Government officials to this effect, this is simply not the case. North Vietnam and China could be totally destroyed without any marked effect on the struggle in South Vietnam because a major source of Vietcong military supplies are captured from Government troops. In Korea there was a certain logic, in a military sense, in MacArthur's desire to bomb north of the Yalu River because of engagement with masses of Chinese troops and fighting aircraft from across the Yalu. But there is no fighting with Chinese or North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam, and enemy airpower does not exist. The strongest single area of Vietcong control is, in fact, in the southern tip of South Vietnam, in the Mekong Delta, where the Vietcong are completely cutoff, geographically, from any contact with Laos and North Vietnam. Under these circumstances, to call for extension of the war is to reveal the prompting of frantic desperation rather than the workings of a calm and objective mind.

In view of such talk it should be noted that, in fact, the war had been extended into the north some time ago. It made no headway. C. L. Sulzberger (who supports increased U.S. intervention) reported in the New York Times, June 27, of this year: "In 1961 a South Vietnam 'First Operation Group' was established under U.S. direction to fight secret operations in North Vietnam. Now, as we have shown in Laos, we contemplate backing this kind of action with air support. * * *" The problem is that the so-called counterinsurgency forces which penetrated North Vietnam were unable to establish any base. They had no support from the local population, were quickly reported to the military authorities, and were wiped out. (This should cast doubt on the relative conditions in North and South Vietnam as reported. We are told that North Vietnam is a terror-ridden Communist state, waiting for liberation, while South Vietnam is a popularly supported free state. Yet American forces find no welcome in the north, but are reported to the Government. In the south the Vietcong is given food and shelter by the native population.)

And yet there is talk of further expansion of the war. Premier Khanh has publicly stated on at least two recent occasions that he would move north to liberate all Vietnam as soon as the situation in the South was secure. To the best of our knowledge, Khanh's statements have not been repudiated by any U.S. spokesman. Is it possible that the United States, which knows it cannot win a free election in Vietnam, is now seeking to unify that area through direct military action?

HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL PERSPECTIVES

Southeast Asian history did not begin with the arrival of the first U.S. "military adviser" in Saigon, but goes back several thousand years. China has, on at least three occasions, ruled Indochina, one time for a thousand years. Chinese attempts to penetrate Indochina are thus a new expression of a 5,000-year-old dream of Chinese imperialism within Asia: evil, yes, but vastly different from that dire "World Communist Conspiracy" which Washington insists on seeing. It is the imperialism of Chiang Kai-shek as much as of Mao Tse-Tung. Years before his forced retreat to Taiwan, Chiang claimed that island as an intrinsic part of China (just as Mao does today) when, in fact, historically it is not. Chiang long meddled in the affairs of Tibet and insisted upon Chinese sovereignty over it. Had Chiang won the civil war there is every reason to assume he would now be engaged in border disputes with the Soviet Union and with India, and would be trying to extend his influence into Indochina. Everyone's imperialism, whether military or more subtle, is evil, but it is part of an old pattern and should not lead Americans into the sort of paranoid reactions we have been having, as if Chinese influence in Indochina today means the fall of Australia tomorrow.

The second point to be derived from this history is that the people of Indochina, while they have been repeatedly subjected to Chinese rule, are not Chinese and do not wish to become part of any new Chinese Empire. The feeling is strongly held by all factions in the Indochinese states, both Communists and anti-Communists. There is sharp awareness of the dangers of Chinese influence precisely because it has been threatening for so long. There has been, at least until recently, a strong pro-Moscow faction within the ruling party in North Vietnam.

Americans assume a Vietcong victory would mean not only communism but an immediate extension of Chinese Communist influence into southeast Asia. This would certainly be to China's liking, but more probably the regime of North and South Vietnam would take a cautious policy toward China. There is good reason to believe Vietnam could become the "Asian Yugoslavia." Every Communist state that has made its own revolution so far has pursued a distinctive nationalist line. This was first true with Russia which has always treated the world Communist movement as subsidiary to Russian needs and interests. It was true in Yugoslavia and again in China. It is proving true in Cuba which plays Russia against China in order to pursue an essentially Cuban course. Yugoslavia, China, and Cuba all won their revolutionary struggles with

little more than moral help from the Russians—which is about all the Chinese have given their Indo-Chinese partisans. But if the war continues, North Vietnam, historically dependent on southern rice, will have to get supplies from China. And increased U.S. military action in South Vietnam would mean the Vietcong would have to turn to North Vietnam for more than the present trickle of physical help. Chinese help would become essential and with her volunteers would come a dominating Chinese influence. The question—the only serious question—is what situation would exist following American withdrawal.

The likelihood is that the sooner peace comes to South Vietnam the sooner will she, in cooperation or direct union with North Vietnam, be able to follow an independent policy, thus acting as a check on Chinese penetration into southeast Asia. In Europe the defection of Yugoslavia from the Soviet bloc meant the immediate end of the civil war in Greece. Just as Yugoslavia, Albania, and now Rumania can now pursue fairly independent policies toward Russia (and nonaggressive policies toward their non-Communist neighbors), there is good reason to suppose the Indochinese states could do the same in regard to China. Chinese domination over Indochina is not inevitable, but it is made more certain by the intransigence of current American policy. China will accept neutral or independent Communist states to her south, but she will not tolerate an American base on her borders, as she demonstrated at great cost to everyone in Korea.

PRESENT ALTERNATIVES

American policy in South Vietnam is at a dead end. If war is continued on its present scale, the losses will continue and increase. If American forces are increased substantially, either North Vietnam and/or China will send volunteers and equipment to offset such increases. At this point the choice may well be between evacuation and open—ultimately nuclear—war against China. On the other hand, to withdraw now might well permit South Vietnam to follow a course relatively free from Chinese influence. But as such withdrawal is postponed, Chinese influence will become more pervasive.

It has been suggested that the United States seek a convening of the 14 nation conference which drew up the Geneva accords in order to achieve a guaranteed neutralization of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Others suggest that the entire problem be laid before the United Nations. We believe that the matter was most precisely stated by the Socialist Party in recently demanding "* * * that our Government should use every effort by negotiation to bring about neutralization of Vietnam and to maintain a genuine neutralization of Laos and Cambodia, but under no circumstances to continue its investment of men and money in war in southeast Asia."

This means that we must not fall into the trap of supporting the U.S. Government "pending" an agreement on neutralization, U.S. policy should be totally opposed as a bumbling fraud, and the withdrawal of U.S. troops and arms urged as a first step. This should be done at the same time that we support plans toward the neutralization and independence of the Indochinese states, ending all attempts to draw them into our pattern of military alliances.

Finally, no settlement of the problem of Indochina is possible as long as the United States refuses to face the reality of China. In long-range political terms, American power in Asia is extremely limited relative to the enormous Chinese power and therefore cannot hope to affect events except in the negative sense of destroying these areas through war. It is thus the height of political folly for the United States to continue denying the existence of the Chinese Government, let alone the refusal to enter into serious negotiations with that Government. But beyond diplomatic recognition and permitting entry of China into the United Nations, realism dictates realization that China has legitimate interests, particularly in the Far East. Such realization would make clear that negotiations cannot be conducted as long as the United States retains the island of Okinawa as a military base; subsidizes Chiang Kai-shek on Taiwan and even on the islands of Quemoy and Matsu (indisputably Chinese territory); permits Chiang to raid the mainland coast; and regularly sends spy planes over Chinese territory. All this is in addition to this Government's direct military intervention in the affairs of the Indochinese states in flagrant violation of international agreements.

We do not believe the public would approve the reasons for this war or the way in which it is being fought. We do not believe that most Americans want the war extended, and certainly not to the point of open conflict with China—one in which tens or hundreds of thousands of Americans as well as Chinese would have to die to cover up the blunders of the CIA and the general incompetence of the State Department. And certainly no one, except for the extreme right, really wants to risk a nuclear war on the issue of whether or not we shall continue to defend an oppressive and undemocratic minority government in South Vietnam.

The full story of the war in South Vietnam must be brought to the American public, particularly to those community leaders in the church, the trade unions, the schools and universities, who can help to effect a change of policy.

The issue of Vietnam must be brought into the coming political debate. BARRY GOLDWATER is entirely correct in saying that this is a campaign issue—but it must be made an issue quite different from the one he intends. Every congressional candidate must be confronted with it and support should be rallied behind those who, like Senator WAYNE MORSE, have spoken out uncompromisingly for an immediate end to U.S. intervention in South Vietnam.

The peace movement must show greater vigor on this issue than it has in the past. All peace and liberal organizations should be encouraged to speak out, now, for the immediate end of the war. In our approach to the public and to opinion leaders it is not enough to express our sense of moral outrage. We must also communicate the utter folly of U.S. policy in southeast Asia in political and military terms. If we fail to do so—vigorously, now, everywhere—then we shall continue to drift toward a general war in Asia.

PASSAIC, N.J.,
September 6, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Today I got final proof that the fourth estate is a party girl and should be running around a pool, instead of filling us with the quarter truths they do; as when they report what you say. I am sorry you won't be able to stack me up with your VIP mail because I am not a professor.

You were splendid on "Youth Wants To Know" and I got your message, as they did. You could see them percolating with the truth you speak and I think you should talk more to young people. The fact that I understood you so pellucidly means I must be in my second childhood. But I understood you when you were in Passaic almost 20 years ago, I guess, at a United Jewish Appeal dinner and I sent up a note asking would you please run for President and you said, Oh, no, not I. It's around here someplace but it would take all day to find it, as I put away the things I treasure very carefully.

It may have been at the time of pinhead's first run, that grinning vacuum who now makes HUMPHREY seem unconscionably wordy, for surely the general was the most inarticulate President we ever had.

I was right, though. You should have run for President and we would not have had Foster's brinkmanship and 8 long years of Eisenhower's golf and Mamie's trip to the beauty parlor. The world hates an I-told-you-soer, but I did tell you and I think I was pretty smart. But you would have none of it. What a campaigner you would have made. That year is gone and there is no use thinking on it. Take care of yourself, we need you; and don't let the reporters malign you with half quotes. Bye.

Yours,

CELIA SALKIN.

P.S.—I am not disagreeing with you but as a member of the youth panel did not bring it up, didn't the U.N. ask North Vietnam to discuss the mess there and didn't they agree, if they would be addressed as the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam? Didn't South Vietnam then want to be addressed as the Republic of South Vietnam or else neither would come to discuss Malaysia? This is Gilbert and Sullivan stuff to me and proves again that Peiping should be in the U.N., no matter what we think of the regime. How can you call anyone to book who isn't in the book?

I have written many times to the local paper (an offshoot of the Chicagon Sun, politically) and have been called a Communist because I thought Red China, not Chiang, should be in the U.N. Why is the U.N. so leaden in its worship of protocol and why does it walk as if only eggs are underfoot and none must be cracked? When Makarios, whose only claim to religion is the beard, asked Nasser for support and then Nasser announces that there should be no interference in the internal affairs of nation by nation, why didn't the U.N. blast him with a simple question like, What are you doing, then, in the Cyprus dispute? No striped pants, no rap of the gavel, no international channeling. Just the question. The U.N. is smothered in polite windbagging. U Thant seems all right, but there was only one Trygve Lie. There should be a U.N. spokesman who is empowered to speak up loudly, and fast, in certain situations.

That's a postscript. But I can't stand the sight of wasted paper. Do take care of yourself.

AUGUST 17, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I have a copy of your August 5 speech on the resolution with regard to military action in Vietnam. I thank you in advance.

Yours truly,

NATHAN NEWMAN.

JACKSON HEIGHTS, N.Y.

P.S. Take continued courage to speak the truth openly.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for sending your message last Thursday (Aug. 6), to those of us gathered in Washington Square to commemorate the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and to plea for an end to the war in Vietnam. It is good to know that there is at least one person in the Senate who feels as we do. I hope it is comforting for you in your lonely stand to know that there are those of us who support your stand.

If it would not be to presumptuous of me I would like to ask if you could send me a brief list of good material on Vietnam. I am afraid most of my knowledge on the subject comes from newspapers and liberal publication and I wholly trust the objectivity of

neither. I am interested in both the background and the present situation. Thank you for whatever you can do.

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY BARRON.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
August 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to express our deep appreciation for the courageous stand you took regarding the Vietnam crisis. We only wish that there were more responsible men like you in our Senate to represent us.

As long as we have a few men like you, who have the courage to speak the truth, we can still have hope for the future of our country.

We would appreciate it, if we could receive any newsletters which might be issued from your office.

With much admiration,

JOSEPH and MARY RUSSO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 12, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Please accept this letter as a vote of confidence in the brave stand which you have been taking against our policy in southeast Asia. In a time when the use of simple answers to complex international problems and in an era when the greatest country on earth feels compelled to resort to force and violence rather than reason and the following of international law to inflict its will upon the weak and undeveloped nations of the world, it is encouraging to see on the floor of the Senate a man strong enough to speak the truth no matter how unpopular the truth may be. And I am also extremely disappointed to learn that other men in Congress who surely are intelligent and informed enough to know better have, for the sake of political expedience, gone along with the resolution to support the President in his present agggressive and unlawful course of action in Vietnam.

Since a great deal of the factual material which you have presented in the Senate has not been reported in the press, I as well as, I believe, the great majority of the population have been remaining in ignorance of much vital information on our involvment in Vietnam. If you have on hand any such information I would appreciate receiving it.

Sincerely,

DONALD R. WASKEY.

RHINEBECK, N.Y.,
August 15, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Three cheers for your opposition to the rubberstamp resolution giving a blank check to the administration to do what it likes in southeast Asia. Any day now I expect to hear that an electronic device has been installed in Congress so that our elected representatives won't have to bother to appear in person meekly to vote "yea" on another involving a military action. Your opposition and that of Senator GRUENING to this whole insane Vietnamese muddle is one of the bright spots in the picture.

The news media, at least 99 percent devoted to brainwashing the public with whatever the official Government stand is on any issue, has, of course, not published your speech in opposition. In only one paper, the National Guardian, was I able to read much of what you said. That is a pity, for the excerpts given there should make even the most conformist American sheep sit up and think there is more than one viewpoint on this vital issue.

I was one of those persons participating in the silent vigil held in Times Square commemorating the bombing of Hiroshima and held a placard demanding peace in Vietnam. I also attended the rally following the end of the vigil, at which well-known members of various peace groups spoke, among them I. F. Stone, Norman Thomas, a Japanese survivor of the bombing, who had been a child at the time, and reported that people are still dying today as a result of that bomb which is as a ping pong ball compared in size to a basketball as to its destructiveness. The H-bombs which we have stockpiled today are enough to eliminate all life on earth many times over.

Bayard Rustin made what seemed to me the most effective point of the evening when he said that what we should do instead of sending our troops to Vietnam to establish democracy there was to pull them out and try establishing it in Mississippi. I heartily second the motion.

May I have, if possible, a copy of your speech to put in the Peace Center that Dutches County Women for Peace operate in the city of Poughkeepsie? On second thought, if you can spare them, I'd like to send five other copies to my relatives in Kansas and Texas. They need them.

Thank you for everything. I wish you were my Senator so I could vote for you. Keep up the good work.

With gratitude and best wishes,

MRS. HELEN ROHR.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 14, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to commend you for your courage in speaking out against the military actions of our Government in South Vietnam. Both of us have been active in COPE and are very interested in obtaining copies of your pertinent remarks on foreign policy, particularly those dealing with the situation in Vietnam and on foreign aid.

Since the press coverage of your remarks has been scanty, would you be so kind as to send us this material at your earliest convenience.

Thank you.

Yours very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. ELMER JOHNSON.

LOS ALTOS, CALIF.,
August 11, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am unaccustomed to letter writing. but the nature of the times and your superb performance in the Senate recently in regard to our foreign policy in general and our unjustified, illegal position in South Vietnam in particular, have moved me into action. I wholeheartedly support the courageous stand you have taken to use the Senate as a sounding board to alert the people to the fact that there is another side to the Vietnam story which is not being presented to us in the mass news media. I hope that your pleas for logic and reasoning in this situation do not fall on deaf ears. This country's future as the land of the free may well depend on a few voices such as yours which can alert the press to its responsibility to get all the viewpoints presented to the people, whether these viewpoints are to our liking or not. If there is no public response to your efforts then these are indeed foreboding times.

Your position regarding our foreign aid commitments is also commendable. Foreign aid to the needy and specific projects benefiting the common people of a country is one thing and should be continued, but foreign aid to support corruption, dictatorship, and enslavement is quite another and needs to be stopped.

If copies of your recent speeches on these subjects are available, I would like to get them.

Your truly,

EARL C. WATSON.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
August 12, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: This is to express admiration for your stand on Vietnam, as glimpsed briefly on CBS television. We would greatly appreciate copies of your Senate speeches on the matter.

Yours respectfully,

ESTELLE BAER.
R. M. BAER.

STEWARTVILLE, MINN.,
August 13, 1964.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: We noticed you were cutoff of "N.B.C. News" during the giving of your statement to reporters on the affairs in the Gulf of Tonkin.

Would you send us a copy of that statement in full? We would like to have it for a Farmers Union meeting August 20. We are not at all satisfied with the news as given out on this matter. There seems to be something that is not being told, perhaps you can tell us what it is.

Perhaps history will record that this Congress had two statesmen and a few hundred that were something else. Your courage was noble.

Yours sincerely,

STUART AYSHFORD.

JUNE 16, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would very much like to receive a copy of your speech on Vietnam.

Also, if you still have any copies of your speeches on "Communication Satellite" episode—I will appreciate that.

Sincerely,

Mrs. PEGGY KAZARIAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
August 14, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I read your wonderful speech delivered to the Senate in opposition to the resolution which, in your words, is a predated declaration of war. In its complete honesty and concern for the fate of this world, it is a most moving and valuable document. It was not published in its entirety, and I should very much appreciate receiving a copy of it. I wish to circulate it among my friends.

What a tragedy for our country and for the world that only two voices were raised in behalf of sanity. The remaining Members of Congress either could not or would not recognize the danger that confronts us.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. IDA G. KLINGSBERG.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 7, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I do not support our aggressive policy in Vietnam. Rather, I support Senator WAYNE MORSE who so eloquently and courageously stated that he would not support our predated declaration of war in southeast Asia.

As Senator MORSE has indicated, the United States has been making covert war in southeast Asia for some time now. He is correct when he states that the recent events in Vietnam are as much the doing of the United States as the doing of North Vietnam.

The primary issue in southeast Asia, that of peace, will not be solved by the type of aggression in which we are now engaged. Rather, peace will only be brought about by taking the issues to the United Nations.

I wholeheartedly support Senator MORSE in his brave, fearless, and forthright decision. It is a pity that our Nation does not have more statesmen of his integrity and foresight, for it is the lack of such qualities which will lead us to war.

I hope that you will exhibit these qualities in your choice of alternative solutions to that which can only lead to destruction. The decision, and the qualities which it takes to make it, will come from you.

Therefore, we look forward to a decision which is consistent with the realities Senator MORSE has presented.

Very sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS E. FERGUSON.

AUGUST 8, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations for your forthright and courageous stand on the Vietnam war.

I would be grateful if you could send a full copy of your speech, because, as you must know, the newspapers are giving your stand very little coverage. I am sure you also realize that there are many people who are heartened by your stand but who find no way of expressing their feelings, and I hope you will be able to continue to speak out on this issue, and to find additional support among your congressional colleagues.

Sincerely yours,

CARL MOOS.

P.S.—We've wired KEATING and JAVITS, and urged others to do likewise, but I doubt if there is much hope of support for you from that quarter.

NEWARK, N.J.,
August 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for the courageous speech that you delivered in the Senate recently against the ridiculous attitude of our American Government in continuing hostilities in South Vietnam.

Good health and continued strength to you in your lonely position in the U.S. Senate. We would hope that in time you will be joined by others who will recognize the decency in our avoiding such unnecessary expenditure of money and life.

Very truly yours,

SEYMOUR CHARLES, M.D.

SAN BERNARDINO CITY SCHOOLS,
San Bernardino, Calif., August 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: May a teacher in a faraway town express personal appreciation for your stand in trying to reduce the method of war in resolving problems. Your wonderful, yet unpopular, insight on our problems in Vietnam place you way above political advantages.

I worry often why we are so eager to use the same methods to achieve our goals which we have so vehemently condemned when they are used by our adversaries.

I believe you might agree with Thomas Paine when he wrote, "That there are men in all countries who get their living by war, and by keeping up the quarrels of nations, is as shocking as it is true; but when those who are concerned in the government of a country make it their study to sow discord, and cultivate prejudices between nations, it becomes the more unpardonable."

The best of luck to you and your views. My choice for President—Senator WAYNE MORSE.

Respectfully,

JOHN RAGSDALE.

DUBLIN, CALIF.,
August 12, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I heard from a radio newscast last week that you accused the United States of being the provacateurs of the North Vietnam gunboat attack. Also the newscast stated that you said that we the United States have been breaking the U.N. charter in respect to the Vietnam crisis. Due to the fact that our local newspaper (San Francisco Chronicle) failed to mention your above statements, will you please elaborate further?

Yours truly,

LOREN D. WARD.

AUGUST 14, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I should greatly appreciate having copies of your remarks of August 5 regarding the situation, and our involvements, in Vietnam, of which I have seen brief excerpts.

My wife and I agree with you that our present course enhances the danger of nuclear war, and that the resolution of the military part of the conflict, at least, must be accomplished through the United Nations.

With sincerest best wishes.

Very truly yours,

SAM ZASLAVSKY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

AUGUST 13, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our Chicago South Side Branch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, wishes to commend you for your courageous stand and vote against the resolution empowering President Johnson to take any military action he deems advisable in southeast Asia.

We would appreciate receiving a copy of your remarks in the debate on this question.

Enclosed is a copy of a recently passed resolution of our branch, for your information.

Sincerely yours,

LOIS ROMERO.

CHICAGO, ILL.

PASADENA, CALIF.,
August 11, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is a great satisfaction to me that you are a Member of the Senate with courage to speak out against the war in South Vietnam and to voice opposition to whatever you feel isn't right.

I'm sure you are not against all foreign aid, but only against its wrong place or use.

I have written the President and our Senators from California to have a negotiated settlement of the war in South Vietnam, and to the Pasadena newspaper (Independent-Star-News) which printed it in "The Forum."

I wish I could vote for you.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs. J. F.) MARGARET C. JOYCE.

AUGUST 20, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to congratulate you and Senator GRUENING for your most courageous criticism of the U.S. bombing of the North Vietnamese bases, and I agree with you completely.

Sincerely,

Mrs. FREDA PRIWER.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I give my full support on your views on the southeast Asian crisis. Also I hope that in the long run your views will prove to be predominant.

Sincerely,

SUSAN ALPERT.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like you to know that I am in support of your views regarding the southeast Asian crisis.

Yours truly,

RONALD J. PUTIRKA.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am glad to hear you are one of the few not in favor of the President's aggressive action in Vietnam. Also that you feel that a more peaceful way can be found to settle differences.

Sincerely,

JOYCE ZACK.

EL PASO, TEX.,
August 9, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would appreciate a copy of your recent comments regarding Vietnam.

Yours truly,

(Miss) NATHALIE GROSS.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
August 8, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It has been unbelievable that such venomous criticism should be thrown your way because you had the courage to vote against giving the President full war power to carry out our "advisory" capacity in the Vietnam affair. The attached clip is all that was reported on your stand—I am hoping your speech has been reprinted so that I may receive a copy to read in its entirety. Believe me, as a complete nonconforming independent, I have not agreed with you often, but in this count me on your side.

We have paid a disproportionate share in keeping the U.N. alive—but we are afraid to use it, and with good cause. But in this instance, when we carry a chip on our shoulder 10,000 miles from our shores, and start bellicose noises when confronted by someone willing to try to knock it off—it is time we sat back and took a long serious look at our stance. For once let the U.N. make a decision—and let us get out of where we are not getting results. We cannot afford the loss of face again we got in Korea. The U.N. would let us withdraw without losing the little prestige we have left in Asia. Does Johnson really believe we can take on all of Asia? Who over there would stand with us?

I agree with GOLDWATER in being firm—when the integrity of the country is involved; but this is simply "involvement" with neither victory nor peace to be hoped for.

Sincerely,

HERSLEA C. CONWAY.

FORT BRAGG, N.C.,
August 7, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator of the United States,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was very interested in the Greensboro Record's report of August 6 on your remarks regarding the joint, bipartisan resolution supporting President Johnson's retaliatory attack on North Vietnam. According to the article, you felt you could not support the resolution as a "predated declaration of war" and also stated that the U.S. Navy had escorted South Vietnamese naval attacks on North Vietnam, at a date prior to the incidents this week.

Although I am not one of your constituents, I would greatly appreciate it if you could send me a full text of your comments on the above matter, and any other comments that you have made on recent foreign policy, both in Vietnam and elsewhere.

After careful reflection, I cannot help but feel that there is a slight odor emanating from the administration's handling of the naval incidents of this week.

Yours truly,

MELVIN ROSENBERG.

P.S.—I am a registered Democrat.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
August 21, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to to commend you again for your positive position on South Vietnam and on U.S. foreign policy in general, as expressed in your statements supporting your recommendations to cut U.S. foreign aid programs. It is our opinion that your voice is one of the all to few sane, progressive, and independent ones in our National Government today. It is also our opinion that our domestic policy is tied inseparably to our foreign policy. The present course of these foreign policies cannot help but lead to internal repression under the guise of the need for national unity in support of a bellicose foreign policy.

It is clear that today "national unity" is the objective of both national parties since there is not the slightest difference in their foreign policies: witness President Johnson's attack on South Vietnam a la Senator GOLDWATER. We believe that this "national unity" is most dramatically expressed internally by the agreement of the candidates not to discuss civil rights as a campaign issue. This agreement is essentially repressive.

In short, we feel that the American people are not being offered a significant choice in the forthcoming election. It is in this connection that we are writing to you. We want to suggest that you become a write-in candidate for the office of President of the United States.

It may be presumptuous on our part to suggest that you become a candidate for the Presidency; but this is a critical time in the history of our country, and indeed, in the history of the world. We sincerely believe that on the American scene today you are the most capable leader, the one most able to rally our people around a courageously peaceful foreign policy, and progressive domestic policies worthy of an open and free society.

We recognize that it would be the height of political naivete to expect that under the present circumstances and at this late date such a campaign as herein suggested could result in your victory for the Presidency. But we do know that your candidacy would give the people of our country a positive choice: a choice which tens of thousands would make, and a choice the importance of which could not be ignored by whomever attains the Presidency in 1964.

With some realization of the personal and political perils which you would face, but with a knowledge of our Nation's perils, we urge that you become a write-in candidate for the President of the United States.

We do not have the political power or knowledge to put such a program into effect. But we are confident that if you choose to become a candidate the means are available to you, that you have the knowledge, and that you will be able to secure thousands of willing and able workers.

With sincerest best wishes we are

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS JACOBS.
DEBBY JACOBS.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
August 15, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On behalf of the board of directors of the San Diego Peace Information Center may I congratulate you on your critical statements of our Government's policies in Vietnam? Yours is truly a "voice in the wilderness" that we hope can be echoed and reechoed throughout our country in order that our lives and liberty may prevail.

San Diego, with its single, very conservative newspaper and pitiably naive citizenry, is especially in need of having the facts brought squarely before it. We in the peace center have tried to urge San Diegans to call for an end to the unilateral action our Government has been taking in Vietnam. Our success has, of course, been more than extremely limited because of our very small resources. For this reason it has occurred to us that we might write you on the sheer chance that you might consider coming to San Diego to give San Diegans the benefit of your own great personal conviction in this very serious time. Naturally, because our own resources are so limited, we would have to call on others in the community to share the responsibility of your coming. Before doing so, however, we need to know if it would actually be possible for you to come here and how much money you would expect to receive for your visit.

If such a visit is not possible at this time, you may be assured that we will continue to do whatever we can to urge San Diegans to heed your words and follow through by communicating with President Johnson and Members of Congress. Perhaps our small effort will help insure that sanity will prevail before it is too late.

In closing may I say, for myself and my friends in the peace center, thank you, sir, for speaking out as few American statesmen have, but as every American should.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. JEAN SWERDLOW.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,
August 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: You made some statements before the Senate about the U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Also you voted against the resolution backing the raid of U.S. planes on Communist PT boats.

The paper quoted you as saying that you advised some time ago that our policy in Vietnam could only lead to a shooting war.

What is so outstanding about the news of what's going on in Asia is the "lack of news as to what is going on there" as presented to the American public.

Would you please elaborate for me on what's wrong with our Far Eastern policy and what should our policy be. I would consider any information on the subject a great favor. Since I could better fulfill my duties as a civic-minded citizen in helping to keep others informed so that they too can more intelligently perform their duties as American citizens.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN WINGATE.

AUGUST 13, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Few newspapers in the country mentioned your vote against Johnson's Vietnam resolution, or that of Senator GRUENING, fewer printed even a line or so of your honest and brave speech. Once again, a press biased and manipulated has seen fit—and effectively—to censor the dissenting view. I offer you my sincere congratulations.

Is there any difference between Johnson and GOLDWATER now?

Would you be so kind as to send me a complete copy of your speech?

Thank you.

Sincerely,

MIKE DISEND.

NEWARK, N.J.

AUGUST 13, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have recently been told that you have made a series of excellent speeches in the Senate on the subject of Vietnam in its relationship to U.S. foreign policy.

If it is possible, I would greatly appreciate receiving copies of these speeches. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. DONALD E. OMAN.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF.

PAWTUCKET, R.I.,
August 12, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was much interested in reading your speech to the Senate last Friday on the South Vietnam situation, but have been unable to find a transcript or even a summary in the Providence or New York papers. If it is convenient, could you arrange, please, to send me one or two copies of your remarks.

I am anxious to read what I know will be your own independent opinion on this involved situation.

Not all the press are uncritical. Here are two current editorials from the Providence Journal on the recent Tonkin incidents.

Although the only time I have had the privilege of meeting you personally was at a meeting some years ago in the Narragansett Hotel, Providence, sponsored by the Rhode Island, AFL–CIO, I have tried to follow your important statements closely.

My best wishes for your good health and continued independence of spirit and expression.

Sincerely,

IRVING JAY FAIN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 12, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have heard of the speech you delivered recently in the Senate regarding our position in Vietnam and southeast Asia in general, and I would very much appreciate obtaining a complete text of it.

In the past, I have requested information on southeast Asia from Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, the Senator of my State. Allow me to say that I have the greatest respect and admiration for Senator KUCHEL and do not intend this as a criticism in any way. But, the information I received was official releases from "the Foreign Policy Department," "the Department of Defense," etc. Needless to say, these official releases were not overly informative, and do not support the general position of your speech, as I understand it. If there is another or additional material available, I have not the words to express how very much I would appreciate receiving it. Could you tell me upon what information you have drawn your conclusions?

What I have heard of your opinions regarding foreign aid, I most heartily endorse. Again, I would appreciate any information in this area as well.

Thank you very much for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

RUTH HEFNER.

P.S.—What happens to obsolete atom bombs?

AUGUST 31, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are fortunate to have a man like you in the Senate, who understands what our Government is doing in Vietnam and has the moral courage to stand up and let the world know how you feel about it and what it may lead to.

I feel like you do, that we have no business there, and that we should get out. I am including a letter I wrote to the Chicago papers a few days ago. I would like to get a copy of your Senate speech of August 5, 1964. Would you please send me a copy.

Thank you.

EDWIN JOHNSON.

WABAN, MASS.,
August 6, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I appreciate your calling to the attention of the people of the United States the dangerous nature of the recent action of the United States in North Vietnam. I support you in your stand as reported in the Daily Press. More power to you for your courage and sobriety.

I would appreciate receiving a copy of the speech which you delivered before the Senate on August 5.

Very truly yours,

JEROME GROSSMAN.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.,
August 7, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your position on U.S. policy in Vietnam and particularly on your outspoken opposition to the congressional resolution backing and encouraging the White House in its latest military adventure there.

I would be grateful if you would provide me with copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which include your statements this week on the new Vietnam crisis.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. SOLLEN.

BINGHAMTON, N.Y.,
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
State of Oregon,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to thank you for your vote in the Senate yesterday. I have watched with great admiration your fight to expose the truth about the United States and its relations with South Vietnam. The press bombards us with statements about "all America uniting behind our policy in southeast Asia" constantly. Yours is one of the few sane voices in the Government today.

I would appreciate it if you would send me your more recent speeches on this issue.

Sincerely,

DAVID J. MARTIN.

AUGUST 9, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I read small excerpts from your address to the Senate regarding the U.S. position in Vietnam. I am greatly interested to learn more about the reasoning of those who oppose our continued intervention in Vietnam.

It seems to me shameful that the press did not give your speech adequate coverage: right or wrong, your views are deserving of consideration by the people through newspaper coverage.

I would be most grateful if you would send me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprint of your address on our position in Vietnam, and any further information you may have available that would elaborate on your stand on this matter.

Very respectfully,

EMANUEL H. ROSEN.

SILVER SPRING, MD.,
August 7, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I think your vote today on the Vietnam resolution was legally and morally correct. I am very discouraged at the way things are going in southeast Asia, but at least it is good that you and Senator GRUENING see the issue clearly and are pointing out the course that we should follow. Congratulations. I would appreciate it very much if you would send me a copy of your speech in the Senate today.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. INGLIS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 7, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is written in support of your position concerning U.S. involvement in Vietnam. I want to extend to you my respect and admiration for your extraordinarily forthright and courageous statements on our position in this southeast Asian crisis.

I definitely agree with you that the recent incidents are as much the doing of the United States as the doing of North Vietnam. Indeed, as you point out, the United States has been making covert war in southeast Asia for some time now. I wholeheartedly support you in your brave and fearless decision not to support our predated declaration of war in that part of the world. It is truly a pity that our Nation does not have more statesmen of your integrity.

The primary issue in southeast Asia, that of peace, will not be solved by acts of aggression. Rather, peace will only be brought about, as you have said, by taking the issues involved in the present crisis to the United Nations or some other international body.

I would appreciate copies of your statements made in the Senate on the recent troubles in Vietnam. And, again, my support and respect are extended to you.

Very sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS E. FERGUSON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 7, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was favorably impressed with the remarks you made on the Senate floor on Wednesday, August 6. I have heard similar statements made concerning our involvement in the Vietnam war but I do not fully understand the allegation in regard to our violation of the Geneva agreements of 1954.

Because of my interest in this situation and what I feel to be the need for reflection and hard thinking, I request some further information in amplification of your reported remarks. I am especially interested in the alleged violations by the United States of the Geneva agreements and also in the apparent fabrication by the Departments of Defense and State of the facts surrounding the encounter with North Vietnam forces.

I'd like to close by stating my admiration for your willingness to dissent in a time when little such thinking is going on and the "unity" theme seems to be covering up any dialogue on this topic.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH S. AUGUST.

PENFIELD, N.Y.,
August 6, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to have all reprints of speeches you may have regarding your current views on the Vietnam situation.

On request I received a copy of the May 27, 1964, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing one of your speeches with the script of your "Meet the Press" interview in the Appendix.

Please send any more similar material you have. I am much in support of your views.

Sincerely yours,

W. EUGENE NOTZ, M.D.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
August 17, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: This is merely a note to let you know I support you completely in your stand in the Far East. Your position is exactly correct in our stand that this is properly a United Nations problem first and a SEATO action second. We act as if we must rush in as a nation.

In my estimation you have a lot of silent support among parents of our young people.

You may be assured of my continued support. I had another meeting which I could not evade the night you talked in Corvallis, so had to miss saying, "Hello."

Sincerely,

MAURICE L. BULLARD,
Director of Guidance.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
August 6, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I have followed with interest your dissent to U.S. policy in southeast Asia, or rather as much of it as has been available in the press. I would appreciate receiving a fuller account of your views, as well as some of the factual material on which you base them.

Thank you,

Sincerely yours,

DAVID ZIEGLER,
Teaching Fellow in Government,
Harvard University.

DEAR SENATOR: I am very confused as to the facts about our role in southeast Asia. Can we win in Vietnam and should we try? Are we really blameless and innocent of all charges of aggression? Do we have any control over the Government of South Vietnam? Do all our advisers simply advise? We support the U.N. but have only gone to that body in the present crisis, I believe. Why?

Would you please write and tell me of your beliefs concerning my questions and tell me what you believe should be done. Could you please also explain your views as expressed in the enclosed clipping.

I admire the intelligence of your argument. I also deeply admire your courage in

dissenting. Please continue your fight for what you believe in. Thank you.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM DEAN, Jr.

"MORSE immediately launched into his criticism in which he said the incident that inspired the resolution was 'as much the doing of the United States as it is the doing of North Vietnam.' Among other things, he charged that a forerunner to the attacks was a bombardment by South Vietnamese naval vessels of 'two North Vietnamese islands within 3 to 5 or 6 miles of the main coast of North Vietnam.' He said the implications were that the U.S. Navy stood guard during this attack."

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 8, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I have always considered you one of the great recondite Members of the Senate. Your able opposition to the Johnson resolution is noteworthy for an impartial study of the Vietnam crisis.

In order that I may be fully informed, kindly mail to me copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD wherein your speeches are contained; and detailed information of your opposition for historical material.

Thank you kindly for your information.

Very truly yours,

CLIFFORD MORGAN.

PITTSFIELD, MASS.,
August 8, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: It is extremely heartening to read of your efforts in the Senate to present a rational point of view in the present crisis. May I also endorse your action in voting against the recent bipartisan resolution concerning southeast Asia.

Information seems to be one of the major problems in evaluating the present situation. If there are any printed copies available of speeches that you have given in the Senate on the subject of Vietnam, I should like to get them.

Respectfully,

ALBERT ROWE.

AUGUST 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are to be commended for your courageous opposition to the Vietnam resolution and expressing the truth.

More power to you.

SCHRIVER.

P.S.—Please send me copies (10, if possible) of your magnificent Senate speech against the resolution for distribution to friends.

Thank you.

AUGUST 19, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I have read your complete statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that followed the joint resolution to give the President power in the Vietnam war. I am shocked that only you, apparently, stood against this resolution. I agree in particular with you on the following: we have no business upholding General Khanh; the struggle cannot be settled by war; we should turn to the United Nations; and we should begin immediately to live up to our obligations as a member of the United Nations.

It is a tragic mistake that much information contained in your speech never reaches the daily paper. Although I would prefer President Johnson over the present Republican nominee for President, I cannot understand the President's actions nor his words. When he speaks of going to war to preserve the peace, I shudder. But I shudder more when I hear Mr. GOLDWATER wanting to atom-bomb the "trees" in North Vietnam.

A little over 100 years ago, Mr. Lincoln stood almost alone in the House to challenge the President to prove Mexico provoked the war between the United States and Mexico, and to call on Congress to reassert their prerogative to declare war that had been usurped by the President. We have changed but little, have we not? I sincerely hope that you are successful in shocking some of your colleagues into using their good senses, and that the President of the United States is influenced by your very excellent advice.

Sincerely,

E. L. ARMSTRONG.

AUGUST 6, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to express our gratitude for your courageous stand these last few months on the war in Vietnam and particularly your statement in the Senate yesterday. The bland assumption of "responsibility" by our Government, together with such reckless acts, much indeed be opposed and we applaud you and support you for doing so.

Would you be good enough to send us the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing the full text of your remarks?

Sincerely yours,

Dr. and Mrs. A. FREEDMAN.

AUGUST 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Your stand on the Vietnam issue interests me as a high school teacher of American history. Would you please send me some of the facts upon which you based your position? I have long been an admirer of your liberal, independent positions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. BOCCHINO.

YONKERS, N.Y.

JAMAICA, N.Y.,
August 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: For quite some time I have supported your actions, with regard to U.S. foreign policy in South Vietnam. It is unfortunate that there are only a few people like you who show such a keen understanding of the situation there. I hope that you will continue your opposition to the present disastrous American policy. I beg you to continue your, almost single handed, fight for a realistic foreign policy. I beg you to continue your voice of sanity amidst a chaotic opposition. Your voice must be heard, for you are perhaps the best hope for a realistic American foreign policy.

I would now ask of you a favor. Could I please, if it is not too much trouble, have some copies of the statements you have made on our policy in southeast Asia? I would deeply appreciate this. Thank you very much, and may God bless you.

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN VERTER.

HAP MUSIC, INC.,
New York, N.Y., August 27, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I express to you and Senator GRUENING my profound appreciation for your courageous stand against escalation (for political purposes preponderantly) in Vietnam and the rest of that area.

Also the thanks of many of us in the front line of our protest August 25 in front of the Convention Hall at Atlantic City. The fact that you veered left and walked past us, then veered right to enter the hall, was a silent gesture of support which enabled us to smile inwardly at the usual flurry of name calling that came our way. And it meant that you appreciate the basic issues involved in this flagrant policy supporting a series of dictators. Only this morning South Vietnam police "carbined" the protesting youth of Vietnam killing two.

A group of us would appreciate having, if possible, three copies of your analyses of the South Vietnam policy, and also Senator GRUENING'S. It is truly frightening that the press has suppressed almost fully the reality and your comments.

I hope and pray that your antiwar stand and solid logic will find new impetus with Senator HUMPHREY'S nomination and election. If not, hell in that area—and maybe the whole world—is sure to break loose.

Most sincerely yours,

HOWARD PLUMMER.

AUGUST 8, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My morning newspaper, the San Francisco Chronicle, informs me today that you spoke for an hour and 40 minutes against the congressional joint resolution granting President Lyndon B. Johnson sweeping powers to conduct military operations in the southeast Asia theater, then favors me with but a single sentence which it seems to think gives an adequate summary of your views.

I suspect that you had more to say than the Chronicle reports, or else would have taken less time to say it. If your speech is issued as a reprint, or if not, when it is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, would you be so good as to send me a copy of it?

And if it is available, I should also like to receive the pamphlet of your statement on H.R. 11380, the Foreign Assistance Act, mentioned in the Nation of August 10, which I also happened to have read today.

I am one of many Americans who have grave doubts and concern about our Government's foreign policy, and I am deeply grateful that there is at least one person like yourself who dares to question and challenge what seems to be a return to the perilous policies of "brinkmanship."

Yours sincerely,

HAROLD ROSSMAN.

FAIRFAX, CALIF.

RALPH J. APPLETON PIANO SERVICE,
August 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: If there is going to be a transcript of your speech in the Senate on the Vietnam resolution I would like a copy plus other of your comments on the subject.

Oblige.

R. APPLETON.

SAN ANSELMO, CALIF.,
August 10, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: I should greatly appreciate receiving a copy of your address of last week in the Senate concerning the Vietnam crisis.

In my opinion, often stated, we should never have intruded ourselves into this matter, and the sooner we wash our hands of it the better. I agree with you that our country has made a great mistake in becoming involved in a matter of this nature.

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT C. MCKEAGE.

NEW YORK,
August 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A portion of your recent speech to Congress was shown on television. However, I note no paper in the New York area had any excerpt or the printing of your entire speech, and this includes the New York Times.

Would it be possible to send me a copy of the two speeches you made to Congress, the first following the President's order of retaliation, and the second before the Congress when it approved or empowered freedom of action to the President?

Very sincerely,

JOSEPH STRUM.

LAUSANNE, *August 21, 1964.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It was with great pleasure to see the Zurcher Woche give prominently your views on Vietnam (clipping enclosed) which should be heard widely. Elsewhere in the newspaper is a story in which it says that China is not anxious to take steps at this time because any American action, including with atom weapons, will turn all of Asia against the United States. I studied also German newspapers and found that there is little belief in the U.S. version of the *Maddox* affair. The *Maddox* was obviously looking for trouble. Also, that little North Vietnam could scare big Uncle Sam doesn't look creditable to Germans. People feel that Khrushchev has been put on the spot. He doesn't want to spoil Johnson's chances for election, yet had promised solidarity in case North Vietnam would be attacked by the United States. Germans are self-conscious when it comes to the discussion of U.S. policies. First they got beaten, then they wanted to build up without becoming involved in militarism, and finally they have to push NATO and join militaristic policies which help the revenge mongers (a very vocal bunch). Mostly, people are afraid that the United States with all its international power politics will involve Europe into a war which will destroy what is left of Germany. Although people are little interested in political communism, despise Ulbricht, and oppose Russia's methods, there is no fear of Russia as there is of U.S. brinkmanship. Khrushchev's desire for peace is considered genuine, and it is often believed that China would like to pursue friendlier tones if it could feel more secure and find better recognition. In any event, there is little understanding why the United States should feel in a defensive position while she is able to build a superior arsenal, send troops and weapons everywhere, bomb other countries, and scare the wits out of any opponent. Your criticism of not using the U.N. to settle conflicts is well taken because it helps to show people of the world that we do have leaders who believe in democratic principles and procedures on an international plane.

We've had a most rewarding trip through parts of Europe thus far and are looking forward to still another 2 weeks in Switzerland, Italy, and Greece before arriving in Israel for the working session. We just saw the spectacular Swiss Exposition in Lausanne at Lake Geneva. Except for a bad mishap in Munich where we suffered losses from a break into our rented car, parked at the U.S. Consulate, we had a good time and saw a lot. German cities were altogether new to us except for some old street names with little to be nostalgic about. There is some good new architecture, and I was glad to see that some of the architectural pioneer work of the twenties and early thirties is still there. We saw also our former house in East Berlin which was my first executed independent design. My reception by the architects of East Berlin was extraordinary and most friendly. There is a great hunger for exchange of news and ideas.

Enclosed is a copy of my interview with a spokesman of West Berlin's Information Center which may interest you. Although there is an intense effort made to stabilize West Berlin's position and nurse hopes for better relations with the East in the future, some of thinking is muddled and some of the conditions seem untenable. Some compromises will have to be found, and every compromise rests on give as well as take. The rigidity may not work to our advantage.

With kind regards, also to Mrs. Morse, from Mrs. W., and

Yours sincerely,

A. A. WAESTETER.

POMONA, CALIF.,
August 18, 1964.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senator from California,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: In all the discouraging news and commentary I have heard in the past few weeks concerning the situation in South Vietnam, the words of one individual alone have struck a note of reason and of possible solution.

Those are the words of Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, whose stand that the present position of the United States in South Vietnam is untenable and indefensible seems, to me, to most accurately express my own point of view.

I write to request that you support Senator MORSE's stand to the greatest extent possible.

Respectfully yours,

Miss LAURA O. DUCLOS.

NORTH NEWTON, KANS.,
August 22, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing you this rather informal note from a vacation cabin in Colorado to thank you for your recent courageous votes and statements on our policy in Vietnam and southeast Asia. Bipartisanship is no guarantee in itself that a policy is feasible or consistent with best long-run interests of the country, let alone morally defensible. I hope that you can continue to furnish us with analyses such as your recent statement in the August 1964 Progressive magazine.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

J. LLOYD SPAULDING.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 6, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept the thanks of at least one citizen for your speech on the floor of the Senate yesterday and your dissenting vote today in committee on the proposed resolution, which expresses support for even more ridiculous actions in southeast Asia on the part of the United States.

As a reporter, I have had occasion to follow with some care the reports of the New York Times and those coming over the Associated Press wire on the situation in southeast Asia. With minor exceptions, I find myself in agreement with the views which you have expressed in your speeches on the floor of the Senate during the last 6 months. I cannot but deplore the scanty attention which those speeches have received in the press, but this coverage has unfortunately been quite consistent with the general press coverage of the southeast Asian situation. You may be interested to know that KPFA in Berkeley, Calif., with which I am connected, has broadcast significant portions of your speeches on this subject. If there are any reprints of those speeches available, I would appreciate receiving copies at the address below.

It is not necessary to be naive concerning the actions of the Communists in southeast Asia to realize that our own actions have contributed as much to the deterioration of the situation there as those of the Communists have. Even from the point of view of Realpolitik, our southeast Asian policy has been dangerously foolish and shortsighted. I hope that you will continue to support a modicum of sanity in that policy.

Yours truly,

RAYMOND BRIDGE.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Bless your heart.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN AND ESTHER JOHNSTON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: First of all I would like to compliment you on your stand on Vietnam. U.S. involvement in that country is totally uncalled for and certainly does not help the cause for peace in the world. Unless this whole administration begins to act with honesty in this and many other situations we now are involved in, we will further endanger the lives of the people of this earth. The least we have is the responsibility to act with that honesty and a compassion for human life.

Would you please be kind enough to send me reprints of your major speeches on Vietnam (and the rest of southeast Asia). I wish to learn more about this situation.

With my best wishes,

DAN APPELMAN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 26, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I recently read excerpts of the excellent speech you delivered on the situation in Vietnam.

At your convenience, I should very much like to receive a copy of the full text of your speech.

Thank you for the consideration of my request.

Very truly yours,

Miss E. GREENFIELD.

AUGUST 29, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to have a copy of the Senate speech in which you attacked the resolution giving President Johnson advance approval of whatever steps he deemed necessary in Vietnam and called it "a predated declaration of war."

The approval of this resolution by the great majority of the Congress only goes to point up the truth in G. B. Shaw's famous aphorism that "Fifty Million Frenchmen Can't Possibly Be Right."

My only regret is that I don't live in Oregon and hence cannot cast my vote for you.

Sincerely,

GEORGE A. TOMPKINS, Jr.

AUGUST 14, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know how very much I agree with your stand on Vietnam and your votes on this issue.

I read with great interest your article in the August issue of the Progressive on Vietnam. It is one of the most informative articles I have read. It is to be regretted that every adult in the United States can't read what you have to say. Perhaps there would be more dissent. One wonders what has happened to us. When Mr. Dulles tried

to convince the people that we should send troops to help the French, they objected so vigorously that he had to abandon the idea. Now we have so-called advisers (over 15,000 of them) on Vietnam soil, have lost over 200 killed and many wounded, and only a comparatively few raise their voice in protest.

Mr. McNamara says we must protect our vital interests in southeast Asia. He doesn't say what these "vital interests" are 8,000 miles from our shores. It seems to me that Australia, etc., in that area should be more concerned about what really are vital interests, that any communistic takeover would affect them quicker and more drastically (should there be a communist takeover). Yet they are smart enough to keep out of it.

In the last copy of Fellowship (Fellowship of Reconciliation), under "Peace in Southeast Asia in an Election Year?" and what can and should be done, they say: "Testify for a neutralized southeast Asia before the Democratic platform committee. (It is understood the administration would turn to escalation of the war if events got out of hand before election day.)" It is difficult to believe Fellowship would make such a statement without some basis. If it has a basis, it is most depressing. Do you think Mr. Johnson and his advisers would really take such a step?

If available, I would like to have copies of your speeches before the Congress on Vietnam. Also on the foreign aid bill. I think you are in the right here also. Do you favor, in full, the antipoverty bill?

Thanking you in advance, and again assuring you of my support of your stand on Vietnam, I am

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JOHN T. SCANLAN.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 22, 1964.

CHICAGO SUN-TIMES,
Chicago, Ill.
Letters to the Editor.

DEAR SIR: In perspective our brief war with North Vietnam looks very much like a put-up job, a provocation by our puppet South Vietnam. Consider the following facts: Our Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, at his August 6 news conference confirmed that a large force of South Vietnam armed junks and gunboats were present in the Gulf of Tonkin and "* * * is very active in that area." He also refused "* * * to confirm or deny" that two offshore islands had been shelled 48 hours before the first attack. Then when the PT boats came to investigate what was going on, they ran into our destroyer waiting for them and the fight was on.

If we had let it go at that everybody would have forgotten about it. But someone somewhere thought this is an election year and we got to outdo GOLDWATER, so another fight had to be staged. North Vietnam admitted the first encounter but has categorically denied the second one and facts seem to back them up. The second encounter was during a dark and stormy night; it started 65 miles out at sea and the two destroyers were headed out of the gulf and into the Pacific Ocean. It would have been the utmost in stupidity for North Vietnam to invite retaliation by attacking our destroyers; far from their own coast and when they were going away and headed out to sea.

This fight lasted from 10:30 p.m. until 1:30 a.m., 3 hours of fighting and not a hit or even a near miss, from an "undetermined number of attackers, which means more than could be counted on the radar screens. Mr. McNamara says North Vietnam has little more than 25 PT boats (Jane's Fighting Ships records only 16) while South Vietnam's Navy, he says has "about 500 junks and some other craft." Our destroyers did not identify the attackers. If they were North Vietnam PT boats they would have had to race home some 150 miles to be there in time for our airplanes to blast them to bits a few hours later.

Does all this sound logical to you? To me it looks very much like a pretended attack by a lot of these South Vietnam junks, to give our side an excuse for a devastating counterblow to appease Mr. GOLDWATER.

We should ask ourselves if the greatest power in the world can afford to act like a street corner bully that will resort to violence at the drop of a hat? It takes no brains to act like a bully. But it takes brains to act for peace.

I want to end by quoting Senator WAYNE MORSE, speaking in the Senate on August 5: "For 10 years the United States has violated the Geneva Agreement of 1954." It has "* * * sought to impose a military solution on a political and economic problem. The rule has been that of a provocateur. I have been briefed many times and witness after witness from the State Department and from the Pentagon have admitted under examination that they had no evidence of any foreign troops in South Vietnam; from North Vietnam, Red China, Cambodia, or anywhere else. The only foreign troops there have been * * * Americans."

I hope our Government will take the initiative in calling the original Geneva conferees that negotiated the 1954 Indochina settlement into a new conference to settle the present hassle peacefully before it is too late.

Sincerely,

EDWIN JOHNSON.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Only you and Senator GRUENING had the courage and honesty to vote against the escalation of the war in southeast Asia and the coming holocaust we face if we pursue the tragic course we are taking.

Please keep up your struggle for peace and sanity.

Would you send me 5 copies of your Senate speech opposing the extension of power to the President.

Sincerely,

TOM SIEGEL.

PATERSON, N.J.,
August 6, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE B. MORSE,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my support and congratulations for your stand in opposition to our role in southeast Asia and specifically on the latest incidents.

Since the press ignores your speeches and remarks, I am requesting copies of your speeches on June 5 and 6, 1964. Also, if possible, any other copies of previous remarks available. I would like to have them not only for my own personal understanding but also to show them to friends in an effort to muster support for your courageous stand for peace.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

GEORGE SHELDRICK.

AUGUST 16, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Apropos our costly involvement in Vietnam, it was you who did "keep your head when all about you were losing theirs." Millions of frightened and anguished Americans feel as you do. More power to you.

Respectfully yours,

NATHAN BERMAN.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
August 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I read the speech you made in the Senate on August 5 against our policy in Vietnam. History will prove you and Senator GRUENING brave fighters for peace and the policy of no interference in the internal affairs of any state.

Am sure you have the thanks of all peace-loving and fair-minded Americans.

Keep up the good fight.

Yours very truly,

FRANCES G. BERLIN.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,
August 21, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I both wish to tell you of our admiration for your courageous stand against the war in Vietnam, and the action in (of) Congress.

We have followed the continuous and prolonged battle you have waged to open the eyes of the American people, and I am sure that many are inspired by your efforts. We hope that you will continue your fine work.

Can you suggest how ordinary citizens can make their attitudes felt most effectively.

We hope to attend the dinner which will be given in your honor here in September.

Sincerely yours,

EVELYN L. PRITCHER.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your bold and courageous stand in your TV appearance last week, your sincere opinions expressing grave concern over our country's involvement in the South Vietnam war and the warning that this participation may bring about a major war in east Asia, was most heartening and found a deeply felt response in the hearts and minds of the American people. Especially, in the hearts of our mothers, who do not want to see their sons killed in a senseless war in Vietnam.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING from Alaska was so right when he said, and we quote "all Vietnam is not worth the life of one American."

We, the listeners were most proud of you Senator, as well as of Senator GRUENING, and we wish to commend you on your stand in protesting the unjust slaughter of human beings.

Let us hear your voice raised in strong protest, again. You are not alone, in this fight. Thousands of Americans are with you. We hope, that with the help of people like you, peace will be achieved.

Most sincerely yours,

Mrs. J. DOBSON.

SIR: I am so in accord with you about this South Vietnam situation. I do not have one drop of Alabama Davis blood to leave in southeast Asia, and the way we are being villified I would not think the country would want it. Why not send these do gooders down there stirring up the Negroes, they want to fight. I have a 22-year-old grandson just made a first lieutenant Army helicopter pilot, slated to go over there. How did we become so well acquainted with those folk anyway that we should fight their battles? I gloried in your vote against it and the raising of your voice, I could bellow and it would do no good.

Sincerely,

BERNICE DAVIS.

PJAI, CALIF.,
August 17, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is to let you know that I support your outspoken stand on the Vietnam issue. I am one of many southern Californians who thinks that the United States should find another means other than subsidizing war to end the

fighting and American involvement in southeast Asia.

First we should make fuller use of the United Nations to settle disputes between countries. Secondly we must practice the late President Kennedy's statement, "Let us never negotiate out of fear but let us never fear to negotiate."

Our leaders must come to realize that their efforts must be concentrated on establishing a binding and honorable peace in world. They must stop playing with fire and rattling their swords in this nuclear age because if they don't mankind may perish.

You clearly see the danger we face and if you keep on reminding your colleagues about it enough times I think you will reach many of them. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

NED MOORE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 21, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Ever since I read of it in the newspaper, I have been wanting to congratulate you on your courageous stand on Vietnam. I hope you will continue in this effort.

With my best wishes.

Cordially,

GEORGE BRAZILLER.

TEWKSBURY, MASS.,
August 24, 1964.

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

SIR: I understand that certain British newspapers and certain elements of the left-wing press in the United States are suggesting that the second incident in the Gulf of Tonkin may have been a fake attack staged by General Khanh's navy to get us to retaliate against North Vietnam. Do you have any information which could either confirm or deny this possibility?

By the way, you are my favorite Senator, keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BALL.

CHICAGO, ILL.
August 19, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for taking the position you have on the southeast Asia conflict. I read your address to Congress and I support you 100 percent. War is unthinkable and our policy seems to be leading right into it. Please, please keep up the good work. We need some sanity interjected.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. N. WELCHER.

SITUATION SERIOUS

There was no indication of new Communist buildups in the Far East yesterday, but the State Department warned that the situation is "intensely serious."

Department spokesman Robert McCloskey disclosed that South Vietnamese Premier Nguyen Khanh had discussed his general mobilization order with U.S. officials before placing it in effect. Khanh had warned of stepped-up Red attacks on his country and he called the next few weeks decisive.

The major opposition to the congressional resolution backing Mr. Johnson came from Senator MORSE.

BLANKET AUTHORITY

The Oregon Democrat charged that the President was asking "blanket authority to wage war."

"No matter who the President is nor how good his intentions, unsanctioned acts of war can lead to all-out nuclear war and the end of this Republic.

"The President does not have the power to make war without a declaration of war by Congress."

GRUENING charged that "all of Vietnam was not worth the blood of one American boy."

BROOKLYN, N.Y., *August 10, 1964.*

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations for your lone stand against the dangerous administration policy in Vietnam. You have my support.

I looked in the New York Times in vain for the text of your speech against the Vietnam resolution. I would appreciate a copy.

Sincerely,

MARION KRONHEIM.

OSSINING, N.Y.,
August 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your forthright and courageous attack on President Johnson's actions in Vietnam, and on our policy there all along.

Is there any chance of getting a text of your address to the Senate, as I missed hearing it and the press almost missed covering it. I consider the poor coverage flagrantly unfair to the lone voice of criticism you so properly raised.

With best wishes for your continuing vigor and wisdom.

Sincerely,

MAISIE FOREMAN.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
August 8, 1964.

SIR: You and Senator GRUENING are to be commended for your votes against the resolution to sanctify aggression against Vietnam. That war is the act of a greedy bully, and your denunciation of it will read better in history than the bellicose excuses for it.

Unfortunately, the commercial newspapers here are silent on what you have been saying. I may have to subscribe to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

LEE COE.

REDWOOD CITY, CALIF.,
August 7, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: To date I have been unable to obtain a copy of your address with reference to the Vietnamese situation. I would be most appreciative if your office could send me a copy of this speech. Also any additional references which pertain to this topic which are unlikely to appear in the newspapers would be most appreciated.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. RICHARD J. BURKE.

TRURO, MASS.,
August 12, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: We wish to thank you and Senator GRUENING for the courageous battle that you have been waging against our intervention in the Vietnam situation. Such military policy as our country has been carrying out in Vietnam may very well lead to a nuclear holocaust. We urge you to continue your brilliant and courageous fight against intervention. We are sure that the American people would be completely behind you if they could be apprised of the actual facts.

We would appreciate it if you would kindly send us a copy of your speech in the Senate Chamber. Thank you. We will do all in our power to inform as many people as possible of its contents. Unfortunately the press, television and radio has given your speech poor coverage.

Yours respectfully,

EUGENE and ELLA JACKSON.

PLAINFIELD, N.J.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: During the recent Vietnam crisis the New York Times carried some information concerning your refusal to support President Johnson's request for a congressional resolution about southeast Asia. Since the coverage of your position was poor I wonder if you can send me a copy of a speech you've made on the subject or a reference which will explain your position.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. WATNICK, Ph. D.

GLENDALE, CALIF.,
August 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.
Representative from Oregon.

DEAR SIR: I, and my family, always listen respectfully when you speak, and we have heard you whenever you were on TV. We have come to the conclusion that you are the only honest man in government today, and we want you to know how much we appreciate what you have done and are doing. I consider you a patriot, and this is a word I use thoughtfully and lovingly.

I would like very much to have a copy of your speech before the House against the war in Vietnam. It was the only voice in this country raised for truth and humanity.

The people who turned their backs on you and walked away have walked into the arms of fascism.

If you can advise me on how to secure a copy of your speech to the House, I shall be very grateful, or, if your office could send me a copy I would reimburse them immediately.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

MARGARET M. DORNHAUSER.

P.S.—The particular speech I want is the one against the resolution of the President for carte blanche in North Vietnam.

M.D.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
August 9, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your solitary stand in Congress with Senator GRUENING offered a little optimism to the day in seeing that my views on the Vietnam situation are represented in that august institution. My opinions of official U.S. policy in Vietnam are essentially a mirror image of your own; your having the courage to stand up for what you believe to be right has added some steady ground under my own shaky questioning. Though when judging what I know of the problem, gained through the incomplete and insufficiency commentary and published sources, tainted with emotionality, conflicting facts, and nonsense, as they are, one cannot help it but feel pessimistic about the future and impotent to do anything about it.

I first became aware of your stand through a derogatory and superficial editorial in the Seattle Times about a month ago and through William Mandel, a radio commentator. The Seattle Times is best known for its ability to hold those attitudes that are most acceptable, and not for its insight or depth of reporting. In such a capacity they came out with many irresponsible statements, which was of course what they thought to be the proper thing to do.

The opposition you are encountering to your ideas is undoubtedly very intense, but still there are many people who see them as the answer to peace, at least for the immediate future. This group of course comprises a small minority of the population, but you do not stand unsupported.

Here in Seattle a few months ago last spring over 150 students and other interested persons (myself included) staged a demonstration favoring the movement of troops out of Vietnam, at a time when such a move might have been conceivable. The ill-received demonstration consisted of a march of several miles, ending in the center of the business district with a vigil. There was no mention of it in the papers or on the radio.

The similarities between the events so far taken place in Vietnam and those of the incipient stages of other wars in history are a fearful prognostication. It seems strange that 7,000 years of civilization have not taught man that the use of weapons and the waging of war on one's fellow man is not the answer to any problem. Please continue to support a peaceful solution to the Vietnam crisis, either by means of the U.N. or by any other rational means.

Sincerely,

RONALD R. RINGDAHL.

(If it is at all possible, could you send me a copy of your speech explaining your position delivered before the Senate on the occasion of congressional support of the President's actions in Vietnam last week?)

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
August 10, 1964.

SENATOR MORSE: Your principaled stand against the war in Vietnam and any extension of it is an extremely significant event in U.S. history. I urge you to stand firm at all costs.

Please send me copies of your Senate speech of the week of August 3.

Yours truly,

STEPHEN SALOFF.

POWER, MONT.,
August 18, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want to thank you and Senator ERNEST GRUENING for the courageous and honorable stand you took on August 5 on a resolution introduced in the U.S. Senate to grant the President advance approval on all steps he deems necessary in southeast Asia.

The war in southeast Asia (Vietnam) could escalate into a third world war if carried into North Vietnam and this is a very dangerous game we are playing. We ask that the President and the Congress consider the following points for a peaceful solution in southeast Asia:

1. The U.S. Government should be in favor of calling, or rather, reconvening the 1954 Geneva Conference of 14 nations and abiding by their recommendations, or:

2. The U.S. Government should work through the proper agencies of the United Nations to obtain a settlement satisfactory to all parties concerned. The United Nations is the only proper organ through which such controversies should be handled. If a powerful nation like the United States does not respect the United Nations, then we cannot expect smaller nations to respect its decisions and one another.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. HAROLD WOODHOUSE,
Mr. and Mrs. MATT MAYER,
Mr. and Mrs. NILO ANTILA.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
August 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a veteran of World War II, and as a father, I want to express my gratitude to you for your forthright and courageous voice for peace and against the abuse of Executive power. If only we in New York State had someone of your caliber to run for the Senate.

Please send me a copy of your statement regarding events in Vietnam and the "advance declaration of war."

Sincerely yours,

SOL GORELICK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 9, 1964.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Please accept my thanks for your vote against the joint resolution on southeast Asia. The size of the approving majority give reason for much misgiving.

Beginning with our refusal to sign the Geneva Pact of 1954 and ending with our provocative acts in the Bay of Tonkin, our Government's policies in that part of the world could not have been better designed not to win friends and not to secure a peace by compromise.

Twice this year I have written the President on the subject; once, I received a State Department "handout" and the second time my letter was not acknowleged. Early in the year I referred to the danger of actions being prompted by political considerations, a fear which I think was well founded.

I hope you will continue your efforts to introduce a sense of reality into the debates and to remind the Nation of the dangers. The United States' actions in southeast Asia remind me of the young man who is sure he will manage to dominate the marriage which he enters into with an older woman who has already had a half dozen husbands.

Yours sincerely,

S. M. RABSON.

P.S.—May I have a copy of your remarks of August 7.

S. M. R.

EASTON, MD.,
September 16, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am very pleased indeed that you are promoting a more forward looking approach to problems in Vietnam. Do continue the good work. The following is more or less what I mailed to my Congressman and the Maryland Senators.

1. Apparently South Vietnam is an excellent area for raising food, so we should do all we can to encourage and help the local population to improve their farming in order to increase their production. That might best be done through agencies of the United Nations, such as Food and Agriculture Organization, with all the support they need from the United States, so that people who are now opposed to our being in Vietnam will not have grounds for objecting.

2. Since there is lack of food in North Vietnam, negotiations should be started now for trade between North and South, the southerners sending food north in exchange for products from northern factories. This might discourage the North Vietnamese from feeling that they must have political control of South Vietnam.

3. Eventually South Vietnam might increase its food production sufficiently to trade with hungry people in southern China, Indonesia, India, and elsewhere in order to help stabilize southeast Asia.

4. The longer war is carried on in Vietnam the more chance there is for further involvement of mainland China in that peninsula. Very probably the Vietnamese people, either North or South, do not want control from China, and would be glad to start negotiations toward stopping the fighting.

5. Communists have been offering solutions to problems to Vietnamese people for several years now. We should not be simply anti-Communist, but we should be helping people learn about and practice democracy. This development of democracy may have to be helped by agencies of the United Nations, such as technical assistance.

6. Many other nations that are hesitating to help us in Vietnam today may be glad to join in these projects. In the process of building democracy we may find many Vietnamese people will work with us, who are now fighting against us, since they think we are not now bringing constructive aid to their land. All of this will be difficult, but will be in the right directions, as opposed to continuing the warfare.

I received a reply from Senator DANIEL BREWSTER apparently sympathetic to my ideas.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. CAROLINE L. FORMAN.

CHITTENDEN, VT.,
August 21, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although I am not one of your constituents, I cannot forbear writing a short note congratulating you and, at the same time, expressing my gratitude to you for your strong position over the past months with regard to the Vietnam situation. Especially do I admire your vote against the President's policy pertaining thereto. Courageous men of integrity and uncompromising belief in what we hope is the peaceful democratic ideal are always few and far between; the fact that your vote was one of only two cast in the whole Congress is a measure not only of this fact but also of your integrity in the face of overwhelming odds. I can only say that I wish you were representing my State and, failing that, that there were some way in which I could support you in your continuing fight to maintain the ideals for which our country is supposed to stand in a world growing ever darker under the threat of militarism, war, and nuclear destruction.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD A. CLARK.

GOLETA, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR: My parents have been receiving your "Senator MORSE Reports." I would greatly appreciate being added to your mailing list.

I am a student at the University of California, who is greatly aware of his responsibilities in this democratic society of ours. I support your stand on the Vietnam question, because of the possibility of a GOLDWATER in the Presidency with this great increase in power to wage war.

I would like to commend you for your reports and would greatly appreciate receiving them.

Sincerely,

PETE RELIS.

HOUSTON, MINN.,
August 28, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Would that words could express the profound respect, admiration, and love we have for you and Senator GRUENING, the only two who spoke up against our country's cruel meddling in Asia, all contrary to international law and treaties. Your speech on the Senate floor June 23, 1964, shows the highest courage in voicing opposition to the "powers that be." From now on you can live at peace with your conscience. You have voiced what so many ordinary people think and feel, but lack courage to express for reasons too well understood. But, as you rightly say to the American people, "that a war in Asia will be stopped only if the people of the United States stop it." If the

bulk of the populace survive the era of "fear and smear," in time, maybe there will be hope for redemption of our folly and insanity.

All we can say is God bless you and all your kind. May you be sustained throughout your difficult dedicated service—the price is high, as the Linus Paulings, John Haynes Holmes (recently deceased at 85), Norman Thomas, Muste, Martin Luther King, and many others have found but such souls will go down in history as saviors of humanity when the others will be forgotten in ignominy.

We are grateful to you for your noble service to our country.

Very sincely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN C. REFSLAND.

POST OFFICE BOX 218,
NORTH SYDNEY, N.S.W., AUSTRALIA,
August 9.

DEAR SENATOR: Would you be kind enough to mail me copies of your recent statements and speeches on the Vietnam situation? A little in the form of very cut quotes have trickled through a fivefold censorship to appear in the local press. The British Broadcasting Co. has also quoted you at times. Evidently yours is the only sane voice these days to be heard in Washington, D.C. You seem to be surrounded by packs of murderous boobs bent upon war and only too eager to scuttle what remains of constitutional government.

When I left the United States 3 years ago I was distressed at the growing U.S. militarism of the worst junker type. It now alarms me to read of a near military dictatorship in the present concepts of establishing and implementing foreign policy. If this keeps up how long before domestic matters take on the form of a garrison state?

Senator, has it occurred to anyone that the psychological climate in the United States today is very close to that which prevailed in Nazi Germany of about 1939 before the war? Believe me, the image of the United States abroad is now closer to that of a war-mad bully than many of us Americans like to think. It's been a real eye-opener to travel out of our country. And not very pleasant or flattering either. Frankly, I find it more comfortable at times to be mistaken for a Canadian than a bloody Yank and this is one of the most friendly countries to things American. Or once was.

There is something drastically wrong with the United States what with riots and violence at home, gun running to this and that country abroad, military provocations all over the globe, the big lie techniques in much of what comes out of State. The sheer dirtiness of our warmaking in southeast Asia is worthy of anything the Nazis did and hung for. And just how does the United States now wage war of any kind without congressional declaration according to the Constitution? Sounds like our republican form of government is over.

On the basis of those brief news items about your own efforts, let me say that you have our (mine and other Americans here) sincere thanks for your efforts to avert our national suicide. I, for one, hope you succeed and we all convey our best wishes to you.

Sincerely,

L. A. BENEDICT.

HAYWARD, CALIF.,
August 19, 1964.

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

DEAR WAYNE: I have read your speech recently given on the South Vietnam issue.

Yours is a courageous, clear, and telling indictment of the wrong-headed policy now being pursued by this Government.

Thank you for your leadership in the cause of peace.

Last March I was in Washington and called at your office but you were not in.

Keep up the good fight.

Cordially,

ED.

VENICE, CALIF.,
August 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Foreign Relations Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: "A clear voice in the senatorial wasteland."

We are humbly grateful for your lone clear voice that spoke out against the resolution introduced in the U.S. Senate on August 5, 1964, to grant the President advance approval on all steps he deemed necessary to "repel any attack on U.S. forces in southeast Asia." Many thanks also to Senator GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, who also voted against the resolution.

Enlightened citizens who understand the dangerous implications of this resolution are saddened along with you, especially so because the press, radio, and T.V. have been practically silent about the issues, so they are ignorant of the threats of war confronting us.

It is clearly evident, as you so wisely state, "that a continuation of the U.S. unilateral military action in southeast Asia, which has now taken on the aspects of open aggressive fighting, endangers the peace of the world."

It is imperative that the American people make themselves heard on U.S. policy in Asia and to urge the Government to send our boys home.

Thank you again, Senator MORSE, for being such a true representative of the American people.

Most sincerely,

HELEN ROSS.

SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA,
August 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On behalf of my wife and family, I wish to thank you for your sane approach to the southeast Asia crisis.

I am sure peace-loving peoples throughout the world agree with you.

The impression your beloved country creates to my family and I is aggressive, and is typically "do as I say, not as I do."

Senator MORSE, you seem to be surrounded by madmen and I do admire your courage and tenacity. Sir, you have millions of unseen friends all over this world of ours. Let us hope and trust that men of the caliber such as yourself eventually make all men see reason and the utter futility of foreign aggression and war.

Yours faithfully,

GEORGE C. WELLS.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
August 6, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I applaud your forthright comments on the Vietnam situation. By bombing ports and bases in North Vietnam, we are the ones who are becoming provocative. We were justified only in firing on the ships which fired on us.

You are also right in not giving President Johnson a free hand in decisions relevant to the military situation in that area.

I plan to write to my Senators and to McNamara and Rusk to oppose an extension of the conflict.

Sincerely,

STANLEY A. NESHEIM.

P.S.—Please send me a copy of your statement of August 5, 1964. Thank you.

KINGSTON, N.Y.,
August 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I were very pleased that you voted against the Vietnam resolution in the Senate.

We know, through I. F. Stone's Weekly, that you have made several important speeches on our southeast Asian policy, but there has been almost no mention of them in the press that we could find. How is it possible that such speeches are not reported? We cannot believe that there is a conspiracy against you. Is the press so sure that your speeches won't sell papers that it doesn't print them? Is the press so biased that they all refuse to report a Senator's views?

We would like to have an answer to these questions that is not merely speculative but one that can be substantiated.

If it is possible to obtain your speeches please tell us how to get them.

Sincerely,

EDWARD W. AVERILL.
JOANNE AVERILL.

ALBANY, CALIF.,
August 12, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Please be assured of my heartiest support of your position on the Vietnam crisis and my admiration of your demonstration of courage in standing up for your convictions. I would be happy to support you as a candidate for the Presidency, but I suppose at this time that the bulk of the American people are not yet ready to face the truth about our conduct of foreign affairs, and a truthful statesman might come out second best in a contest with a double-talking politician.

I would appreciate it if you could send me about 10 reprints of your speech on the Vietnam crisis, and will distribute them to friends and acquaintances.

Yours respectfully,

G. W. SORENSON.

BOSTON, MASS.,
August 13, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you heartily for having the courage to stand in a minority of two and vote your convictions on the recent resolution on our involvement in southeast Asia. Circumspect and responsible dissent is a vital part of our American system.

I myself have some qualms about our current involvement in southeast Asia, but do not have sufficient information to be sure that I agree fully with you. I would greatly appreciate receiving a copy of your remarks on the resolution and any other pertinent material you may have on hand.

Sincerely,

GORDON D. GIBSON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 11, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Permit me to offer you my appreciation for your courage in face of the recent Vietnam crisis; it was in the tradition of Senators Borah and Norris. There was a disgraceful editorial in our local paper, "The New York Daily News" in which they questioned your patriotism. I hope that you will find time to answer this vicious attack, as many New Yorkers regard this yellow journalism sheet as the truth.

As a former GI who served in the Philippines in the last war, I sometimes wonder what the hell are we doing in Vietnam, especially since it seems to me that since the war, most of the leaders of these so-called

Asian democracies are of the ilk of the Diems, Sukarno, etc., who seem interested in milking the U.S.A. for their own selfish motives, and we should stop risking lives of American boys unless BARRY GOLDWATER is interested in defoliating the area in his own plane with the Birch society as back-up troops.

Would appreciate it very much if you would send me the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that contains your views on Vietnam.

Wishing you many years of healthy service to our Nation,

Sincerely,

A. D. TINKEL.

SAN PEDRO, CALIF.,
August 8, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: You have my admiration for your independent and objective stand on our South Vietnamese and South Asian involvements.

It is a sad commentary that only Senators MANSFIELD and SALINGER (as presiding officer) were present when you made your address. Also, that only Senator GRUENING joined you overtly.

George Washington, if he were still around, I am sure would be in your corner.

Did anybody make an attempt yet, to survey and evaluate our foreign involvements of several decades? It is certain that not everything that we did was bad, but neither was everything good. I wonder is there any such move on the horizon?

I appreciate that you possibly can't answer me personally. But if you know of anything that appeared in print, won't you please send me the bibliography?

By all means, please send me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which carries your last address, and possibly also those with your previous addresses on the subject at hand.

More power to you, Mr. Senator; history will prove that the Senate and the Nation should have paid more attention to you.

Respectfully and sincerely,

ADOLPH WEINBERGER.

THE BERLIN GOVERNMENT SEES ITS PROBLEMS

(Exclusive interview for the Eugene Register-Guard)

Berlin continues to be a pivotal point on the world's map. When fighting is going on in Vietnam or in the Congo we should perhaps keep in mind that the frightening struggles for power are being played simultaneously on the entire political keyboard of the world. At the moment both Berlins appear to be calm places if divided. Who knows, however, how to analyze the situation as to possible future changes in emphasis on political pressures? Germans, who generally look with apprehension at any kind of brinkmanship, no matter where their personal sympathies happen to be, usually express their feeling with caution unless when talking privately. They feel that they may become victims of outside forces who are able to make Germany the battleground of conflicts which are beyond their control.

Because Berlin's vigorous mayor, Willy Brandt, was still in the hospital after surgery, we were unable to renew our acquaintance which we made when both of us were refugees in Sweden some 25 years ago.

However, Herr Werner Steltzer of the Berlin Information Center was kind enough to answer, as Mayor Brandt's spokesman, the questions which I present. Particularly welcome was his analysis of the Berlin situation and the government's basic position.

At first, I made reference to President Johnson's recent talks with Chancellor Erhard and his renewed interest in German unification, and asked whether such ideas might be based on realistic plans.

Mr. Steltzer answered that "the unification of Germany is a necessity, not because the Germans always want it, but because we won't have peace in this part of the world on the basis of a permanently divided Germany." He pointed out further that at present Germany is in a historical phase before a peace treaty with the victorious powers of the Second World War. "The declared basis is unconditional surrender," said Mr. Steltzer. Therefore, the victorious powers could decide on whether there should be one or two Germanies. However, the individual powers have interests of their own and they will try to swing matters in their own favor. As long as the cold war exists there will be no unification despite the fact that unification will be necessary for the development of a stable situation, according to Berlin's spokesman.

On the other hand, Mr. Steltzer said, the Soviet Union cannot agree at present to a unification of Germany because it would mean that the western border of communism would have to recede a couple of hundred miles to the east. In the field of economics this would mean a tremendous loss to the Eastern powers. The Soviet occupational zone represents perhaps the greatest industrial force next to the Soviet Union itself.

"Consequently, our interest is to bring about a situation in which Mr. Khrushchev can place his signature on a treaty which has the headline—Unification," continued Mr. Steltzer. Berlin's interest is with a policy of "detente," with a decrease of tension. Only many very small steps will lead to a solution and many of these will have to go through quite a few changes as progress is being made, Mr. Steltzer said.

My second question referred to possible contradictions developing out of policies toward unification of the two Germanies on the one hand and toward integration with France on the other.

Mr. Steltzer was emphatic about the point that all solutions for an integrated and united Europe, which would be rejected as possibilities from any German point of view. To emphasize the point that France would not resist unification with East Germany, Mr. Steltzer quoted the former French premier Mendes France, who was not exactly a friend of Germany, as saying: "Well, let Germany have unification and they will have so many domestic troubles that they won't bother us much." We are convinced that the necessity of the unification of Germany cannot hinder or postpone the integration of Europe, said Mr. Steltzer.

I was then interested in the question of how the unification of Germany and European integration could take place in view of the seeming incompatibility of the capitalistic and communistic systems.

In his answer it appears that, according to Mr. Steltzer, the Berlin government is sharing a theory which has been advanced also in the United States. "I think it is a commonplace already that, seen from a worldwide point of view, the two systems are approaching each other. Ultimately, the only difference will be in the ownership. A large tractor factory in Stalingrad is owned by the state but run according to the principles of General Motors," said Mr. Steltzer. He emphasized, however, that these similarities exist only with respect to economics. The Russians, he pointed out, have changed completely from the earlier method where price and productivity didn't matter, but just the order to fill a demand regardless of what the cost would be. They have now introduced the following factors: (a) the market price and (b) the production costs. Therefore, the manager of the plant in Leipzig cannot differ very much in his working mentality from a manager in Dusseldorf, said Mr. Steltzer.

As a point of interest he added that the big business managers of West Germany, while belonging themselves to the governing Christian-Social Party, did not support their Government when it came to a steel pipe embargo against the communistic East. The German pipe manufacturers protested this embargo although it could mean the prevention of piping oil from the Tiflis fields to a potential western front. The western managers explained that they have to look after their own productivity. To Mr. Steltzer this explained that, although the western managers belong to the same party as their Government and have the same general mentality, they nevertheless have to oppose their political leaders when the demands of their own production are clashing with the demands of international policy. As a consequence, if the Government insists on its policy, it has to step into the production cycle and has to support industry, including the assumption of business risks. In this manner the Government obtains influence on production and in an almost involuntary way will end up with a production mode which industry and government are actually trying to fight, said Mr. Steltzer. He apparently is taking this development, which one might call "cold socialization" as an inevitable and permanent byproduct of the cold war.

A further question was: "You said that immediate unification as a whole would be unacceptable to the East because it would be a loss to them. Therefore, you said, it would have to take place in small steps. Could you give some examples of what these small steps could consist of?"

Mr. Steltzer: "Yes, for instance, we should have an increase in technical contacts which we already have with each other. We have a general construction plan for Berlin. The area around the Potsdamer Platz shall again be the hub of the city. All our construction plans for Berlin provide for this future development. Then, for the city Autobahn, a circumferential road, of which we have charge halfway around the circle, we hope to work together with the East Berlin authorities who are in charge of the other half. There is one service where we do work together. While water and electricity are divided, the sewage system could not be divided and engineers on both sides have to cooperate. If we could achieve slowly small steps in the unification of communications as for instance of the telephone service and, as Willy Brandt has recommended for a long time, of the public transportation system, then personal contacts will be possible again, and that demands cooperation."

I asked as a final question what one should think about the German remilitarization, which gave Germany a key position in NATO, which of course angers General de Gaulle and makes Russia afraid.

Mr. Steltzer said, "of course, the Russians are afraid because of what they have suffered from the German Army. This certainly is not just propaganda what Mr. Khrushchev says about it. There is a genuine fear of what might happen.

"It was more by demand of the Western Allies than by German initiative that we are making a direct military contribution to the security of Europe," continued Mr. Steltzer, "Germany is supposed to be part of the decisive command post which has a finger on the trigger, and this is a very, very dangerous situation. It should be overcome by diplomatic and political activity in the international field as soon as possible."

Mr. Steltzer concluded the interview with a quote from Mayor Brandt that Berlin is not a source of danger but a thermometer of danger, of tensions and of difficulties that exist in the world. One cannot cure a disease, Mayor Brandt said, by throwing away the thermometer. For the time being there is no particular pressure on Berlin, "but we

do not know whether tomorrow perhaps someone will decide to put the pressure on this area again," said Mr. Steltzer.

World politics can be well studied in the mirror of Berlin. My thanks went to Mr. Steltzer in Berlin's Information Center, a fine modern building near the Zoo station in West Berlin's business center.

H. H. WAECHTER.

KNOXVILLE, TENN.,
August 21, 1964.

Sen. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to thank you for your vote on the Vietnam resolution. I wish that our own Senator GORE could have had the judgment and wisdom to vote as you did. As I am sure you agree, we have no legal nor moral right in this pathetic country.

It would seem that we are now rapidly becoming involved in the Congo and wherever else we believe our benevolent presence is required—or allowed. We read in the press that a committee is being sent to Malaysia to ascertain what "military aid" these people need. Do you not agree that we seem to be fast losing our minds in our country?

We hope that you will do everything you can to prevent our further involvement in these countries. In most of them, we are not only not wanted but are hated and despised.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. FRANKLIN PITCHER.

TUCSON, ARIZ.,
August 20, 1964.

Sen. WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my hearty endorsement regarding your position urging negotiation in the Vietnamese struggle.

Apart from the constant threat of wider military involvement, we are missing an opportunity to set an example in the peaceful resolution of conflict. As a leader among nations, this seems to me an important obligation resting on the United States. Our proclaimed intentions of bringing "freedom" and "democracy" to South Vietnam at the expense of their lives and liberty makes a hollow mockery of all that we claim to represent.

Again, therefore, may I add my modest encouragement to you in your efforts to bring this problem to the conference table.

Respectfully,

RALPH C. KAUFFMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 19, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for the brave speech you made in the Senate on August 5, which I have just read.

Like many other Americans, I had hoped that the President could and would find a way to settle the situation in Vietnam through negotiation by all the groups concerned either in accordance with the Geneva Agreement or under the control of the United Nations and so end this unilateral action on our part, which is so completely at variance with all our two centuries of traditional American principles—principles which have made our country great, and of which we have been so proud. One can depend on the good sense and clear thinking of the American people if they are given the facts; but, unfortunately, they have not been given the facts during the past 20 years.

The resolution against which you spoke only entangles this country more deeply in a situation where we did not and do not belong and makes it much more difficult to withdraw with honor; it is as if this country had been caught in quicksand.

It seems incomprehensible that you and Senator GRUENING of Alaska were the only Senators to cast your votes against the resolution. Can it be that Senator GOLDWATER is already directing American foreign affairs? Heaven help our beloved country if he is. What has happened to the thinking of all the other Senators? Are they blind to the precipice which lies at the end of the road they are now taking?

Sincerely yours,

E. J. SPENCER.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your bold and courageous stand in your TV appearance last week, your sincere opinions expressing grave concern over our country's involvement in the South Vietnam war and the warning that this participation may bring about a major war in east Asia, was most heartening and found a deeply felt response in the hearts and minds of the American people. Especially, in the hearts of our mothers, who do not want to see their sons killed in a senseless war in Vietnam.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING from Alaska was so right when he said, and we quote, "all Vietnam is not worth the life of one American."

We, the listeners were most proud of you Senator, as well as of Senator GRUENING, and we wish to commend you on your stand in protesting the unjust slaughter of human beings.

Let us hear your voice raised in strong protest again. You are not alone in this fight. Thousands of Americans are with you. We hope, that with the help of people like you, peace will be achieved.

Most sincerely yours,

MATTY SALTZMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DELMAR, N.Y.,
August 9, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are to be highly commended for your efforts to raise your reasonable voice above the raucous hue and cry which bursts forth on the topic of southeast Asia.

Please continue your efforts to present your side of this vital issue.

I would like to have copies of your remarks to the Senate regarding the resolution approving the U.S. Navy attack on the North Vietnam naval bases.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. MANCUSO.

TRENTON, N.J.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to congratulate you and thank you for the stand you have consistently taken on the war in Vietnam. It took real courage for you and Senator GRUENING to vote against the President's resolution.

Could you send me the texts of some of your Senate speeches on Vietnam?

Sincerely,

RICHARD PARKER.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA.,
August 8, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a citizen of this great land, naturally I am very much interested in the doings of our legislators. I always had a warm appreciation of what the Oregon delegation so heroically had done.

I want to know more.

Can you, dear friend, send me some of your speeches, and what others said on the great topic before us today?

Good fortune be with you.

Most sincerely,

MEYER CHARIFF.

LAKESIDE, OREG.,
August 9, 1964.

TO THE EDITOR,
The Oregonian,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SIR: Your current castigation of Senator MORSE because of his stand and his vote on the southeast Asia hassle calls to my mind the time the writer attended a testimonial dinner in a distant city honoring a gentleman who had just been reelected by the largest vote ever given a candidate for a high office in his State. When the guest of honor arose to respond to the several toasts he did so in words and in substance as follows: "As I sat here listening to the kind things you friends have had to say about me my memory took me back to that early morning hour in April 1917, when the question was put in the House of Representatives, Shall we declare war on Germany? I was one of the five who voted in the negative. Before sundown I had been fired from my only appointed office, a member of the library board here in my home town, and of course the voters fired me from my congressional job at the next election. How sweet it is to be back on top again surrounded by such good friends. I cannot pass up this opportunity to have the last word and say that if that emotion-packed hour should be reenacted today that I would not change my vote for I voted right the first time."

When the writer was a kid I shovelled coal after school into the basements of the neighbors to earn the price of admission on Saturday night to the Des Moines auditorium to watch the would-be champs of the world try to pin Frank Gotch, the champ. No one was ever able to do it but it was worth the price of admission to see them try. Today it is a treat to pick up my morning paper and observe you attempt to rope and hogtie Senator MORSE. I am like the tourist down in Bombay who put up four bits to watch the native do the Indian rope trick. I do not think you can do it but it is worth a nickel a day to watch your efforts. If bets are in order I will play the percentage and string along with the champ.

Yours very truly,

FORREST E. COOPER.

DEAR WAYNE: You voted right the first time.

F.E.C.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
August 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to some others and thought I might as well begin with the most courageous Senator of them all. I know your advice about our withdrawing from Vietnam goes unheeded but perhaps not quite. Two million dollars per day for killing human beings who don't want us in their homeland. I can't read all the cruelties perpetrated. One has enough trouble sleeping in these unresponsible times. Have we become callous to what destruction of men, women, and children means? Along with all possible chance for them to raise their own food. It is so barbarous and why should our young men we have nurtured and taught to want an education and a future be sent out as victims, killing those they don't want to kill? This just by way of letting you know that I am grateful to you for speaking some terrible truths that need to be uttered. I wish you and GRUENING were in the Johnson-Humphrey driver's seat. One wonders and hopes about our new civil

rights law. Who will supplant Bobby (and how glad I am that he is being supplanted) and will the laws really be enforced? When shall we ever have a lynch law? I have my own opinions about a number of matters re how our Government has avoided helping those heroic youngsters in Mississippi. I share some of Dick Gregory's opinions about who helps whom. The situation in which we are willing to let the noble be slaughtered must come to an end if we are really to have life more abundant.

Thanks for being the heroic Senator. Senator CLARK, from my native Pennsylvania, is good on so many matters but not on the foreign situation.

Very appreciatively yours,

ANNA C. DART.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 26, 1964,

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have written you many times commending your courage and agreeing with what you say about our foreign policy, especially our current brinkmanship in Vietnam. It seems that wherever there's trouble, our CIA is behind it.

Your radio comments on Tuesday, August 25, were very timely. It's about time someone in our Congress came out with the truth.

I enclose an expression of opinion from my neighbor, Mr. A. Fried.

You deserve the thanks of all the American people. Carry on.

Sincerely,

Mrs. SALLY COOPER.

CLAREMONT, CALIF.,
August 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Old Senate Office Building,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I regret very much that I will be out of town on August 29 when you are in Los Angeles, and thus will be unable to be at the dinner where you are speaking. I am especially sorry because this will prevent me from telling you in person how very much I value your splendid performance in the Senate on South Vietnam and all foreign aid, to say nothing of a host of other things. If by any chance, however, it should be possible for you to be in southern California after August 30, I would appreciate very much the opportunity to see you and would be delighted to invite you out to the Claremont Colleges.

Yours sincerely,

FRED WARNER NEAL.

P.S.—I enclose a recent effusion of my own, which you may find of interest.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY, THE NEW ISOLATIONISM AND THE 1964 REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

(By Fred Warner Neal [1])

Any foreign policy is likely to challenge rationality. I am inclined to think that foreign policies generally can best be understood if one keeps in mind two guiding principles: First, foreign policies tend to be irrational. Second, the more irrational the policy, the more tenaciously it is pursued. By irrational here I mean based on unreal or factually inaccurate premises, faulty perception of reality, producing unreasonable goals and/or action demonstrably leading elsewhere than to the goal sought.

This results essentially from what Sartre would call the human condition. There is a human propensity, in the best of circumstances, to self-delusion. The arena of international politics is by no means the best of circumstances, because it requires judgments about unfamiliar terrain in a milieu of nationalism, which itself exudes irrationalism. All this, of course, is, in the existentialist sense, inescapable. It cannot be eliminated, only coped with. In the good old days, say pre-1954, this irrationality in foreign policies was not so bad, comparatively. At best it could produce short-run benefits. At worst it could only result in loss of a few billion dollars and a few million lives. Today, in the thermonuclear age, it can no longer produce even short-run benefits, and the potential destruction of lives and property, if not total, is beyond human reckoning. What international politics in the thermonuclear age is about, essentially, is how to live in a world of human and institutional irrationality and still avoid this result.

Elements of irrationality in American foreign attitudes are not hard to find, starting, perhaps, with the time soon after the Union was formed when, unarmed and at war's edge with England, there was a great popular urge—fortunately resisted by a wise leadership—to go to war with our chief ally, France. Examples in other epochs vie with each other. But, if only because the United States did not participate actively in international affairs, the period after World War II has seen more, and more obvious, examples. With the United States at the height of its military power after the war, and the Soviet Union at its lowest ebb, we developed an almost paranoiac fear of Soviet military aggression. With Stalin, for his own purposes, opposed to Communist expansion, we based our whole foreign policy on its imminence. We focused our European policy on a NATO conventional armed force when it was clear that any war in Europe would be nuclear. In an age of nationalism and revolution, we have managed to be on bad terms with nearly almost every national revolutionary movement that has come along. Urging the Soviet Union to accept the status quo, we oppose it in Central Europe. With a rising fear of Soviet aggression in Europe, we poured money, via France, into Indochina and considered going to war to help a lost French cause. We opposed the Geneva settlement, refused to sign it when it was negotiated, intervened to aid those opposed to it, and now are involved in military combat to uphold it. When the Chinese Communists, who for years had been developing power in China for all to see, defeated the Nationalist Government and set up shop, we blamed it on to the Russians and/or Communists in the State Department. We declared South Korea to be outside our defense zone and then promptly went to war when the North Koreans invaded. When our forces approaching the Yalu River clearly threatened Chinese National interests, we were completely unprepared for Chinese intervention, despite the fact Peiping had warned us about it as well as it could warn a country which did not recognize its existence. When the Chinese came in, to a war on their very borders and 10,000 miles away from ours, we denounced China as an aggressor. We have continued to support the Formosa regime, which wants to overthrow the mainland government, and denied the Communist regime control over islands only 5 miles off its shores, and then say the Chinese will have to stop being hostile to us before we will treat with them.

The illusion that we can refuse to treat with China while ourselves meddling in the Far East and still have stability there is perhaps the penultimate irrationality. The ultimate one, of course, is the idea that in the thermonuclear age there is security in an overkill capacity. As with other irrationalities, the trouble with it is that it not only does not serve American interests, but actually works against them.

The United States is not alone in the irrationality of its foreign policy. These odd peccadilloes of ours are, in fact, all the more dangerous because of foreign policy irrationalities of other nations. But in this area, the desire of the Americans always to be foremost does seem to have been fulfilled.

How can one explain it? Here is the United States, with its scientific skill and pragmatism, its revolutionary ideas of political freedom for all, lack of binding class feeling, social mobility, and unlimited opportunities for education. A nation so richly and uniquely endowed, impelled by neither need nor desire for conquest, uninhibited by ideology, caste, or precedent, should be able to see the world calmly, objectively, and in perspective.

That too often we have not done so is explainable, I think, by the fact that the United States is essentially an isolationist nation. There is no question, of course, that we have abandoned the formal isolationism of the interwar period. But isolationism does not mean merely not participating actively in international affairs. Isolationism, in a sense meaningful for international politics, is fundamentally a state of mind; it is ignorance of the rest of the world and its main currents. A nonparticipating nation tends to be isolationist in other ways too, but not always, as witness the case of Switzerland. The slightest eddy in world affairs is recorded and usually understood in Bern, for example, despite the fact that the Swiss participate politically in nothing, not even the United Nations; while on the other hand there are nations that participate in everything and intervene everywhere which do not really have a grasp of what they themselves, let alone other nations, are doing. An isolationist nation in this latter sense tends to reject the unpleasant truth that the world is a very plural place, that other nations and peoples neither do, nor have to, see the world the way it sees it.

Such an isolationist nation tends to see the world in terms of its own moral superiority, and opposition to it as evil. Since to compromise with evil is evil, it tends to become rigid in its positions, rejecting compromise of any kind as appeasement of evil. Such an isolationist nation tends to see disagreement as hostility, hostility as threatening military conflict, and military conflict as Armageddon. It finds it difficult if not impossible—often despite the best of intentions—to conduct its foreign relations according to the fundamental principle that international politics is a two-way street. It may be genuinely peace loving—most nations are, on their own terms—but since it ignores, grossly misconceives, or denies altogether the interests of other nations where they differ from its own, it has difficulty in practicing restraint; and the lack of restraint itself produces a propensity to conflict. But, incapable of introspection and self-criticism because of its conviction of its own righteousness, the isolationist-minded nation sees the lack of peace resulting only because of the intransigence, or aggressiveness, of other nations; and the next step is trying to achieve peace by making war. Slowly, then rapidly, reality eludes it to the point of irretrievability.

Now, despite the irrationalities of our foreign policy I have cited, I do not mean this as a description of the United States. We have thus far escaped many of these pitfalls. But surely the syndromes of the isolationist-minded nation are apparent in too many of our foreign policy attitudes. Particularly has there been a tendency to ignore the principles of international politics that were so well understood by our Founding Fathers. These were well expressed in the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine was firmly based on the concept of reciprocity inherent in international political principles and was tied to the fundamental principle of core interests and

[1] Professor of international relations and government, Claremont (Calif.) Graduate School. Lecture delivered at convocation of Claremont College's summer session, July 23, 1964.

their relation to geography. That is, the truth that some nations have interests which are more important to them than others, and that these interests begin with geographical proximity. The Monroe Doctrine has been so vulgarized and misrepresented of late that perhaps it is necessary to recall it to you as it was conceived by that wise and prudent stateman, John Quincy Adams. There were two parts to the doctrine. One part asserted the priority of American interests in this hemisphere. And the other part asserted, as a quid pro quo, that the United States would not interfere in areas which were the priority of other nations, that is, affairs of Europe. As such, the Monroe Doctrine was a balanced and reasonable assertion of American interests and American restraint. It is a typical syndrome of the isolationist-minded nation that we have ignored, violated and now forgotten the second part of the doctrine while continuing to assert the first. The Monroe Doctrine may not be dead, but if it is in an exceedingly critical condition we have only ourselves to thank. Cuba was only the chickens coming home to roost.

To a considerable extent, the development of the United States as an isolationist-minded nation was probably unavoidable. Young, we lacked historical perspective. Protected by the God-given oceans, to say nothing of the British fleet, we could concentrate on our internal development without fear of attack. We could expand westward without encountering other nation-states. Our puritan background of self-righteousness was unchallenged by the give and take of normal international relations. Our Calvinist background led us to equate our great material successes with divine will. International war was an evil other nations constantly engaged in, because they lacked our moral base. The Indians, against whom we warred constantly, challenged neither our moral self-satisfaction nor our growing sense of omnipotence. The United States never had, aside from infrequent wartime, a real meaningful opponent in the world, which challenged its policies, its methods of social organizations, its moral standards, and its way of life. For all of our history, up to World War I, the world stood firm and solid, comfortably controlled by the Western Europeans, from whom we sprung; and where the Western Europeans faltered, as was the case with Spain in the Philippines, we stood ready to pick up the pieces and plug the dike.

When we finally did get involved in the whirlpool of the immoral world in 1917, we resolved to set things right according to proper moral and democratic standards. And if our high-minded war aims did not win over our victorious allies, they made a lasting impression on much of the American intellectual community. This group was shocked at the American rejection of the league and our subsequent withdrawal back to our own bastion. From the shock developed the fixation on the need to participate actively in the world, come what may, and the subsequent confusion between isolationism and nonparticipationism. Responsible for ideas and education, this internationalist-minded intellectual community, in effect, proceeded to sell their concepts to the American elite. When the formal isolation of the interwar period proved calamitous, they were in business, as it were. A whole generation of Americans had had it drummed into them that the thing to do above all else was to participate actively in world affairs—never mind on what base, never mind with what knowledge—participate and this time, for sure, set the world aright. Even as we set forth, we were misconceiving the nature of international reality. Engaged in a war for freedom and democracy, we were convinced all our allies saw things much as we did. Again there was shock when it turned out otherwise. But this time there was no retreating back into our shell. We set out to do what we thought we should have done after World War I. We were now going to participate. We were going to intervene. But the old isolationist base, the old ignorance of the main currents of the world, was still there. Isolationism in this sense remained, but was now joined by participationism. This time, however, the familiar, comfortable world of a strong Western Europe and solid British Empire had collapsed. Even the oceans had suddenly shrunk. The old sign posts were missing, and the specter of atomic weapons turned the path into a veritable nightmare. And, in addition, there was an erstwhile ally—motivated by an unrealistic fervor of its own—demanding its right to be heard, its right to put the world in order the way it saw things—which was not our way at all. The United States now, like other great nations before, had a powerful opponent, and our reaction was one of indignation to the very idea of it.

Thus emerging suddenly, full-blown like Athena, after decades of isolation and with strength unimagined in any other time or place, it is not surprising that the isolationist background of the United States produced irrationalities in our efforts to cope with this unfamiliar and hostile world. In some ways, it is surprising that we did as well as we have done. For there were limits on our irrationality, which, after all, was not much greater than anybody else's. Maybe we saw reality dimly, but we were not altogether out of touch with it. Maybe we had illusions of near-omnipotence, but they were not of absolute omnipotence. Maybe we suffered confusion about idealism and realism, but not complete confusion. Maybe domestic politics took us into irresponsible foreign policy positions, but they were not totally irresponsible. On all sides, and in all political parties there were leaders who, if they did not clearly perceive the path, at least perceived the awful pitfalls; who, if they did not stand for enough restraint, at least stood for some. And as the harsh impact of the real world crowded down on us, we began, however slowly, to make progress in our adjustment to it.

Today, however, the limits on our irrationality have been challenged. Isolationism has been joined, not only by unrestrained participationism-interventionism but also by total irresponsibility. There has been a return to the know-nothings of more than a century ago, but this time concentrating on foreign policy. What we are now faced with is the danger not only of isolationism-participationism but isolationism-participationism-know-nothingism. I refer, of course, to the platform of the 1964 Republican Party adopted in San Francisco. Up until now, the irrationalities of our foreign policy have not been a fundamental issue of domestic politics. Neither party has had a monopoly on irrationality, nor has either party had a monopoly on those elements of wisdom, commonsense, and restraint that from time to time have found their way into American foreign policy. Indeed, despite the dangerous peccadilloes of John Foster Dulles, an objective analyst might find more of these elements in the Eisenhower years than in the years immediately preceding or following.

The recent Republican convention changed all that. With the takeover by the know-nothings, the proposed Republican foreign policy is a nightmarish parody of a foreign policy based on ignorance, wild emotion, and unrestrained arrogance. I am sympathetic with many of the aims of this platform. But as written, almost every foreign policy plank in it constitutes a rejection of fact and reality or a violation of the most elementary principles of international politics, and a good many manage to do both at the same time. It is a document so incredible that one could not take it seriously were it not so dangerous. And when seen in the context of foreign policy utterances of the party's new standard bearer, it is even more dangerous.

Now I earnestly hope that my remarks about the Republican platform will not be misunderstood in any narrow partisan sense. This is not a political speech. It is with considerable reluctance that I use harsh adjectives about the platform of one of the major parties of the United States. But I could not be true to myself as a scholar, or as a citizen, if I permitted the ideas formulated at San Francisco to go undescribed for what they are just because they are in a party platform. The Republican platform is far more than a partisan matter, and most assuredly I do not speak about it from the standpoint of partisan politics, any more than do the increasing number of Republican leaders who do not go along with it. This platform is of the greatest national concern, and to every citizen. For almost every plank of it could jeopardize the interests of the United States—no matter how you conceive them—and jeopardize the rest of the world as well. If it be part of Communist strategy to extend its influence and isolate the United States, then the foreign policy parts of the Republican platform would constitute the greatest boon to communism since the Russian revolution. Even on its own wild premises, the platform does not stand up. Far from rallying the nations of the world to a crusade for freedom or anything else, it is a recipe for isolation in its worst sense—unilateral American military intervention all over the globe, without allies. It would undo all the slight advances that have been made toward getting out of the dangerous cold war morass, and then proceed to take us closer and closer down the path to thermonuclear war and destruction.

Now in making this strong condemnation of the Republican platform, I do not wish to question the motives of the men who made it. That they are ignorant is obvious, but, as I said earlier, ignorance is no monopoly of the Republicans. Essentially they, those who made the platform, are extreme products of irrationalities and frustrations produced by our past policies, both Republican and Democratic alike. Both Democrats and Republicans are responsible for the anti-Communist hysteria which has left deep marks on our thinking. Both are responsible for the deep misunderstandings of the nature of Soviet communism under which we labor. Both are responsible for our tendency to treat communism as a passing phenomenon over which right combined with might can triumph, rather than a lasting phenomenon that must be coped with. Both are responsible for our hopes of "winning" the cold war. Both are responsible for the unrealities of our Far Eastern policy. Both are responsible for our confusion between compromise and appeasement. Both are responsible for our fixation with security through thermonuclear overkill capacity. And it is out of these irrationalities that the frustrated know-nothings of San Francisco, in the name of victory and democracy, produced their incredible recipe for the defeat of freedom and democracy and their destruction.

It would be bad enough if all this were simply deceit, to fool the people, to get votes, to outbid the Democrats in the American game of "I'm more anti-Communist than you are." But worse still, I fear, is the fact: all indications are that the standard bearer of the Republican Party and his henchmen who wrote the platform are sincere. I do not even doubt their sincerity when they engage in what seems to be pure doubletalk, such as urging an increase in our military apparatus, preparing for war, reducing Government expenses and decentralizing Government, all at the same time.

Nor when they boast on the one hand that they will never surrender any American interests to the United Nations and then—in the same breath, as it were—call for a method of voting in the General Assembly based on population. Can they, one wonders, be oblivious of the fact that—despite their opposition—Communist China is certain to come into the U.N., sooner or later, and that even without China it would be easily possible to muster a far greater population aggregate against us than for us? The answer is yes, they can be oblivious to it; for those who could, with sincerity, draft the rest of the foreign policy planks in the platform, are capable of any other inanities as well.

Then there is this repetitive use of the word "freedom" in the platform. What does it mean? Does it have a single meaning? Does it mean the same to an American, to a Chinese, to a Vietnamese, to an African? I well remember when Senator GOLDWATER was here in Claremont a short 3 years ago. He talked then a great deal about freedom. The Algerian war was then in progress, and the Senator, like some French extremists, apparently saw in it a Communist plot. He rejected any sympathy, let alone help, for the Algerian nationalists in these words: "What we must be for is freedom. The interest of freedom must always be first. If the Algerians have to wait for independence in the interests of freedom, this is too bad but freedom comes first." Nobody thought to ask Senator GOLDWATER freedom for whom and from what, and apparently then, as in San Francisco, the question didn't occur to him either.

It is for this nameless and amorphous freedom, it seems, that Senator GOLDWATER and his fellow know-nothings think they must be faced with Armageddon. There is no question to them that they will be fighting a holy war. "The struggle today," Senator GOLDWATER told a reporter for the German magazine Der Spiegel, "is a struggle between Godless people and the people of God, and if you want to put it in its basic form, it's between slavery and freedom. It's now worldwide. I claim that one cannot live with these two philosophies forever. Sometime there'll be only one."

One institution that has had a good deal of experience with holy wars is the Vatican, and if there were, in fact, a struggle between "Godless people and the people of God," one would think the Pope would know about it. Yet if one seeks an absolute contrast to the views of the Republican platform and its standard bearer, let him examine the measured plea for coexistence made by that great ecclesiastical statesman, Pope John XXIII, in his Encyclical, Pacem in Terris. "All political communities are of equal natural dignity," wrote Pope John, "since they are bodies whose membership is made up of these same human beings." And then he urged: "Spare no labor in order to ensure that world events follow a reasonable and human course. In the highest and most authoritative assemblies, let men give serious thought to the problem of a peaceful adjustment of relations between political communities on a world level * * *."

Now the basic, fundamental and indisputable fact of international politics in 1964 is—as Pope John knew—if either the Soviet system or ours wants to exist, they must, for the long-run future, coexist. They must either achieve a detente and make progress toward disarmament, or the dangers of their mutual destruction will increase by arithmetic if not geometric proportion. The interest of the United States simply cannot be served in any real and ultimate sense unless we are able to reach the necessary understandings with Moscow. This does not mean that we have to give up any basic interests fundamental to our security or that they do. There is every reason to believe that such an arrangement is possible. The Soviet leaders have adapted themselves to the realities of the thermonuclear world. They clearly seek a detente. We are not obligated to accept their terms for it, but we are obligated—if we want our Nation and its ideals to survive, let alone flourish—to make compromises in areas that are not basic to our interests. President Kennedy came to realize this, and the great tragedy of his assassination, apart from the poignant personal part, was that he appeared to be on the verge of doing something about it. President Johnson realizes it, and there has been reason to hope that, once the need for politicking is behind him, he too, will try to do something about it. Many Republican leaders have recognized it also, this truth that we must live with the Russians or not live at all. One can argue about methods, and it is proper that we should—about how we should get on with it, where we should stand firm, where we should compromise, how far we should go toward disarming and when. But the Republican platform rejects, flatly and absolutely, the idea itself.

The platform calls for the military assertion of global American interests including, indeed, dismemberment of the Soviet Union itself and elimination of whatever influence the U.S.S.R. might have outside of whatever borders Senator GOLDWATER might see fit to leave it. Such a policy would be morally indefensible even if we had the power to make it meaningful. The United States has no God-given right to police the world or to determine what kinds of social and political systems other people shall have. It is dubious that attempts to do so could in fact promote our ideals: certainly some of our efforts to date have been less than edifying. Even more clearly it would not serve the interests of the United States. But the indisputable fact is, in any event that we do not have the power to do it even if it were desirable. To say this is not defeatism—we can well take care of ourselves and our own—but it is simply a recognition of the hard, cold facts of thermonuclear life and death. To assert the contrary, as does the San Francisco platform is worse than know-nothingism; it is megalomania run riot.

Those who wrote the platform call for the United States to reassert its leadership by repairing NATO and other alliances, and then they set forth a policy that could not better guarantee the desertion of our allies were it designed specifically for that purpose. No matter how much our allies may join us in opposing communism, not a single one of them would be willing to risk its fate—and the world's—in a global crusade led by an atomic juvenile delinquent.

One cannot quarrel with the desire to take the initiative in the cold war, but the initiative called for in the Republican platform is the initiative of lemmings, intent on their own mass destruction.

The very assertion by a major American political party of foreign policy goals demanding dismemberment of the Soviet Union is a fundamental disservice to the interests of the United States. One of the great hopes we have is in the revision in Soviet Communist doctrine about war and peace made by Khrushchev. Fortunately, the Russians have in the last few years acquired some sophistication about American politics, but even so, it would not be surprising now, in light of the San Francisco platform if Khrushchev has a few second thoughts about how much the American people do support a policy of detente. After all, the Republicans came within a few votes of victory in 1960. Khrushchev's approach to the matter of coexistence is bitterly opposed by the Chinese, and they have supporters throughout the Communist movement including, doubtless, in the U.S.S.R. Khrushchev's inability to reach substantive agreements with the United States, even given our present policy, has strengthened his hard-line Communist opponents. Can there be any doubt that if Senator GOLDWATER were elected on the San Francisco platform, they would be so strengthened as to threaten seriously the present Soviet policy of accommodation? The platform says, rightly, I think, that we should not take sides in the Soviet-Chinese dispute, but its whole foreign policy could not give a better assist to the Chinese if it had been written in Peiping.

Of course, all these matters are complicated, while the world of the San Francisco platform is foursquare and simple. What does not fit it is simply rejected. One of the most significant developments in the last 10 years has been the breakup of Communist monolithism, the rise of Communist nationalism and the appearance of important differences among the various Communist countries. The Republican platform not only ignores but at the same time denies this development altogether. Communism there, is an even more amorphous concept than freedom. The platform's treatment of communism would have been wrong enough 10 years ago; today it is simply ridiculous.

Now none of this discussion anticipates much close cooperation and friendship between the United States and the Soviet Union, in any event. Come what may, we are adversaries in a grand competition, nor is there anything so unusual about this. It is a competition that we can't win, in any absolute sense of doing something so that, suddenly, there won't be any communism any more, but it is a competition that we don't have to lose either, if we act on the basis of wisdom, reality, perseverance, and restraint. Indeed, our strength in this competition is great, up to now so great that I see only two ways in which we can lose. One would be thermonuclear war. The other would be the enactment into policy of the Republican Party platform, and the two dangers may well be intimately related. I do not consider the Soviet Union a danger in a military sense, but communism, as a philosophy and as a method of organization, could endanger us if it were to sweep the world. I should say, however, that at the moment this is a danger far less acute than that posed by the Republican platform.

I hope I have made it clear that I would consider it a catastrophe of the first magnitude for the United States—and for human progress—were this know-nothing-isolationist-extremist platform ever to be implemented. There probably is not much likelihood that it will be. One cannot have even a little faith in the American people and say anything else. On the other hand, we must face the fact that the Republican platform was produced out of the isolationist-participationist climate of American life, and one can't conclude, therefore, that it will have no support.

Again, I want to emphasize that I am not in anyway speaking from the standpoint of partisan politics. I am not totally out of sympathy with Senator GOLDWATER's desires for economy, private enterprise, and restricted Government power. I can well appreciate his yearning to escape from the hard world of the 1960's. How pleasant it would be if only we could return to the 1890's, and I do not say this sarcastically. But alas, barring a time machine, it can't be done. Were it not for the Republican platform's extreme positions on foreign policy, I would not dream of speaking out here against it in this manner, regardless of my private views. I hold no brief for the policies of the Democratic Party, and I have repeatedly criticized many of them, sometimes from this very podium. I cannot conceive that the Democratic platform will prove to be any paragon of political virtue or wisdom, and should it degenerate to anything like the Republican platform, I shall attack it likewise.

Ordinarily in an election, the intelligent, conscientious voter, regardless of party, will weigh the candidates and their platforms before making a choice. But I would be less than honest if I did not say that I can imagine no intelligent, conscientious American, whatever his political affiliation, who will not oppose utterly anything like the San Francisco platform and those who support it, irrespective of party. We shall soon have a test, and the results will show us, and the world, how many such Americans there are, and how strong the know-nothing extremists are. In a very real way, the test may be that of the viability of the American political system itself.

C. L. Sulzberger, writing of the Republican Convention the other day in the New York Times, quoted Karl Marx as saying: "History repeats itself first as a tragedy, then as a farce." And Sulzberger commented: "Here we have the farce first." One can only add: May God spare us the tragedy.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 26, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your comments on CBS radio, Tuesday, August 25. We commend your courage in coming out with the truth. It's too bad you are in the minority in our Congress. This country is badly in need of courageous commentary so that the public which is uninformed and badly informed by the press should somehow get to know the truth about our immoral foreign policy.

Thanks again and keep up the good work. There are many who agree with you—you are not alone.

Very truly yours,

ADOLPH FRIED.

MARLITH, MICH.,
August 10, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please send me a copy of your recent speech concerning the American attack on the North Vietnamese.

I would also appreciate any other material you have which gives your position on America's involvement in southeast Asia.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

(Rev.) EDWIN L. KNOPF.

P.S.—I admire your independence and your willingness to speak your mind on these matters.

THE RILEY ROCK SHOP, INC.,
Springfield, Ohio, August 10, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have long had an admiration for you for being one lawmaker that had the courage to speak out for what you thought was right. You have now voiced the same doubt I had in my mind, and that is that there is a very good chance that the United States had been the provocateur in the recent North Vietnam situation. In fact, I had been looking for just this thing to happen, for a nephew of mine, a West Point graduate, had been ordered into intensive training several months ago. He is now in South Vietnam. Of course, he is not an isolated case, for they don't train just one man at a time.

May I have a copy of the speech you made in the Senate in opposition to granting the President power to intervene at his discretion? What is the point? What are we doing over there anyhow, mixing into the affairs of other people? We're not saving the world from communism. It is steadily advancing. Some more positive measures will have to be taken than allowing them to take two steps forward, then stepping back one.

Thanking you in advance, I am

Yours truly,

Mrs. JAMES W. RILEY.

ELKINS PARK, PA.,
August 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Although I previously understood that the United States of America was fighting this current war in Vietnam for the preservation of freedom and to withstand the further enslavement of the peoples of the world by the Communist threat, recent statements which you made have forced me to reconsider the role of the United States in the East.

To end this confusion that has resulted from utterly contradicting statements, I would greatly appreciate any factual information which you would be so kind to send me or any other reliable sources of information to which you might direct me, concerning this most grave situation.

I have the honor to remain,

Yours very truly,

STEVEN L. KEROES.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Recently I heard your talk before the City Club. I find that I agree with your views on the Vietnam situation, at least those I heard in your speech and based on the facts you presented.

It seems to me that, under the present circumstances, we have no business there alone.

It also appears that the administration or at least some of its representatives are trying to whip up enthusiasm for an invasion of North Vietnam. The same kind of publicity campaign was staged prior to the First World War by those who wanted the American people to accept the United States entering the war.

If we got our ships out of the places where they have no business at this time and stop beating the tom-toms we will have no occasion to retaliate for a PT boat attack.

The purpose of this letter was not to tell you things you already know, but to tell you that a Republican supports your position and to give you encouragement.

Yours very truly,

PETER VOORHIES.

CAMPBELL, CALIF.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Although I am not one of your constituents, nevertheless I would like to commend you on the stand you and Senator GRUENING have taken opposing the extraordinary powers given to our President L. B. Johnson.

I wish the Senators of our State would have the same intestinal fortitude you have shown.

Sincerely yours,

ANNA B. KRIESFELD.

POINT PLEASANT, PA.,
August 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator From the State of Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am greatly impressed by many of the ideas which you express so clearly and fearlessly. I am indebted to you for your article, "Humpty Dumpty in Vietnam," from the Progressive (to which I subscribe). In a situation where news is edited to favor status quo decisions, every breach in the wall of silence is precious to us all.

There are three people here who discuss your expressions with deep concern and belief in their immediacy and relevance. We would greatly appreciate it if you could send us any sampling of your thoughts that may be printed up for distribution by your office.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

VAL SIGSTEDT.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 31, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I've wanted to write to express my admiration for you and the courage you've shown in shedding light on the sordid—and sadly obscured—truth about the ghastly situation we've been embroiled in in Vietnam. It means a very great deal to know that there is a voice to affirm the truth, the reality about the corruption we've been supporting with enormous funds and now ever more lives in that antithesis of democracy, South Vietnam.

Many thanks for your affirmation of a—of late—badly befuddled ideal; yours is the true Americanism.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) SANDRA WALLACE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 28, 1964.

THE NEW YORK TIMES,
229 West 43d Street,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: I was astonished to read at the conclusion of one of your articles on the demonstrations in South Vietnam (Danang Rioters Hit U.S.-Run Hospital, Aug. 27, 1964) that "Authorities made an effort to calm the mobs last night by simulating a North Vietnamese air raid. The bands thinned out but reformed this morning."

Since no Communist air power has yet been used over South Vietnam, either by the Vietcong, the Chinese, or the North Vietnamese, one wants to know in more detail exactly how the authorities "simulated" a North Vietnamese air raid. Did they drop bombs and strafe their own people? Did they paint North Vietnamese insignia on South Vietnamese planes?

Which authorities were responsible?

Finally, if North Vietnamese air raids have been simulated to calm South Vietnamese mobs, will they also be simulated to justify "retaliation" by U.S. planes against North Vietnam? Is it beyond doubt that North Vietnamese torpedo boat attacks were simulated for just that purpose?

The Times and the "authorities" owe us a more detailed explanation.

Yours truly,

STEVE SELTZER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 27, 1964.

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

SIR: Your statements in the Senate and in the Progressive (August 1964) have shed new light for me on our present involvement in Vietnam. In them I believe you have irrefutably demonstrated the fallacy of our policy in South Vietnam by pointing to the disparity between this policy and our fundamental commitment to the right of self-determination for all nations.

I extend my sincere respect and admiration for your courage to give voice to unpopular beliefs in these troubled times.

Sincerely,

RICHARD F. CONRAT.

BRIGHTON, MASS.,
August 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Once again I feel compelled to write a letter of congratulations to you on your vote on the Vietnam statement by the President. I agree with you that a peaceful settlement of some sort must be reached. The current civilian unrest there proves your recent statements. I feel happy that there are at least two Members of Congress with courage.

I would be interested in hearing your views on the NATO nuclear force which we propose. I am against it as it seems only to spiral the arms buildup in Europe. It also brings the nuclear weapons that much closer to Germany which I fear greatly as a military power.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. TARPEY.

AUGUST 7, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May we congratulate you for your sane and forthright stand on Vietnam. We have long been dismayed over U.S. foreign policy in southeast Asia. We heartily endorse your refusal to go along with the joint resolution supporting Johnson's moves against North Vietnam. You might be interested to hear that at a June meeting of academicians at Lewis and Clark College ("The First Northwest Faculty Seminar on Problems of War and Peace") the members unanimously rejected U.S. policy in South Vietnam as unsound politically, legally, militarily, and morally.

May we also compliment you on your trenchant article in the August issue of the Progressive and on your views on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964, especially those pertaining to military assistance.

We will reproduce portions of the Progressive article and distribute it throughout our town. Thank you again.

Respectfully yours,

BRUCE ANAWALT.
LORETTA ANAWALT.

P.S.—Please pass on to Nancy my very best wishes and let her know that I have been teaching at Washington State University for 4 years now. I have heard some news of her and am pleased she is doing well. Thank you.

B. A.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Democratic Convention Headquarters,
Courtel Motel, Coos Bay, Oreg.:

Support you on your position on Vietnam. Hope that State Democratic convention does likewise.

RUSS FARRELL.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
State Democratic Convention,
Coos Bay, Oreg.:

We urge you to pass a resolution condemning the shameful war in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. LARRY E. MEDINGER.

GRESHAM, OREG.,
July 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Courtel Motel,
Coos Bay, Oreg.:

DEAR SENATOR: We beg you to continue your courageous fight to bring U.S. military home from southeast Asia.

MARK and CORINNE CHAMBERLIN.

GRESHAM, OREG.,
July 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Courtel Motel,
Coos Bay, Oreg.:

Congratulations on growing support for your good stand against our involvement Vietnam.

CLARENCE BERGQUIST,
Chairman, Methodist Federation,
Gresham.

MORSE PRAISED

TO THE EDITOR: Senator WAYNE MORSE is performing a valuable service for the American people. He appears to be the only U.S. Senator who has not succumbed to the hysteria carefully cultivated by the Johnson administration during the recent Gulf of Tonkin incident.

His role in the present southeast Asia crisis is similar to the role performed by Senator Robert M. LaFollette, of Wisconsin, during the hysteria that dragged the United States into a war that was supposed to "make the world safe for democracy" in 1917. It should be pointed out that Senator MORSE is a native of Wisconsin and was raised in the fighting liberal tradition of old Bob LaFollette.

Senator MORSE is absolutely correct in his assertion that the U.S. Government is indeed seeking a predated declaration of war. The congressional resolution desired by the Johnson administration would be a carte blanche for any future fait accompli that the State Department and the Pentagon might present to the American people in the future.

Apparently we are now entering a new era of international anarchy where governments will first act against each other without exhausting peaceful remedies for the resolution of disputes. It is an unpleasant truth to contemplate but the United States has now decided that a Pearl Harbor approach to the resolution of international disputes is sometimes justified.

Senator MORSE deserves the gratitude of the American people for his fight against the Pearl Harbor approach. He is a man among sheep.

ROBERT E. NORDLANDER,
Menasha, Wis.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 6, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I commend you with all my heart for your courageous stand on the Vietnam situation. I only hope other elected representatives will follow your lead.

I agree with your view that there is a civil war going on in South Vietnam and we are interfering in the internal affairs of that country.

I've sent telegrams protesting the involvement of American troops in Vietnam to President Johnson, California Representatives James Roosevelt and Charles H. Wilson, also Senator Thomas H. Kuchel.

My personal opinion is that President Johnson will commit political suicide and not only lose the election but the respect of the American people if he follows the Goldwater line, which is to escalate this so-called war further north. His alternative is to be honest with himself and the American people and present this entire dispute before the United Nations or to use the methods you recommended for solution to the southeast Asian problem.

The local newspapers do not always print what you say on Vietnam so would appreciate copies of your speeches regarding this subject so I may publicize your stand and get my friends and others to see the light and spur them into action.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. MAE LEVIN.

RIDGEFIELD, N.J.,
August 26, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I thought I would take this opportunity to congratulate you on the fine stand you have taken on so many issues, and especially on the speech you gave condemning our meddling in Vietnam. I feel that you are the conscience of Congress and I regret that a man of your integrity should not now be acclaimed our next President. I have followed your course in Congress for many years, and you echoed what I felt I would have done if I were in your place. May the sanity evinced by you spread to other responsible Members that they may return our Government to pathways consistent with Christianity.

Sincerely,

CHARLES WOODROW LAUBER.

MODESTO, CALIF.,
August 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Want to express my appreciation for your forthright stand in regard to our involvement in southeast Asia. There must be many more among your colleagues who agree with you but are afraid of political lightning.

I would like to know how much, in the estimation of our military or the CIA, support has General Khanh among the South Vietnamese. From what little information available here it is exceedingly small. Would also like to know if Secretary McNamara is sure that the attack on the *Maddox* and *C. Turner Joy* on the night of August 4 was not perpetrated by General Khanh's gunboats in order to involve us deeper and thereby make his own position more secure. It would not surprise me if he should use such shenanigans.

It is very disconcerting to reflect on what kind of regimes we are keeping in power by our foreign aid. It seems to me that we would be better off in every way if we used that money for slum clearance in Harlem and other cities. There is so much that needs to be done in order to alleviate those pressing problems here at home.

Hoping that you will send the information requested in the second paragraph above. With the very best of wishes, I am,

Yours for more sanity,

STEFAN C. CHARNESKI.

ASHBY, MASS.,
August 23, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I was glad to learn that two U.S. Senators had the courage of their convictions and voted against endorsement of President Johnson's orders to the Navy in the recent Tonkin Bay affair.

I do not like what we are doing in South Vietnam. I cannot believe that our policy there is helping to preserve peace or build democracy there.

The common people, as usual, are the sufferers.

Why are we not giving some consideration to President de Gaulle's suggestion that efforts be made to establish a neutral region in southeast Asia? Or are we? How can we begin to support the ordinary peasants rather than the elite ruling class? How can the shooting be stopped?

Sincerely,

DOROTHY T. WILDER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 22, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you for your steadfast opposition to the undeclared war in Vietnam.

It is unfortunate that in the U.S. Senate there are only two courageous Senators that have the courage of their conviction to speak out against a war that we have no business to be in, and it is the best interest of the American people and the world to pull out of it.

In this nuclear age the only way to resolve differences is by negotiations and we surely have the instruments to do just that. Keep up your humanitarian fight for a world of peace and brotherhood.

Very truly,

ESTHER BECKER.

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

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

I approve and endorse your position regarding the war in South Vietnam.

STEVE WILK.

WALLED LAKE, MICH.,
July 31, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: All praise for your valiant fight against flagrant U.S. aggression in Vietnam. Keep up the good work. The reason you don't hear from me oftener is I'm so busy bombarding the L.B.J.-Rusk-McNamara war machine with protests I can't find the time. (Copies to Michigan Senators and Representatives.)

Senator GRUENING has sent me his speeches on the subject from March 10 to July 2, 1964—the fullest review I've read, though I've been a steady reader of the National Guardian since its beginning, and am also an earnest reader of Monthly Review, New World Review, and the Minority of One, which do their best to dispel the blackout of the representative press.

I would appreciate receiving all of your speeches on the subject, past and future, you will send. I read it all most studiously.

Can't you and Senator GRUENING and other valiant soldiers for peace and conversion to a U.S. economy to nonmilitary production, get a new party going with this long overdue objective?

Respectfully yours,

R. P. BREDE.

Names of others who would value copies of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with your Vietnam speeches:

Rev. Colin D. Keys, Shanton, Iowa; Mrs. Sylvia Trulin, Howell, Mich.; Dr. and Mrs. E. C. Bancroft, Hamilton, N.Y.; Miss Judith Bancroft, Arlington, Va.; Mr. Alexander Brede III, East Lansing, Mich.; Dr. Robert Peebles, Oberlin, Ohio; Mr. and Mrs. Alec Krater, Independence, Calif.

JOURNAL SUPPORTS MORSE

To the EDITOR:

As Friends, we wish to express our grave concern regarding the situation in South Vietnam—a situation particularly tragic to the Vietnamese people.

We urge the placing of the entire Vietnam situation before the United Nations and the withdrawal of U.S. military forces from this area of southeast Asia as soon as United Nations personnel can be assigned.

We strongly support and commend Oregon's Senator WAYNE MORSE for his forthright stand and his outspoken desire to correct this phase of U.S. foreign policy.

Likewise, the Oregon State Democratic Platform Committee is to be commended for supporting the position of Senator MORSE.

As events of the recent weeks have demonstrated, we are fast approaching a point of no return. Immediate steps must be taken to neutralize this area of conflict.

ESTHER RICHARDS, *Clerk.*
ROBERT MORRIS SMITH,
Chairman, Peace and Social Service Committee, Religious Society of Friends.

CHALLENGE TO PRESS

To the EDITOR:

It has been an open secret now for several months that our Government was seriously considering an extension of the war in South Vietnam into the north. At the same time the American people have been kept unaware of the day-by-day progress of U.S. involvement of Vietnam and of the most recent policy decisions of the Government. Now a resolution is demanded of Congress, on the basis of the "Tonkin incidents," delegating the power to make war in that area for an indefinite period of time to this same administration.

To this point, only Senator MORSE has opposed this unnecessary and, in my judgment, indefensible policy. There has been no investigation of the supposed "aggression" of North Vietnam, nor of the ulterior designs of the administration, in seeking this grant of extraordinary power. There is plenty of reason to doubt that the administration is telling the full truth about these "attacks." In particular, the American people do not know the prelude to the incident and the role of these same ships in aiding and abetting South Vietnam attacks on the coast and islands of the north.

Since it is not likely that Congress is going to question the policy of the administration and entirely unlikely that the Republican Party is going to give us a choice by making the Government give the full facts of the incident, that responsibility falls on the press.

It is incumbent on the press to demand the full facts, to present them to the American people and to reserve approval of this dangerous and covert policy until it has been discussed openly and fully.

In my opinion, the press has not given the American people the critical examination of this policy which it so badly needs.

J. L. TOBEY,
Tolovana Park.

TOO MUCH POWER

TO THE EDITOR: In your August 18 issue, Mr. Dearborn of Minneapolis made a broad-brush smear of our U.S. Senators. An answer to part of this attack is in order.

I support Senator MORSE in his opposition to the handling of the Vietnam crisis. There is a sound constitutional basis for this. The right to declare war or initiate acts of war is reserved to the Congress.

The right of our naval force to defend themselves against attack in international waters is unquestioned. When we go beyond this and launch an attack on another nation, then this should be authorized by the Congress. The hasty and unauthorized retaliation by the executive department was not warranted by the circumstances.

Time was available for our clear warning to North Vietnam by authorizing attacks on their supporting facilities in the event of a repeated attack. This would undoubtedly have discouraged further action on their part and dispelled the charges of "paper tiger" in Asia.

Unfortunately, congressional action came after our attack and goes too far. It yields to the President the power to engage in acts of war throughout all of southeast Asia. This resolution is a complete abdication of congressional responsibility in these matters and places no limitations on the President as to time, place, means or provocation. How will our President in 1984 use this power?

FRANK J. MIEHE,
Lake Oswego.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
August 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your stand on Vietnam. While you stand almost alone in the Senate, you have helped keep alive the possibilities for a further examination of our policy in southeast Asia.

Sincerely,

F. RICHARD SINGER, III.

WHITTIER, CALIF.,
August 25, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is my opportunity to compliment you for what I consider a very courageous stand, in your recent criticism of the resolution which supported President Johnson and our provocative action in the Gulf of Tonkin. You were obviously in the minority, so far as the vote in the Senate was concerned but, so far as popular support from "the people," I am sure you had many, many supporters.

I personally am very much concerned with the trend of our present foreign policy. The United States seems bent on lending our support everywhere—whether or not it is requested.

It is my hope that our representatives in Washington, D.C., begin to realize that their actions involve the lives of human beings. It is admirable to be a fervent patriot and support our elected leaders, provided these leaders are realists as well as patriots.

Your position in the Senate has been unique and I personally have great admiration and respect for your stand on international problems. Keep up the good work. Although I can't vote for you personally as I am a resident of California, I support you whenever and wherever I can.

Sincerely yours,

R. W. SMEDUL.

SEVEN VALLEYS, PA.,
August 29, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just discovered yesterday that my letter to you of August 7 was in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and found this most heartening—I hope it will do some good there. I have not given up yet on our policy in Vietnam. Last Saturday I participated in a demonstration on Vietnam locally and Tuesday I was in the Vietnam demonstration in Atlantic City. I am also enclosing a carbon of a letter I have just written to Senator CLARK.

During our local demonstration we handed out one-page sheets quoting you and Senator GRUENING and urging people to wire or write the President, Senators, Congressmen. You may have seen the sheets handed out in Atlantic City—attempting to present the facts that too many are unaware of. Unfortunately too often the response is like that of one man in Atlantic City who saw the large type at the top of the page, crumpled it up without reading it, and told me I was a Communist. He didn't want the facts and was darned if he was going to let anyone tell him the facts. But it was heartening too to have many people say warmly "I agree with you." Often these were people unlikely to write to their Senators or Congressmen, but who knew that war is not the way to change men's minds.

So—let's keep trying.

Best wishes,

LINDA SMITH.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your bold and courageous stand in your TV appearance last week, your sincere opinions expressing grave concern over our country's involvement in the South Vietnam war and the warning that this participation may bring about a major war in east Asia, was most heartening and found a deeply felt response in the hearts and minds of the American people. Especially, in the hearts of our mothers, who do not want to see their sons killed in a senseless war in Vietnam.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING from Alaska was so right when he said, and we quote, "all Vietnam is not worth the life of one American."

We, the listeners, were most proud of you, Senator, as well as of Senator GRUENING, and we wish to commend you on your stand in protesting the unjust slaughter of human beings.

Let us hear your voice raised in strong protest, again. You are not alone in this fight. Thousands of Americans are with you. We hope, that with the help of people like you, peace will be achieved.

Most sincerely yours,

HYMAN MOSKOWITZ.

CORTLAND, N.Y.,
August 21, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an American citizen I would like to thank you for the independent position that you and Senator GRUENING have taken on the war in Vietnam. If the press reports that I have seen accurately reflect your views, I am 100 percent in agreement with the position you have taken. I would appreciate it very much if your secretary could send me some material from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in regard to the southeast Asian problem and in regard to your position on foreign aid.

Let us hope that in the very near future that peace can be restored in this wartorn area.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. BARKER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 22, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your bold and courageous stand in your TV appearance last week, your sincere opinions expressing grave concern over our country's involvement in the South Vietnam war and the warning that this participation may bring about a major war in east Asia, was most heartening and found a deeply felt response in the hearts and minds of the American people. Especially, in the hearts of our mothers, who do not want to see their sons killed in a senseless war in Vietnam.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, from Alaska, was so right when he said, and we quote, "all Vietnam is not worth the life of one American."

We, the listeners, were most proud of you Senator, as well as of Senator GRUENING, and we wish to commend you on your stand in protesting the unjust slaughter of human beings.

Let us hear your voice raised in strong protest, again. You are not alone in this fight. Thousands of Americans are with you. We hope, that with the help of people like you, peace will be achieved.

Most sincerely yours,

M. GINSTOSS.

NANUET, N.Y.,
September 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: From time to time, I read small excerpts in the New York Times, from your speeches, which I find exceedingly interesting. Likewise, I read some excerpts of your address on August 5, with reference to South Vietnam, which I found very informative and an analysis one doesn't get in the daily press, radio, or TV. I would, therefore, appreciate so very, very much, a copy of your entire talk. And so would some of my friends who likewise have been saddened by our young men, who have bravely given their lives, and have questioned "why?"

I am therefore enclosing a list of their names and addresses, who likewise, like Diogenes are seeking the truth. Will you please put us on your mailing list and send us a copy of your entire address of August 5, referred to above? I notice that Senator GRUENING of Alaska, likewise voted against the resolution, and I am therefore mailing him a copy of this letter.

Thank you, and with every good wish, believe me.

Very sincerely,

(Mrs.) ROSE PORTAL.

J. Herbert Allatt, Nanuet, N.Y.; M. Ackman, New York City; P. Campoli, Nanuet, N.Y.; P. D'Addeo, Monsey, N.Y.; M. Dickstein, Nanuet, N.Y.; Dr. and Mrs. Edelstein, Nanuet, N.Y.; V. Eismont, Spring Valley, N.Y.; Dr. N. C. Fine, Nanuet, N.Y.; Dr. E. Garbus, Spring Valley, N.Y.; J. Garfinkel, Bronx, New York City; Dr. H. Grushkin, Nanuet, N.Y.; Mr. and Mrs. S. Gurlitz, W. Nyack, N.Y.; F. R. Horn, Pearl River, N.Y.; Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Kapelner, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Alex Kelter, Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y.; Dr. and Mrs. H. W. Lubetsky, Pamona, N.Y.; Mr. Lance Malkind, Pearl River, N.Y.; Mrs. Helen Lucas, Radburn, N.J.; Dr. and Mrs. G. Morlan, Pearl River, N.Y.; Dr. and Mrs. H. L. Sperling, Suffern, N.Y.; Mr. Thomas Theise, Pearl River, N.Y.; Mr. and Mrs. J. B. Wiggenhorn, Valley Cottage, N.Y.

YAKIMA, WASH.,
August 18, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is hard to put into words our appreciation for your dissenting vote when President Johnson asked for the resolution to step up the Vietnam war.

Thank God for you and Senator GRUENING who stood on conscience. It seems as if the rest of Congress is like a flock of sheep.

My husband is away on business at the present, and I have been ill is the reason for neglecting to get this note of thanks to you. He and I have been alarmed at our policy in Vietnam and admired your stand.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. M. E. HERR.

RIDLEY PARK, PA.,
August 22, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I have already congratulated you on your wonderful stand in opposition to the official Vietnam policy. However in talking to my friends I find that most of them are very ignorant of the most elementary facts of the situation. Would it be possible for your office to send me about 50 copies of your speech in opposition to President Johnson's resolution.

As a member of the Philadelphia Orchestra I travel a great deal and am anxious to distribute your speech to many people.

Wishing you continued strength and increased success I remain;

Very sincerely yours,

FRED BATCHELDER.

MADISON, WIS.,
August 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to heartily commend your vote against the Vietnamese resolution and your consistent stand against U.S. presence in southeast Asia. The questions you raise and the reasoning you present need the greatest support—I admire your sanity and courage.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. PETER WEISS.

ELSINORE, CALIF.,
August 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept our commendation of your speech on the Senate floor on August 5, 1964.

We agree with you wholeheartedly, and hereby express our thanks for your courageous stand on behalf of peace.

Respectfully yours,

ELSINORE JEWISH WOMEN'S READING CIRCLE.

Aida Beldner, Corresponding Secretary; Bertha Sideman, President; Dr. Rosa S. Warben, Mary Magnus, Anna Schultz, Mary Hafer, Bessie Zaretsky, Baina Rival, Zena Goldsmith, Rose Shapiro.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
August 22, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I cannot understand why so few people care about the truth in Vietnam. I am gratetful for your constant efforts to bring it to light and urge a realistic, nonwarlike policy—but I am terribly frightened as we become more and more aggressive, and no one seems to care.

Thank you for your efforts—I hope for my children's sake others will see and act by your light.

Sincerely,

Mrs. K. J. ACKERMAN.

WORCESTER, MASS.,
August 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my appreciation of your position and that of Senator GRUENING, on the Vietnam situation.

I wish that our Massachusetts Senators shared your views about our policy there, which is so disgraceful and dangerous to our country.

Respectfully,

THURSTON TAYLOR.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
August 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note to let you know that you have my support in your stand on our involvement in South Vietnam.

I lost a brother in Korea who died in support of a dictator, and the area is still under a dictatorship.

In South Vietnam the government is a military dictatorship. Up north the Communists have a dictatorship. So what choice is there. Is our side better than the Communists? I am 100 percent for pulling out of Vietnam. If the present government can't stay in power now, after several billions of

dollars of our military aid, then it deserves to fall.

Sincerely,

WALTER F. MANDICH.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
August 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for never disappointing me, in all these years of your senatorial record.

Your stand on Vietnam was heroic—and I approve—and applaud your vast courage in speaking out.

I'm a 47-year-old cynical citizen. My faith in the legislative process we have currently is sorely tried. Then you speak, and I feel if there is one Senator—you are the one.

Sounds a bit like a fan letter to the Beatles, but I do want you to know how sincerely I admire your bravery and clear-mindedness.

Currently, politics so sickens me that hearing you speak your mind is truly an oxygen treatment.

Thank you for just being you.

Sincerely,

HELEN BRIDGET TETLEU.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
September 5, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The enclosed letter to the editor I sent to the Evening Sun, and as you can see it was published in its entirety.

I am sending it to you to encourage you to keep up the good fight. So many of us are behind you.

I was recently a Republican candidate for the U.S. Congress from Maryland's Seventh District. I lost in the primary to a saber-rattling Goldwater Republican. Even though a Republican, I am supporting President Johnson in his campaign.

I sent a copy of this letter to the President also.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely,

SYLVAN M. SHANE.

WINTHROP, MASS.,
August 27, 1964.

MY DEAR MR. MORSE: Just a note to express my sincere appreciation of your stand on Vietnam. Yours seems to be the only voice raised in opposition to our big-bully policy there and I feel heartened each time you raise it. I don't know how we got ourselves into that mess, but I do know that more military force is not the way out of it. Can't vote for you—alas—living in Massachusetts, but I surely can send up many prayers for your support. Do what you can to dispel our vast misinformation about things, as it is now, and may heaven help you.

Most gratefully,

Mrs. FAITH B. WHITMAN.

BUENA PARK, CALIF.,
August 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Good for you. Are you the only man in the Senate with any sense? Or the only one with any courage? Or both? Whatever the case, I feel a moral obligation to let you know that I applaud and support your position on Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. CONSTANCE D. HADDAD.

PERKINS, OKLA.,
August 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to congratulate you upon your stand on the Vietnam question. You are so right.

I thank you for your courage in standing against the idiotic reaction of other supposedly peace-loving officials.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. C. B. STOUT.

GRANVILLE, MASS.,
July 7, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: No words can express my pride in knowing you and my thorough endorsement of your logic, historical data, your international law, and your practical and sane diplomacy.

Thank you for taking the open stand and the vote recording that you did. Please convey to Senator GRUENING my appreciation of his stand by word and vote.

Even if you speak to an empty house you have some who will hear you on the outside and many more who, in days yet to come, will learn of and commend your stand.

I have written my humble contribution to newspapers and to several Senators as well as to Ambassador Stevenson.

May I receive copies of your speeches if available and convenient?

Is there a grouping of opinions by competent lawyers and eminent citizens backing your arguments which it is possible for me to obtain and circulate? I will try to be responsible for circulation in my own town to the extent of 100 at $5 per mailing.

If that $5 can be used to better advantage otherwise, please command me.

Cordially,

HERMANN G. PATT.

SALT LAKE, UTAH,
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

MY GOOD BROTHER AND HONORED SIR: If, as the Good Book says, "being thy brothers keeper" be honorable, conscientious, and considerate of your fellowman then I hereby christen you "All-American of the U.S. Senate today." Were I in your shoes today I would oppose McNamara's war, and his "yes-men Senators" as do you; and I thank you for defending my sons, and other sons, against the danger of fertilizing Asiatic soil by their blood being spilled there.

From my humble position, I feel the U.S. Navy attempts to convert all of the Pacific into a yankee lake, to aline the crumbled British and French empires into U.S. colonies, of pouring billions of dollars into the Vietnam and forcing a war on China and Russia is only another Korean rathole that John Dulles engineered; and gives growing international evidence of the United States being the breeding ground of the worldwide wars, oppressors of the backward peoples, and wreckers of world peace; and very clearly outlines the bankrupt state of U.S. leadership and diplomacy.

Can one fail to see why "anti-yankee" agitators make such staggering gains in successfully maligning the United States and activating crowds (mobs?) to spit on Mr. Nixon in Caracas, or keep Mr. Eisenhower out of Japan?

Expanding war in Vietnam under a smoke screen of "stopping communism" only exposes the truth, the real truth, of U.S. design, debunks our boasts as "defenders of the free world (?)," and will make China the protector of Asia from the "Godly" (?) western (Christian ?) United States.

As we sow, we shall reap. Henry A. Wallace said "don't send tanks, guns, and planes to the prostrated nations—but send seed, plows, and food to them." Voice of sanity. Today, with two-thirds of humanity "anti-yankee" and many others leaning that way, we face the necessity of nuclear incineration for our opponents—or cease the "fire and death" prescription of "Dr. McNamara" and his coterie of collaborators—Which will others of the NATO choose? Certainly not war.

One more Hiroshima and U.S. prestige is in irreparable discard, the vaunted leadership is repudiated and U.S. "sphere of influence" shrinks to our shoreline.

To one of your grasp of facts, I can only falter in your shadow, but may I implore God to give you the wisdom of the ages and fortitude of Atlas, that your good efforts prevail to turn the Senate from war, to a humble appreciation of, and application to, our social needs.

I will appreciate 20 copies of your last statements in the Senate against the naval and military acts in Asia.

Thanking you, I am always,

Yours in respect,

JOE BIRD.

DUNREITH, IND.,
August 23, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A belated thank you for the stand you took, almost alone, on the Vietnam actions.

You have probably experienced a lot of hateful opposition on this account, and I want to add my encouragement and thanks for the service you are rendering by speaking what you consider to be the truth.

Sincerely,

PETER N. KIGER.

NEW WINDSOR, MD.,
August 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was much interested in your article in the August issue of Progressive "Humpty Dumpty in Vietnam." I guess I was not quite sure of the logic of your position from the newspaper accounts but this article is very informative. I would be interested in receiving any copies of speeches you might have made on the subject, if any are available. I have always respected your integrity ever since I remember seeing your billboards out in Oregon when you ran for the Senate back in 1944. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM P. NYCE.

STOCKTON, CALIF.,
August 30, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I don't feel as though my letter is going to have any bearing on the subject one way or another, but I do feel like I have the right as a voting citizen of the United States, to voice my opinion.

I do not feel like I am only speaking for myself, but thousands of other Americans

My topic is Vietnam.

I work in a large department store and talk with people, 5 days a week, from all walks of life, and I have yet to find one person who is in accord with our military being in Vietnam.

Aren't we doing just the opposite of what we said we would at the Geneva Conference?

Conditions in Vietnam have shown no improvement in the 5 years we have been over there. I feel like thousands of other Americans, that we are only a source of irritation by having our military dictating over there. I am sure that the Government of Vietnam could be more easily stabilized if we would pull our military out of there and deal with them on a roundtable discussion basis and helping them to achieve better and more peaceful living standards. Better schools, hospitals, various types of enterprises to create employment, better knowledge of agri-

culture and last but far from least to have unity and love for one another. This cannot be done with rifles and handgrenades.

Our military men are a source of rebellious contention with those people and they will resent that form of aggression as long as there is a Vietnam. I do not feel like we are exploiting ourselves as Christian Democrats in the methods we are using.

There is only one way to defeat communism and that is to show and prove to those people that there is a better and healthier way to live and again that cannot be done with the "Do as I say plan or we will kill you."

Maybe my whole understanding of this situation is wrong but that is the way thousands of Americans feel.

Why must we sacrifice any more of our sons, husbands, and brothers over there when nothing is to be accomplished by their sacrifices.

Please, Mr. MORSE, fight just a little harder and try and get our leaders to see and admit that they are making a costly mistake. There is no disgrace when you admit you are wrong but it is a disgrace to take any more lives of our American men. A Purple Heart or a citation of one kind or another is no reward to the loved ones of these men who gave their lives—for what?

Respectfully,

MRS. MOLLY MCGUIRE.

GOLETA, CALIF.,
August 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE: This little letter is written to remind you that those all-too-few Americans fortunate enough to be exposed to an undiluted portion of your political views steadfastly support your unswerving dedication to a peaceful world, as admirably seen in your Senate speech on the southeast Asia declaration.

Your example is a fitting addition to another chapter in profiles in courage.

We thank you,

BILL WILDE,
JACOB DEKKEN.

AUGUST 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I write to thank you for the incredibly courageous efforts you have been making to bring an open discussion of U.S. policy in southeast Asia (and elsewhere) to the Senate floor.

You stand as the greatest inspiration to those of us who are optimistic that the confrontation with communism will not produce world war III.

May I suggest that the Willard Matthias of CIA suggestion for negotiations may be an important opening in the direction of peace.

Thank you,

ROBERT O. DOYLE.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
September 2, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note of encouragement in line with your stand on the South Vietnam situation.

Sincerely,

WM. A. MYERS, M.D.

UNITED STATES DUTY BOUND TO TAKE VIETNAM ISSUE TO UNITED NATIONS, SAYS WAYNE MORSE

"I will repeat and repeat in the months to come," vowed Senator WAYNE MORSE, "that the United States cannot justify sending an American boy to his death on a battlefield in the absence of a declaration of war and without seeking first to settle the dispute in the United Nations.

"What is happening in South Vietnam is a threat to the peace of the world. That puts it under the jurisdiction of the United Nations. It is the clear duty of the United States to file a complaint before the United Nations in respect to the violation of the Geneva accords, and not to take unilateral military action, which action has intensified the threat to the peace of the world, flowing from the violation of the accords."

The above remarks of WAYNE MORSE are to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 21, 1964.

AUGUST 22, 1964.

To the Honorable SENATOR MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I read your speech defending the right for the South Vietnam people. They have the right to live without the United States to interfere aggressively.

And I wish to congratulate you with all my heart.

All the people with brains say we will lose and the goofy generals don't see it.

My best wishes to you, Senator, for your health so you can be able to tell the goofy ones.

Yours truly,

S. A. DROPOLL.

MICKLETON, N.J.,
August 23, 1964.

Senator CLIFFORD CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: The situation in Vietnam, and therefore in all of Asia, looks more and more dangerous to the peace of the world, and the standing of the United States among the nations.

I am particularly disturbed by the recent vote in the Senate when you and all but two Senators voted to support a military dictator who very evidently has little support among his own people. I can understand the pressures upon you, but regret that you did not back Senator MORSE after his very able speech on Vietnam.

The idea that arms will defeat communism is the theme of the narrow nationalists who threaten to precipitate a war to end civilization. I believe that any such armed victory would only prolong the reign of communism, and that the field of action must be changed to that of the minds and welfare of the people of Vietnam. Our own example is the most effective weapon that we have, and it has been contradictory and inconsistent in many ways. I am convinced that our troops have no more business in Asia than Russia's have in Cuba or Hungary.

Hoping that you will study this question more carefully, I am

Sincerely yours,

HENRY W. RIDGWAY.

MADISON, WIS.,
August 19, 1964.

To Senator WAYNE MORSE: Congratulations on your integrity and commendable stand on the Vietnamese resolution, and your consistent stand against the presence of United States in the southeast of Asia. More strength to you.

Sincerely,

MRS. DENISE NOBLE.

AUGUST 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God, you have the courage to stand fast in opposition to the insanity of expanding the war in Asia.

Continue your efforts for peace.

CHESTER KINSY.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,
August 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator from Oregon.

OUR DEAR SENATOR: I feel that in raising the question of what our country's business is in South Vietnam, and what cost to us ensues in the close-working alliance between our Government and that of a succession of dictators in South Vietnam you are rendering, as Senator GRUENING is also, a valuable service to the American people.

As Senator FULBRIGHT has on occasions remarked, or wrote, "to think on the unthinkable" is a salutary exercise of reason for anyone in Government, or for any citizen for that matter.

I suspect the major portion of the South Vietnamese people has come to look upon the 21,000 American "advisers" as intruders and heartily wish that they would clear out.

There is the appearance that local dictators are holding the populace in thralldom, and that a few amongst the higher echelon of thousands of American "advisers" have established, and are in the process of establishing an ever-tighter dictatorship over the Vietnamese military Khanh and for the Khanhinate.

Our local press only published an excerpt from your recent speech on this "graveside" matter. This appears to me as being censorship, which I think does not befit a democrary; neither does it seem emulous of an honest way of life, which thought leads on to another, that being the question: how can "free" world become much free without constructing a great society based and buttressed on honesty in government and in life?

If available I would appreciate receiving reprints of each of your two speeches recently made dealing with this acute problem.

Sincerely,

CONNER MCGEE.

SWITZERLAND, *August 21, 1964.*

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: While in England I read a brief mention of your stand in declining to give anybody a "predated check for a declaration of war" in southeast Asia. The press once again failed to report your views and facts of value to the public but that one man had the courage to stand by his convictions—and the awesome truth—was important to history.

Events since that moment of hysteria seem to have vindicated your assertions that the United States was at least as much to blame as North Vietnam for any incident which occurred there. It appears that the Vietnamese mosquito boats may have had good reason to believe that the *Maddox* was the same vessel that had repeatedly attacked some of their islands—a case of mistaken identity, apparently. The vessel or vessels that attacked the islands may have been merely ships furnished to the South Vietnamese by the U.S. Navy and possibly escorted to the scene of the attack by the same patron.

May I have a copy of your remarks made in opposition to the granting of that "predated check"? I have a notion that they will be important to add the historical record.

Enclosed is a brief comment of my own on the direction of U.S. policy in southeast Asia in which I took the liberty of quoting you—I hope, acceptably. French and British editors were and remain much concerned that some trigger-happy believers in the omnipotence of airpower may involve us in some more tragic episode before the elections are over and I hope that I am correct in assuring them that such is not the intention, at least, of responsible leaders of the administration. All the same, it appears evident that Hanoi's restraint or caution or discretion—or more sanity than most of us are prepared to concede the Asian opposition—prevented the enlargement of that Tonkin incident into a general holocaust. Men with that much sense of responsibility might be worth talking to before shooting up. I would say that a more effective response to a few harmless shots from the mosquito boats of Tonkin would have been a bombardment of those ports with bags of gift rice instead of explosives, accompanied by a warning to them and

the world that the next time might be more lethal.

Sincerely,

EDGAR SNOW.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
August 20, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: This afternoon I read the major excerpts of your speech of August 5 in opposition to President Johnson's policy on Vietnam. It was published in a small weekly newspaper published in New York.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I wrote to the local San Jose paper. I would appreciate it if you would mail them a copy of your speech and mail to me five copies of your speech.

Thanking you from the bottom of my heart for your courage and strength, I am

Very truly yours,

DONALD H. CLARK.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
August 20, 1964.

EDITOR,
San Jose Mercury,
San Jose, Calif.

DEAR SIR: According to today's (August 20, 1964) "Inquiring Reporter" all seven of the people interviewed on the "U.S. Stand in Vietnam" voted approval of our present policy. This is understandable when you consider what they have read so far about what has happened.

In all fairness to the truth I would urge you to print the major excerpts of Senator WAYNE MORSE's speech of August 5, in opposition to the resolution in support of President Johnson's action. I would further urge the Inquiring Reporter to make another interview after the speech is printed to gage public opinion on the issue.

Very truly yours,

DONALD H. CLARK.

[From the San Jose (Calif.) Mercury, Aug. 8, 1964]

INQUIRING REPORTER: FAVOR U.S. STAND IN VIETNAM?

Danny Moyers, food clerk, San Jose: "So far, so good. As long as we stay firm with it right now. If I had my way I'd just draw the line and say, 'This is it.' I'd agree up to a point with GOLDWATER who wants to go in and cut out the supply lines. Either get in or get out. No sense wasting dollars and men. It won't be a campaign issue now. Johnson took the bite out of it."

Mrs. Donald Tewalt, housewife-school employee, San Jose: "Yes, I do. I'm in agreement with his returning the fire, if you can call it that. He sort of showed them he wasn't afraid. I think it would be a good policy for the future. I don't agree with GOLDWATER even though I'm a Republican. The theory of retaliation with limited force will accomplish its mission. I don't think Vietnam will be much of a campaign issue now that GOLDWATER has agreed with Johnson."

M. D. Stewart, college teacher, Santa Clara: "I think the action Johnson took is consistent with our policy: a reluctance to get into war, but an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. I'm for it under the present circumstances. If they made a major change I hope our Government would take similar steps. Right now we should be content to cope with Russia and their bluff. The attack was a decided advantage for the Democrats, as Johnson has taken a strong and decisive position."

The Rev. Joseph Green, pastor, San Jose: "Yes, I do. We've been long overdue in standing up to the Red forces. We've been backing down more or less since Korea. It's time we showed our colors. Sooner or later we'll have to resolve the Vietnam problem. But let them be the aggressor when it happens and we can defend ourselves. I sort of go along with GOLDWATER. 'Peace through preparedness.'"

Becky Lira, high school student, San Jose: "We just couldn't let it go at that. If we did let it go, even though they were just little P.T. boats, they may come back with something bigger. I think Kennedy would have probably done the same thing. I don't think we should take over Vietnam. I wouldn't want anyone to take over our country. And I wouldn't favor the use of atomic weapons. If I had my way we would go back to using pistols.

Mrs. Zella Galletti, housewife, San Jose: I don't think Johnson was correct in ordering the recent attack. He's definitely just trying to carry out Kennedy's policy down the line. To me this is good, if we can do it, as I was behind Kennedy all the way. And I'm sorry Johnson eliminated Bobby Kennedy. As a result, I don't think Johnson has a very good chance now. As for others, I don't think anybody should comment on Mr. GOLDWATER's comments on Vietnam or otherwise. Just ignore him."

Jack Vitale, cement plant worker, Los Gatos: "I guess so, I guess Johnson did the right thing. The Russians are just waiting and waiting. They could step in any time if we didn't stay right after them. Johnson is really trying. He's holding his head up like anybody else would, I guess. Cuba is pretty quiet right now compared to what it once was. Maybe Vietnam will turn out the same way if we don't let them get ahead of us."

DAYTON, OHIO,
August 26, 1964.

To the Honorable Senator Morse.

DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you for standing up to your beliefs, even in spite of so much opposition. God bless you always.

I will be praying for you and other leaders of our country.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BETTY DE LONG.

YORK, PA.,
August 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I cannot express deeply enough to you my thanks and appreciation for the courage and integrity you have long shown in the Senate, but especially in regard to the war in Vietnam. It is so difficult for us to really get the truth, but I'm sure many Americans feel the U.S. role in southeast Asia is unjustified. It seems as if we deliberately are looking for a major war in that area.

I am certain that you must feel a sense of tremendous frustration standing almost alone in your attempt to reverse the trend toward war. Many of us share this feeling and wonder what, if anything, we can do. Quite a few months ago I wrote President Johnson about seeking a negotiated settlement in Vietnam. My reply came from the State Department stating firm opposition to this point of view and including an historical sketch of the Vietnamese situation from about 1954 on. This did not seem to fit with information I have read elsewhere. It almost seems that we ordinary citizens are being told what the Government wants us to believe. This is exactly what we have criticized so strongly in Russia and other totalitarian states.

This trend toward almost a party line, the activity of the CIA, the strong pull to the right which the nomination of GOLDWATER seems to presage, and the almost required pose of being tuff that politicians exhibit makes me very doubtful that a world of peace can ever be achieved. Isn't there something that can be done? Perhaps if the profits could be removed from war preparations, the strength of the military-industrial complex in foreign affairs would be minimized.

Thank you for your lone strong voice. If you have any advice to peace oriented people, please let me know. I plan to join the protest vigil in Atlantic City on August 25.

Sincerely,

MARGERY H. DAHN.

DETROIT, MICH.,
August 21, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you for your courage and commonsense in speaking out against the war in Vietnam, which you have rightly called illegal and unconstitutional. Please continue to work for a negotiated settlement. My prayers and good wishes are with you.

Sincerely yours,

ROSEMARY LAMBERT.

MENLO PARK, CALIF.,
August 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: During the past several months, or even 2 years I have written dozens of letters of protest on our military exploits in Vietnam. The greater number of these protests were inspired by the lucidity of your reasoning and often by Senator GRUENING as well.

As you say, "our leaders counted on bluffing Communist China; but she was not bluffed in Korea when the whole U.N. was with us, and this time we have not one single ally." (Aug. 5, in the Senate. Quoted at length in the National Guardian Weekly, Aug. 15, 1964.)

I am appalled that not more Senators, especially Senator BARTLETT, did not join you and Senator GRUENING on this matter. I shall write also to the Senators from California, though perhaps Senator SALINGER was not yet a Member.

Very sincerely and gratefully,

Miss INGEGERD UPPMAN.

P.S.—Another article by you, in the August Progressive, we have Xeroxed and we are distributing copies.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
August 21, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have held an election in our house and elected you our honorary Senator. This citation comes about mainly for your courageous efforts in the Vietnam crisis some 2 weeks ago which I have avidly followed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But it also takes into account your past and present efforts in the fields of foreign aid, natural gas, space satellite, left and right dictatorships, and public power. Incidentally, I have not yet informed my family of this vote, but since we vote by weight and I weigh more than my wife and two daughters, I'm sure of the outcome. I'm positive that they will move to make it unanimous. This seems as reasonable a voting procedure as anything the anti "one-man one-vote" people (DIRKSEN et al.) are talking about. It is certainly better than "one-acre one-vote" or "one-cow one-vote." This way, the more you have at stake (pounds), the more your voting power is.

In Wednesday's New York Times (August 19), the headline was "Two Hundred and Eighty Reds Reported Slain in Biggest Saigon Victory." This headline was repeated in all the local papers I've seen. When you read the story, you find out that about 500 Vietcong took part in the engagement, 280 Vietcong were killed but only 10 bodies were found. That is, 270 Vietcong (dead) were carried off through the jungle by the 220 live Vietcong, fighting as they went. This

story seems to be a lie, a victory of press relations, not of battle. If you read the last paragraph of the story in the Times (which was cut out by all the local papers) you find that "First reports from the battle scene indicated that the Vietcong had come out the victor while losing about 40 men. However, Americans said today that the Communist death toll had been seven times greater." The "first reports" sound more like the truth, but very, very few Americans will ever realize this. Chalk up another victory for "public relations." Reporting like this is the reason that the overwhelming majority of Americans are against you and Senator GRUENING in your fight to bring some intelligence into this dispute. You must cite hard facts in your public appearances, not generalities, if you are to make any impression on the American public. Such facts as the admitted violations of North Vietnam (12-mile) waters by U.S. warships (Admiral Moore in the New York Times), the violations by the United States of the Geneva accords (no free elections, introduction of new military equipment, etc.) must be publicized if the U.S. people are ever to understand the position of the Communists. The American people must realize that the Vietcong are mostly South Vietnamese fighting with captured American weapons. This can be documented in the American press but it is usually buried way down in newspaper on page 32 or 50. These are the facts you must publicize if we ever are to get away from the battlefield and to the conference table.

I must admire your courage and honesty in speaking up as you have. Please keep it up. If the rule of law is not triumphant, the rule of death will be.

Yours truly,

GEORGE E. GOLDMAN.

MADISON, WIS.,
August 24, 1964.

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

DEAR MR. MORSE: I should like to express my appreciation to you for the moral courage and clear thinking expressed in your consistent stand against the presence of U.S. forces in southeast Asia and in particular for your vote against the recent Vietnamese resolution. Please continue your good work for the welfare of our country and the world.

Sincerely,

VIOLA J. GRAHAM.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
August 22, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As I believe I've told you before, I respect your record of individualism in the Senate. You and Senator GRUENING, among public figures, are the only two I should trust as President and Vice President of our country. I particularly admire your vote against giving Johnson power to extend the war in southeast Asia.

How I wish I could tell you my hopes for this country, my sadness at the way things are going. But you know my views already. Essentially they are your own. And to do unto others.

My husband is a newspaperman; I am a writer-editor. Please let us know when we can do something to help you, personally, or anyone who loves life enough to know we must not ruin it for ourselves or others through ignorance or false pride.

What can we do now? Shall we join the Democratic Party and work from within? Milwaukee, this truly charming city, is too comfortable and insular to have any effective peace groups. Tell me to whom we should write.

One last thing. A candidate for State assemblyman in our district (third) is the only one who ever said in his public words and meant it, the dirty word "peace," and no CD, and civil rights, and that a politician should declare his sources of income. His name is Bob Robinson. I'm telling you because I hope someday he meets you in the Senate. It's one spark of hope—then you'll have three votes.

Sincerely,

JEAN CLARRIDGE PELLETIERE.

BURBANK, CALIF.,
August 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep saying "it" and saying "it" and saying "it"—the truth about Vietnam and southeast Asia. Why are you and Senator GRUENING alone in your stand for a just, rational, humane settlement of U.S. involvement?

Many, many are sick and cynical and disillusioned by the provocations, arrogance, and indefensible U.S. involvement.

Do "keep saying it," and never stop talking.

Thank you for representing so many who cannot speak for ourselves.

Most respectfully,

MRS. HARRY L. BLACK.

ST. IVES, AUSTRALIA, N.S.W.,
August 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate House, Washington.

DEAR SIR: May I please add my congratulations and support to the many you must have already received for your courageous and sensible protest against America's attack on North Vietnam. Many of us in Australia do not support our own Government's foreign policy which seems to be merely an echo of Washington no matter what occurs. We would all wish to see America as leader of the Western World but fear that she will lose this position if further happenings of this kind take place again.

However we are well aware that even in America there is widespread dismay at the idea of any extension of war in southeast Asia and it gives us a great deal of comfort to know that there is someone like yourself in the vanguard of the struggle for sanity, genuine democracy and the peaceful settlement of disputes. Please continue this struggle, and I can assure you that you have the wholehearted admiration of all Australians whether they agree with you or not. Your leadership has given great encouragement to all sane and sensible people everywhere and we feel sure that in time the American administration will be influenced to feel the same humanity and commonsense.

Again my thanks and congratulations on your stand.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs. MILLICENT L. CHRISTIAN.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
September 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The enclosed clipping will help to correct my present address.

I am anxious to encourage you in your positions on southeast Asia, foreign aid cuts, and civil rights. I respect your courage in the stands you take and I admire your wisdom in arriving at those stands.

Thank you for the things you send in the mail.

Yours truly,

BOBB F. BROWN.

PORT ORFORD, OREG.,
August 29, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Your stand on the Vietnam war strikes me as about the only intelligent one expressed in high circles. I have wondered about our right to be there, regardless of patriotic cliches and thunderings about freedom. I think I fear our Nation's possibly well-meaning stupidity about as much as I fear the enemy.

Please change my address on your mailing list to the above. Formerly, it was: 9198 SW. West Haven, Portland, Oreg. I have now become a rural schoolteacher.

Your truly,

DIANE E. ABBOTT.

P.S.—Even if the tennis-shod (shoed?) little old ladies are damning you, I still prefer your kind of foreign policy.

BLUE RIVER, OREG.,
August 28, 1964.

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

DEAR FRIEND: The enclosed article was taken out of the San Francisco Chronicle this morning. Your courage in making an issue of the Vietnam war is wonderful. Your true friends are mighty proud of you. Keep up the good work.

More and more people are coming around to the view that we have no right being over there.

I felt that you would like to see the enclosed article.

Your sincere friend,

ART DUSTAN.

TALINT, OREG.,
August 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As requested in your news letter of August 12, I am sending you our change of address. We would be sorry to miss a copy of the letter for any reason.

We are proud of your stand on the Vietnam issue, and applaud the courage you showed in voting against the recent resolution.

We hope you will represent Oregon for many more years in the Senate.

Yours sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN BEAGLE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 18, 1964.

The Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE,
417 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I don't find many areas where I am in agreement with you, as I am a registered Republican and believe more in the Republican principles than I do of the Democratic principals. However, on the issue of Vietnam, I strongly support your position, and certainly admire your courage in facing up to overwhelming opposition. I can't help but feel you are right on this issue.

Yours truly,

R. M. JOHNSON.

PARKDALE, OREG.,
August 15, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Allow me to express satisfaction with and approval of the stand taken by yourself and Senator GRUENING of Alaska with regard to spreading the war in Vietnam, and to bestowing on our Presidency the blanket approval to wage war. As reported in the Portland Oregonian, although presumably of a small minority (in my way of thinking), I very much admire and applaud our esteemed Senators for standing up for what is right (but unpopular).

A group of Christians whom I know have been praying for the leaders of our Nation that they may receive divine guidance in directing the complex, and oftentimes vexing, problems and affairs of this great country.

While I am at it, I want to thank you and the Senators associated with you for the successful effort you have made to get foreign

aid onto a more realistic basis. I am with you 100 percent.

Very truly yours,

ERIC S. NANCE.

AUGUST 31, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This copy will show that you have my backing. It is of small consequence, I know, but for whatever it's worth, you have it.

Thanks for the RECORD.

R.F.S., Sr.

[Copy]

COMPTON, CALIF.,
August 27, 1964.

His Excellency, the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: I feel constrained to write you, giving my view in reference to the participation of this country in the military struggle now in progress in southeast Asia. It is my conviction that our engagement in this struggle cannot be justified on any grounds.

Having listened to the oratory at the convention at Atlantic City—most of it beautiful, interesting, and inspiring—I note that nearly every speaker has emphasized the necessity for peace on this planet and the importance of this Nation in the quest for it. I hasten to admit, sir, that the power and influence of this Nation is an important, probably the most important, factor in the effort toward universal peace in the world today.

But let me ask you, Mr. President, in all respect and yet candidly, in the pursuit of peace is it necessary to sacrifice American lives? Again, may I ask with equal respect and candor, what person is willing to acknowledge individual responsibility for the lives of Americans thus sacrificed?

As I have been taught to understand, by the law laid down by the great lawgiver, Moses, and supplemented by an additional commandment elucidated by Jesus Christ, we are admonished not to kill our fellow men.

Force, Mr. President, is not—cannot be, the answer in South Vietnam, or anywhere. The pretension that our part in this conflict is in pursuit of freedom does not stand up when exposed to the light of reason, right, and commonsense.

Please, Mr. President, please let us find some other way. The lives of Americans are too precious to be offered to the god of war in such a useless and senseless manner. Thanking you for your kind consideration to this appeal, I beg to remain,

Sincerely yours,

R. F. SMALLEY, Sr.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
August 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Having written to the Senator of my own State (the first time I ever followed that advice "write to your Congressman"), now I write to you. He was kind enough to answer my letter, but all I found out was that the President knows more about the situation than anyone else and is giving it his most serious consideration. Now, how do we, the little people, make our wants and wishes known? How do we fit in, besides footing the bill? I am speaking of that "unspeakable" situation Vietnam. What I want to know is this, What is the reason for allowing even one known Communist in this country, when our husbands and our sons have been sent 10,000 miles away to that miserable place, supposedly to fight communism and rescue those unfortunate people from its clutches? I am not very learned but I have followed the situation closely enough to know that the biggest majority of those people do not want to be rescued, actually hate us, and are stabbing us in the back. The only ones who do not seem to have lost the will to fight are the ones opposing us. Still we insist on staying in there. Is it that we would rather lose lives than lose a little "face"? You can bet that the lives of the ones who think that way are not being risked and it is not the lives of their sons.

My husband and I are aware that we have footed a part of this bill with our tax money. We are not complaining so much about that, although it represents a lot of hard work and was money poured down a rathole. What we are complaining about (grieving is a better word) is that our son has been sent there, as well. He is our only child and only 19. He made the mistake of enlisting, against our advice. He did not know that he was going to go to the other side of the world to fight something that needs fighting right here under our own noses. Unless I am badly mistaken, Communists are lecturing in colleges, are given the privilege of running for office, and are behind a large part of our racial trouble. Why? Why? Why? We know they are here. I am more than disgusted—I am outraged. The nearly 200 Americans who have laid down their lives over there have died for nothing. Their deaths have served no more purpose than the untimely death of President Kennedy. It's just that not as much is said about it. As my son once wrote me, "I guess that back home, this is just something people read about and turn over to the next page." He is not one to complain. He has no idea that I am writing this. I would like my name as the writer of this letter to be kept confidential. I am not ashamed of writing it but I do not want anything worse to happen to him. He is doing the best he can in an impossible situation and I do not write and tell him how his father and I feel. I tell him that the time will pass quickly and we are sure that he will be all right. This is a lie, for every day is an eternity to us, as it surely is to him, and we are torn with anxiety. If it were for something logical and he were defending us from an attack here at home I would be proud, but this is not so. I do not feel "yellow." I know, as I said before, that the ones who want communism stopped over there before it gets over here are not the ones who stand to lose their loved ones there. If they would open their minds and their eyes they would see that it is here right now.

I doubt very much if our sending a bunch of bright, shiny bugles to Vietnam is going to raise the morale of our boys. We had better send them so real help or bring them home while there are still some of them to bring home. I know that you have had the courage to state your views though they differed from what nearly all the others have expressed. Would that there were more like you. Perhaps you and Senator DIRKSEN can work for us.

Respectfully,

Mrs. J. W. JACKSON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 22, 1964.

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

SIR: This is to commend you on your courageous stand against the Joint Congressional Resolution Supporting Government Intervention in Vietnam.

Many American citizens entertain grave doubts as to the wisdom, moral and practical, of the Vietnam effort. As one of them, I am grateful to your uncompromising honesty in speaking up for me.

Yours Very truly,

Mrs. ANNE FRISBIE O'NEILL.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
August 8, 1964.

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

DEAR MR. MORSE: I applaud your stand on the Vietnamese war. I hope you will continue your efforts to prevent the cry of "remember the *Maddox*" from leading to an immense and destructive war. It is much to my regret that I cannot vote for your reelection.

Sincerely,

FRANKLIN E. MIRER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 27, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: Although belatedly, I wish to congratulate you on your stand with regard to U.S. intervention in South Vietnam. I and many people to whom I have spoken agree that the Vietnamese people should be left to their own devices, to settle their own problems without any intervention on the part of any foreign power. Perhaps there would be no more war there today if the United States had not given such support to the old reactionary regime nor to its successor.

I wish also to declare our support of you in your stand on civil rights and other advanced and progressive legislation.

Keep up the good work, Senator MORSE; the majority of the American people and all peaceful, freedom-loving people are behind you.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

S. BERNSTEIN.

BETHESDA, MD.,
August 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your stand against U.S. military action in Vietnam. U.S. intervention in Vietnam is causing war, not peace; supporting force and violence, not freedom. The Communists are right when they call us "imperialist aggressors" in Vietnam.

An international conference should settle the issues involved, and not the United States.

Sincerely,

GLADYS H. SWIFT.

FORT WASHINGTON, PA.,
August 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Regarding your views of stopping the shipment of American boys to fight in Vietnam and many other places expresses my sentiments also, and I am with you 100 percent.

I admire a man with courage who speaks his own mind.

Respectfully yours,

LOUIS STEFAN,
Veteran, World War I, 315th Inf.

GREAT NECK, N.Y.,
August 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to congratulate you on your speech on Vietnam and foreign policy. I wanted to write sooner but couldn't manage it. Would it be possible for me to get one or more copies of your speech, so that I could give it to friends to read? I wish many more people were aware of the points you emphasized.

Yours most cordially,

Dr. LEONARD FRANK.

WYANDOTTE, MICH.,
August 21, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Newspaper accounts and radio and television news broadcasts have, frankly, confused me over American intervention in South Vietnam.

Having read earlier this year of your concern over American policy in southeast Asia, I, as both interested citizen and prospective newspaper reporter, would appreciate having on file your views on this troubled area.

Perhaps by sending the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or other source material you can meet my request.

Thank you very much. I am

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL L. SKINNER.

AUGUST 18, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We support your stand taken in the U.S. Senate on August 5, 1964, against the resolution to grant the President approval on all steps he deemed necessary "to repel any attack on U.S. forces in southeast Asia."

We urge no escalation of war—urge immediate negotiations in southeast Asia. We have no business in Asia—this is a matter for the people of South Vietnam to settle without our men, money and military equipment.

Get out of South Vietnam now, out of southeast Asia now!

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. HAROLD STOCKER.

POMONA, CALIF.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
August 19, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to commend you for your lonely struggle against the horrors and imbecilities of America's current military program in Vietnam. It is indeed a lamentable fact that men in your position must deal with a public opinion that, for the most part, is dreadfully mal-, mis-, and downright uninformed about the events and issues in question. Following its present course, this American military program seems inexorably destined to result in another unfortunate (and eventually highly unpopular) war with China. If that should happen, your present stand will, of course, be vindicated, and this same public opinion will (just as monolithically, no doubt) howl for an end to the slaughter. Even if you happen to be "wrong" in regard to Vietnam, and this does not appear to be the case, I salute you for your courage.

Very truly yours,

T. G. POWELL.

TACOMA, WASH.,
August 18, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: We wish to commend you on the position you have taken in regard to the recent Vietnam crisis and for your courage in standing up against such odds when everyone else seemed to be climbing on the bandwagon.

People we contact daily were strangely silent about "the action" or seemed reluctant to discuss it. This we believe must be due to the tremendous news buildup and selling job, "brainwashing" U.S. style.

It is difficult to get the truth about our foreign affairs. When we do, months or years have passed by. Then it is too late to get a proper public reaction. Members of the State Department have admitted that, when they thought it was expedient to do so, they would lie.

One thing we are sure of: This Nation seems to have become a self-appointed police force, under the guise of protecting freedom around the world. We are pushing in with a chip on our shoulder everywhere, propagandizing, becoming involved militarily, using economic pressure, financing revolutions and propping up questionable governments, outdoing the Communists at intrigue. This we are doing eslewhere while, here at home, we are doing such a dismal job of protecting and winning some of those same freedoms. It seems as though there is an unseen hand operating within the Government which is continually involving us in international situations which the people really do not approve. This is probably what President Eisenhower was referring to in his parting address when he warned the Nation about the threat of a military-industrial combine taking over.

We should look to our own internal security, take care of our own shortcomings, live by example and lead by example in order to sell the rest of the world on what we believe we have to sell. This is the only way we can succeed in outstriding dictatorships, right or left.

We trust you will continue to carry on the fight for truth, freedom and decency.

Sincerely,

WM. AND IVY MCCULLOUGH.

LOMBARD, ILL.,
August 20, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Many thanks for your August report and your reprint of your "individual views" which I read with great interest.

You are so right in appraising the terrible implications of the resolution giving the President the power to initiate war. The press has given scant report of your protest. I found a sympathetic account of it in I.F. Stone's weekly and a substantial excerpt of it in the National Guardian. I wish I could read the entire speech.

We are still clinging to the inglorious and dangerous Dulles policy. It was Churchill who propagated the cold war and it was Kennan who fathered the containment policy. Subsequently Churchill came out for coexistence and Kennan repudiated his own policy of containment. Both were great to acknowldege an error.

We did not sign the Geneva Treaty but we are acting as if we had a mandate from the world to stop communism. We are still bucking a revolution instead of backing it. We are throwing our weight. If we want to stop communism we should try to improve the standard of living of all peoples. People who are well off do not care for communism. We have all the ingredients to do this; surplus of food, knowledge we can share, and capital we can employ. President de Gaulle, in spite of his hauteur, offers a face saving solution out of this situation but of course nothing can be done until after the election, lest this modern Alcibiades of the Republican Party charges the administration with Communist conspiracy.

If our policy is faulty in east Asia it is equally so in Cuba. As long as we talk of crushing Castro the Progress of Alliance has no chance. The money we are pouring into Latin America is used to support the economic and military groups who are sitting on the peoples' necks. The United States should settle its differences with Cuba—as we did with Mexico—and help to finish the revolution against Batista. This would detach Cuba from Moscow and put the fear of God and revolution into the hearts of the ruling classes. Incidentally it might create one quarter million jobs. We have put the cart before the horse and no amount of beating the cart will make the horse go forward. We ought to do on a gigantic scale what we now do with the Peace Corp.

As a man who has such clear perspective you must have moments of frustration about the way events are shaping up and this is one more reason that I admire so much your consistent efforts to make this a better world for all people.

Most respectfully yours,

D. D. BARTA.

WATERTOWN, WIS.,
August 20, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: According to the voting record you are an independent, not a conformist. What United States needs is more guided men and less guided missiles, men with guts enough to defy the banker-military combine and return our money system to a sane constitutional base.

The administration in Washington claims they are dedicated to peace, but talk and act more like a dictator seeking to scrap portions of the Constitution. Why does the administration permit and support so many provocative incidents; in Germany, Berlin, Congo, Latin America, Panama, southeast Asia by U.S. military forces. It is quite evident there are some triggerhappy personnel in and out of the military to fabricate false reports. The Spanish American was sparked by a false report. The bombing of Japanese cities in World War II was the result of a false report. (Not in the history books.)

Since when has the President the right to start a war? President John F. Kennedy started a war in southeast Asia by dispatching U.S. troops to support a ruthless regime in South Vietnam that the Vietnamese people disapproved of. A religious war? President Lyndon B. Johnson is following in the footsteps of his predecessor (spreading the conflict) by sending troops to the Congo. Was Congress consulted?

If the people of the United States want peace it is imperative that we prepare for peace. Creativity, reasoning, virtue (will to to good) are the only road to peace there is.

Thoughts of war are commodities of no value. United States cannot afford to practice any destructive action.

That is the way it appears from here.

H. B. SCHAUER.

P.S.—Do you have a newsletter to explain your viewpoint?

NATIONAL UNITY, BUT AT WHAT COST?

(By Robert M. Hutchins)

National unity is a splendid thing, but it can be purchased at too high a price. When misrepresentation and self-righteousness are the foundation of national unity, it becomes unattractive and seems unlikely to last.

Our record in Vietnam is a sorry one. We had no business there in the first place. We have none now. We must eventually withdraw. The French tried to hold onto Indochina with 400,000 men. They were driven out after suffering 172,000 casualties.

On April 21, Walter Lippmann wrote: "The truth, which is being obscured for the American people, is that the Saigon Government has the allegiance of no more than 30 percent of the people and controls (even in daylight) not much more than a quarter of the territory."

The situation has deteriorated since April. Walter Lippmann now says we are in Vietnam in order to be a great power in the South Pacific.

The only beneficiary of the extension of the war will be the oppressive and undemocratic regime of President Khanh. He has been screaming for an invasion of North Vietnam. This is not because North Vietinam has been deeply engaged against him.

President Khanh's object has been to bolster his tottering government by involving the United States in a full-scale war on his behalf.

To gratify President Khanh we moved units of the 7th Fleet into the Gulf of

Tonkin in the last month. The land around this gulf is that of Vietnam and Red China.

According to our version, our ships were attacked in international waters 30 to 65 miles from shore. If our version is correct, the attack cannot be excused, though perhaps it may be explained by a certain jumpiness or trigger happiness induced by seeing unfriendly warships so close to shore.

According to our version, the attacks on our ships failed. In the exercise of the right of self-defense, we sank four or five of the enemy. We then proceeded, in the exercise of the "right" of retaliation, to carry the war against the ports—and the people—of North Vietnam.

Since when has there been a right of retaliation? You may defend yourself if attacked, but nothing in domestic or international law permits you to go around the next day and burn down your attacker's house, saying as you do so, "This is a limited and measured response." That is an act of war.

We are constantly proclaiming that our mission is peace. We are devotees of the rule of law. When other nations are involved in a dispute, we insist on negotiation and resort to the United Nations. We disowned our friends the British, French, and Israelis when they tried to seize the Suez Canal.

On the very day on which Ambassador Adlai Stevenson made his belated statement to the U.N. on Vietnam, our schizophrenic State Department announced an agreement among Britain, Russia, and the United States that said, "We declare our intention to do everything possible for the solution through negotiation of unresolved international problems in order to strengthen the general peace, the benefits of which would be enjoyed by all states, big and small, and by all people."

This is the spirit in which we must act if we expect to be taken seriously as missionaries of peace. The Gulf of Tonkin may turn out to be a sadder page in American history than the Bay of Pigs.

CUPERTINO, CALIF.,
August 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your vote, one of only two, against the blank check endorsement of Johnson's retaliation measure. My limited analysis and proposals are enclosed herein. In case I didn't elaborate upon my background in my previous letter, I have never been a member of the noted (or notorious) Communist Party. Rather I spent 6 years in Technocracy Inc. from 1942 through 1948, and as we used to say "Once a technocrat, always a technocrat." My training in analyzing current events came from there.

I intend to pursue the issue noted herein throughout the next 3 months. I hope you are agreeable to the proposition.

I wrote a manuscript of 195 pages single-spaced typewritten, entitled "The End of an Age." DON EDWARDS, Congressman from our Ninth District nearby, has a copy of it and you can get a better idea of my background, analysis, activities, reasoning, etc. from there if you can talk him out of it. Chief Justice Earl Warren received about the first copy, for it deals with the Kennedy assassination and its implications. This is basically why events are at such a late point that what I propose herein—including my suggested name for the party—must be considered seriously and speedily.

Hoping to hear from you about the first of September—affirmatively—I am

Sincerely yours

ELTON R. MAAS.

MANISTEE, MICH.,
August 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You will find the enclosure very interesting.

While Burchett is by no means impartial he has been right far too often in the past to disregard what he has to say.

Your fellow Senators need to read this more than you do. Perhaps some will.

Yours,

JOHN W. HARVEY.

GLENDALE, CALIF.,
August 11, 1964.

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

SENATOR MORSE: I read with much interest your recent article in the Progressive concerning the U.S. position in southeast Asia. When the current crisis and Presidential resolution occurred only a week after I had read your remarks in the magazine, I waited anxiously to see your comments and vote on the President's resolution; your bold position reflected the courage you have always used in the Senate.

If at all possible, I would very much like an outline of your lengthy debate on the resolution before it was passed last week. Or, better yet, I would enjoy a congressional digest reprint of your comments if you are making them available in this form.

Thank you for any cooperation you can give.

Sincerely,

JACK MCCREARY.

NORTH CUMBERLAND, R.I.,
August 13, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Let me commend you for your heroic and honorable stand respecting the resolution adopted last week by the Senate apropos the Tonkin Bay ruckus.

I encourage you to be even more picturesque in your sense of indignation, in your matching words to the crime, if indeed you have proof of the 7th Fleet protective role or actual provocation of South Vietnam attack against Vietcong coastal installations. I remind you of words spoken in 1846 by President Polk, and in a sense echoed by Johnson in the present instance, and which inspired Lincoln to (in effect) call Polk a liar following the latter's allegations about American blood being spilled on "American" soil, way down there at Matamoras. This was another of those fateful moments which opened a Pandora's box of woe, specifically posing the comic ironies of face-saving at the moment in order to win friends in Latin America, an enormous historic "blunder" from which we still haven't grasped the retributive payoff dictated by history, the main ingredient of which is still of Hammurabic origin.

How poverty stricken is our leaders' sense of history. We have culturally and exclusively been geared to a sense of the immediate, to what momentarily is to be gained, when the chips are really down, at the price of what multiplicity of ironies remotely ensue. What beggarly comfort; e.g., we are at the moment expected to extract from the impoverished and universal headline which aims to ease our fluctuations of nail-biting and overwrought tenterhooks with its feeble assurances that "maybe China will not intervene." As though China has not tucked this "episode" in the back of its scheming noodle. As though any halfwit doesn't know China bides a more propitious time for some grandiose dole of historic comeuppance aimed at flushing this incidental arrogance of this chief bastion of the "Christian" dispensation down the privy of history. What a dossier of our lost opportunities could be compiled, as you yourself truly stated in your TV press interview of a few days ago.

Yours is the long view, Senator, and on that basis alone you qualify for the right to enjoy a far greater degree of influence in the highest councils of Government, as countless of your contemporaries ardently wish you did, but who instead are perforce compelled to gape upon the collective mass of rubber stamps who play their role in this stupid focus upon the immediate, via their primacy of concern with momentary political fortunes.

May I have a copy (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) of your extended remarks in the Senate on this U.S. naval involvement with the North Vietnamese?

Respectfully yours,

JAMES A. HABERSHAW.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
August 19, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Ever since you made your splendid stand in the Senate on Vietnam I have wanted to express to you my personal thanks and admiration and to pledge to you all the support I can muster in trying to change our national policy in southeast Asia. As a member of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, I participated in the national convention in Indianapolis from which we sent a strong resolution to the President on the need to reconvene the 14-nation Geneva Conference and neutralize this area before the United States is dragged by the course of events into ever-increasing expenditures of men and money and, possibly, into fullscale war.

My husband and I have written strong letters to our Missouri Senators expressing regret that they did not join you and Senator GRUENING in your courageous and sensible stand.

By an ironic coincidence, the St. Louis Post Dispatch has been printing chapters from "The Invisible Government" on the CIA's role in the Cuban crisis during its reporting on the Vietnam crisis, and some of its editorials on Vietnam might lead one to more than suspect that the "coincidence" was intentional.

If ever you should be tempted to waver from denouncing our Government's military intervention and its bypassing of the commitments it has made in the United Nations to resort only to peaceful means of settling international disputes, please think of all of us who have no voice but yours to express our views in Congress and never feel that you are just 2 against 100 or 435. You speak for the thousands, and hopefully millions who sincerely want war prevented at any cost, and who are not being correctly represented by their own representatives on American intervention in Vietnam.

Very sincerely,

ELDORA SPIEGELBERG.

DAYTON, OHIO,
August 31, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to congratulate you on your memorial speech of August 15. You should be commended for continuously raising your voice to demand that United States withdraws its forces from South Vietnam and agree to negotiations for a true peace in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

I was deeply impressed by the masterly and moving expressions of your speech. Your courageous convictions that peace should be fundamental in our relations with southeast Asia should be a flaming torch to guide us all. In my opinion, you are one of America's great men in our generation.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY H. METZGER.

BRONX, N.Y.,
September 2, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please pardon the informality of my request for information. I would appreciate your sending to me whatever documentation you have available concerning your position with regard to U.S. policy in South Vietnam.

A friend and admirer of your courage.

JAC RADOFF.

OLYMPIA, WASH.,
September 7, 1964.

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

Your cloakroom comments on Vietnam unassailably lucid, reasonable, and of high moral statesmanship. Too bad we don't have 51 like you in Senate.

HELEN and CARL WEST.

VANCOUVER, WASH.,
August 22, 1964.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: Since I have written on the Vietnam situation, I hesitate to do it again. But I have spent more than half of my adult life in the orient and hence am deeply concerned with what happens there. I understand that, especially in an election year, you are pushed by many in your party to take stands in Vietnam which they think will "save our face" as we say in the orient. It seems to me that we are doing just the opposite.

I keep asking, Why are we in Vietnam in a military role? Are we not aggressors in that area rather than the North Vietnamese? It seems to me that their actions are more in self-defense than are ours. We surely felt that way in the case of Russian aid to Cuba?

May I quote from the Oregonian of May 29, 1964, a statement by Walter Lippmann? "Our cardinal mistake in southeast Asia was the decision of Secretary Dulles to treat South Vietnam * * * as an American protectorate * * * we must look for solutions, not by expanding the war, but by taking it to the conference table, whether to a reconvened Geneva Conference or the United Nations or both." I agree. I realize that this is a situation which you inherited, but I hope you will have the courage and vision to change the trend.

I hate to see communism make gains, but when we make our major action military rather than social and economic, I believe that we are helping rather than hurting the Communist cause. As I have said in earlier letters and wires, I feel that, for the peace of the world as well as for our own democratic heritage, we should withdraw from military action in that area, especially as we are not supporting democracy in the regimes we favor there, any more than communism does.

I pray God that my beloved Nation may not be taking action which will destroy all that we really believe in.

Very sincerely yours,

EDITH S. ROEDER.

P.S.—Thanks for the strong stand you have taken on this issue. I want you to know that I support you.

E.S.R.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We of Students for a Democratic Society were heartened by your August 5 speech in opposition to "a predated declaration of war," in your words.

We feel your speech of such vital concern to students that we would like to obtain reprints if possible. If you have reprints available, we should very much like to mail them to 150 key members of SDS around the country.

Thanking you for your attention,

Yours most sincerely,

DOUGLAS IRELAND,
National Staff, SDS.

ASHLAND, OREG.,
September 5, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please put me on your mailing list for Senator MORSE reports. I am a relatively new resident of the State—2½ years—and am looking forward to a long residency.

You have my support on Vietnam. I feel we do not belong there, and I would be very happy if we could get out.

Sincerely,

SANFORD GOODMAN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 26, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your recently expressed convictions on the "tragedy of Vietnam," are worthy of highest commendation. Subsequent events confirm my deep personal feeling that citizens of that war-torn land are tired of the strife and divisiveness which confront them daily. I hope you and all of us will keep proclaiming that there is a better way than the one we now support.

Warm personal regards,

Cordially yours,

A. RAYMOND GRANT.

ALBANY, OREG.,
August 31, 1964.

We agree with your stand on pulling out of South Vietnam.

DON STOOPS, *Republican.*
NANCY STOOPS, *Democrat.*

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have talked to dozens of my friends, and many other people, and their universal opinion is that in the matter of war with Vietnam you are doing a fine job in opposing it.

It is a wonder that the action and provocation of Ike, Dulles, and the great engineer, Hoover, has not had us bombed off the face of the earth. There are some people, I suppose, who don't agree with you, but my contacts with people give me 98 percent who think that you are doing a fine job.

ALLEN F. WILKINSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my support of your stand on South Vietnam.

It seems there is no solution the way things are going. I am 75 years of age and can look back and see where often the popular view was 100 percent wrong.

The military is too powerful and wasteful and should be controlled.

Best wishes,

ROBERT LONTHOLD.

EUGENE, OREG,
August 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to take this opportunity to commend you for your stand on the Vietnam affair. I wholeheartedly agree with you and your colleague from Alaska. You are doing outstanding work and are not afraid to say what you believe regardless of political consequences. You are to be admired for this. Even if I didn't agree with you, you have brought situations into the open so that I can closely examine the facts.

This is my first letter to a political figure. I was not a registered voter until you were defeated by Kennedy in the Oregon primary. I didn't think he could do it. When he did, I figured it was time to register.

My main purpose in writing to you is to show my old address which was 1895 City View Street, Eugene, Oreg., and my new address which is 2961 Allane Street, Eugene, Oreg. Please keep sending me the "Senator MORSE Reports" so that I may be better informed. Keep up your outstanding work.

Sincerely,

LLOYD LANDERS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 17, 1964.

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

DEAR WAYNE: Just time for a few lines between coaches' meeting and summer job.

I've been meaning to write for the last week and a half, and your newsletter today served to jog my inattention. I imagine you are receiving some pretty hot replies to your Vietnam stand; I hope I can in some way alleviate at least one of these by saying sincerely that I believe your position is not only extremely well taken, but also courageously maintained in the face of "gung ho" emotionalism.

Keep up the fine representation. I might add, for your possible benefit, that the most difficult bastion of ignorance I have encountered in the whole matter is that of the war status; i.e., that the United States committed an act of war when it attacked the North Vietnam mainland. Stress this, it's important.

Thank you, Senator.

DONN C. BECK.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
August 19, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I finally succeeded in seeing the full text of your speech in the Senate on August 7, of which our press gave us only a brief and entirely inadequate account. All the more can I now tell you of my admiration for your clearsightedness and courage in speaking up on an occasion when too many of your colleagues, even those who claim to be ready for "unthinkable thoughts," lost all sense of proportion.

Ten years ago, as a research scholar in Paris, I got my first taste of the senselessness of attacking the Vietnamese problem as a military attempt to contain communism and promote democracy. Ever since France pulled out, I have been worried lest our blind anticommunism at any price would suck us into France's position, with even less understanding and ability to solve the real problem. It is a relief to hear at least two Senators acknowledge it.

Why is it that in the United States it takes so long before we can read the full text of what our Representatives say in Congress, compared with, e.g., England, where the press reports on it on the next day in full?

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT SPIEGELBERG,
Washington University.

P.S.—I would appreciate receiving at least two copies of the text of your and Senator GRUENING'S speeches.

GRESHAM, OREG.,
August 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Over 20 years ago, I left Wisconsin with my famliy to make a new home in Oregon. Every year since, I have received increasing pleasure and satisfaction as a citizen of this great State.

But the other day when the senior Senator from Oregon took his stand against further involvement of our Nation in the Far East, I received the greatest satisfaction of all in being a citizen of this, my adopted State.

Leaving seminary in 1925, I chose Wisconsin as my field of ministry because of the heritage of the great statesman who had left his mark so indelibly impressed on the whole of our Nation. I refer to Senator Bob La Follette. Would that his followers and those who came after him in Wisconsin had had the same vision and the same dedication. He was concerned, I felt, about men and women; about human lives and human values—about the enrichment of all men. He was one of America's great statesmen.

And now in the senior Senator from Oregon, I find one who stands head and shoulders above all others in the U.S. Senate in that he is concerned for the real values in national and international life.

The stand you have taken on the southeast Asian crisis, Senator, your clear and forceful logic, your great sense of justice and above all, your dedication to those high and holy values necessary for the building of a world of peace and brotherhood may not today pierce this fog of national pride and prejudice, but it will one day receive a resounding vindication.

It was a great moment in history when the senior Senator from Oregon stood on his two feet, facing the massive opposition of Congress in his forthright declaration on our involvement in Vietnam.

Mrs. Chamberlin says, "amen," and joins me in saluting you as our one truly great statesman in this day of world crises. Words cannot convey to you, Senator MORSE, our admiration as you stand, one man against a great tidal wave that will engulf the whole world unless enough people in other countries and in our own arise to stop it. It may be that foreign opposition, particularly from our allies, will help stay the hand of this administration and help bring this Nation to its senses.

I've heard it said that God and one are a majority. May the good Lord keep your fires burning.

Cordially,

MARK A. CHAMBERLIN.

ST. HELENS, OREG.,
August 17, 1694.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I agree with you 100 percent on your stand on Vietnam and commend you on your courage to voice your opinion and the opinion of many people.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES W. LANCASTER.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In case your mail is running too heavily against your stand on the southeast Asia crisis, you can count me in as a supporter of your position.

Sincerely,

BERTHA H. KNUDSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 22, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I heartily agree with your views on Vietnam.

We have no business getting into war with Asiatics.

We shelled out billions of dollars and killed 27,704 GI's in the Korean war.

We were not permitted to win that war, nor attack China, and yet, all wars in Asia involve the Chinese.

If we are not permitted to attack and destroy Chinese bases and supply depots, we shouldn't go to war at all.

The only people who profit from these wars are the private bankers, to whom we owe $288 billion.

Our next war should be on private bankers.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

V. L. SHIPLEY.

AVIANO AIRBASE, ITALY,
August 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I appreciate receiving your report, and hope to continue to receive it. You help me to keep up with a little of what's going on in Washington.

Being overseas here in Italy, we don't have access to much stateside news, and the Stars and Stripes newspaper, which is printed overseas is good but quite limited.

I have clipped the address and added my zip code number, as you requested. Keep up the good work and just a note of thanks from a serviceman; I sincerely believe the way you do about South Vietnam.

Best regards,

JOHN E. WILLIAMS.

CALIMESA, CALIF.,
August 22, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for sending me your very informative newsletter these past years.

I have recently moved to California, but I still wish to receive your newsletter. Enclosed is the mailing stamp with my old address as per your directions in your last newsletter.

I wish to commend you, Senator MORSE, for your efforts to keep the resolution concerning the Vietnam crisis from being passed.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE D. HAHN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 22, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for the monthly MORSE Reports.

Your comments in the last one on South Vietnam are certainly more realistic than the policy being pursued.

I have felt for many a long year that a thorough housecleaning of the State Department has been overdue.

Yours very truly,

H. CHAS. DETLOFF.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 17, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am in receipt of your report of August 12. I agree with your analysis of our position in Vietnam. I compliment you for having the courage to speak so frankly upon this highly emotional subject and hope that you continue to inform the country of your views.

My mailing address should be changed on your records from 3323 Southwest Harbor Drive to 1432 Southwest Sixth Avenue, Portland, Oreg.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

WM. W. MCGEORGE.

EUGENE, OREG.,
August 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you so very much for your last Report which I received, dated August 12, in which you give an extensive statement of your particular position with regard to activities in South Vietnam.

While I'm not as well informed about these facts and events as you are, by any means, I am inclined very strongly to agree wholeheartedly with your position. I know that for you to make these statements, almost by yourself, does not increase popularity under the present circumstances. Nevertheless, I think we have done some very unwise things in that part of the world. I wish somehow we could take the necessary steps to get the United Nations involved in this instead of ourselves.

In any event, I wanted you to know that I agree with the position you have taken so far as I understand the problem.

Respectfully yours,

E. J. ASCHENBRENNER.

BEND, OREG.,
August 18, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: I appreciate your stand on the North Vietnam situation. It takes a brave man to express the feelings of the people in the face of organized law violation, whether expressed by the Texas millionaire group or the ill-disguised fascism of Generals GOLDWATER and Eisenhower shown by their antagonism to press and TV reporting.

You are a credit to Oregon.

Sincerely,

CECIL C. MOORE.

SEATTLE WASH.,
August 20, 1964.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President, The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I am deeply concerned about the war in South Vietnam and urge that the Geneva Conference reconvene in an effort to arrive at a settlement, with appropriate international guarantees under U.N. peacekeeping supervision. I never could understand why the United States is going it alone in South Vietnam. I believe in making use of the U.N. whenever and wherever we become involved in foreign problems.

In the case of South Vietnam it appears that the United States is trying to weaken the U.N. and I don't like this one bit. We are no better than the Russians when we ignore the U.N. as we have in South Vietnam. Also, why has not the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization conferred on this very grave problem?

The Laotian situation should be taken up at the same time the matter of South Vietnam is negotiated, being a southeast Asian trouble spot. The introduction of foreign military personnel in Laos is in violation of the Laos declaration signed by the United States. We are guilty of breaking too many agreements when it serves our purpose to do so.

Another point I want clarified is—why has there not been a free election in South Vietnam? We hear about free elections, but again, when it serves our purpose we let the military or some dictator take over. Our deeds belie our words.

If the United States is really working for peace as it proclaims to all the world, there should be no delay in gathering around the conference table in a supreme effort to end the very grave situation we face in southeast Asia.

Let's not tempt fanatics to the explosive point.

It would be a joyous feeling for all mankind, Mr. President, if you in your capacity would show the world we mean what we say and truly want peace. This being an election year, I beg of you to use your good efforts to accomplish an end to the strife in southeast Asia.

Respectfully,

MARY O'NEILL HAYES.

HARPERS FERRY, W. Va.,
August 21, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is encouraging to know that you have spoken against the war in Vietnam. I congratulate you on your courage in speaking for an unpopular point of view. I strongly approve the idea of using the United Nations to settle the conflict. Whenever possible, the United Nations should be given a chance to operate, for each time it succeeds in negotiation it becomes stronger as an international arbiter.

Thank you for the continued service you give not only to your country but to the cause of world peace.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. BYRON WEBB.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
August 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your efforts to stop the ill-advised war in Vietnam, and for sending me reports of your speeches. Also for sending Senator NELSON'S speech on ending the draft. I have kept them in my peace information file, for future reference, and will appreciate such information in the future.

Yours respectfully,

RUTH L. SNYDER.

GREAT NECK, N.Y.,
August 25, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been reading about your position in regard to the Vietnam situation.

I can appreciate that yours is just a "voice in the wilderness," but I think it is most important that you stand by your convictions. Our country is the gainer when we have men like you in the Senate.

Respectfully yours,

MAX KOVNER.

PAWLING, N.Y.,
August 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In view of your pronounced opposition to the administration's policy in southeast Asia, with which I fully agree, I enclose herewith a copy of a letter I recently wrote the New York Times on the subject.

The Times did not see fit to publish this letter, pleading the familiar excuse of "pressure of space," which is hogwash as they have published much longer letters of mine in the past. I regret this because probable destiny is a factor that should play an important part in our calculations of the future, a factor, however, that is too often overlooked.

The significance to be attached to my letter to the Times, as I look at it, lies in the fact that even though we were to gain our objective, whatever that may be, and however it is to be determined, the odds, over the years, will remain the same: South Vietnam is unlikely to be any stronger militarily, and its political position to remain unstable and uncertain as now, while there will still be a North Vietnam, and more important, a China with a population of three-quarters of a billion people, sooner or later armed with atomic weapons, making Judge Egerton's remarks tragically pertinent. It is the future probabilities, it seems to me, about which we must think, not the present.

Respectfully yours,

EMERSON C. IVES.

AUGUST 9, 1964.

To the Editor of the New York Times:

I wholly agree with and commend the letter of Judge Henry W. Edgerton respecting our Vietnam policy appearing in today's Sunday Times.

I would particularly call attention to his comment that "When, if not before, Communist China has atomic weapons, it will no more tolerate American military action in southeast Asia than we would tolerate Russian military action in Cuba."

I would like to reiterate a comment I made in a recent letter to the Times to underscore his and Senators GRUENING'S and MORSE'S assertions "that we have no business in southeast Asia."

"What we and our Government officials seem unable to comprehend is the fact that these millions of people are permanent inhabitants of Asia, and that what we do there can be but of a temporary nature, and cannot alter the ultimate destiny that inevitably must rest in the hands of the people living in that part of the world."

Destiny is not a matter of the few years we may choose to concern ourselves in the affairs of southeast Asia, it is a matter that involves decades in time, and it is shortsighted and futile for us to think we can change the ultimate interrelationships of nations that inevitably must be resolved by the hundreds of millions of people permanently living contiguous to one another, and that thousands of miles from our shores on the opposite side of the world.

EMERSON C. IVES.

LONDON, ENGLAND,
September 1, 1964.

DEAR SIR: I am 22 years old and studying to be a lawyer in England; and I hope you will not think it presumptuous of me to write to you about Vietnam.

I read in Newsweek of August 17 that you voted against the resolution supporting the recent action taken by the United States in the Gulf of Tonkin, and that you think the United States should leave Vietnam. I wish to write to you to say that I admire your courageous attitude, and that I think that this policy is the only sensible one for America to adopt. I may add that I am not a Communist or a Socialist, but that I think countries should develop naturally and adopt the political structure that suits them best. The idea so many Americans seem to have, that their Constitution and "way of life" are superior to any other, is quite fatuous. It is merely a system that happens to work reasonably well in the United States.

It seems that many people imagine they are applying the lesson of Munich while "resisting aggression" today. This attitude is apparent in President Johnson's remark about "aggression unchecked being aggression unleashed." But so far from having learned the lesson of Munich, they are surely making exactly the same mistake. Those responsible for that episode no doubt had the First World War at the back of their minds, a pointless war that virtually nobody wanted, and which could probably have been averted if the leaders of the countries concerned had had time to negotiate about the situation. They were determined not to make the same mistake, and to work out a suitable peaceful solution.

People today are looking backward in exactly the same way, and thinking that so long as they pursue exactly opposite policies to those that turned out so badly in the past, then they must be doing the right thing.

In fact, of course, the way to deal with any problem is to look at it as it really is. The differences between Mao's China and Hitler's Germany in terms of, e.g., geographical position, economic power, and degree of madness of the two leaders, are obvious. It is clear that the most urgent problem in the East today is that of rising population and food shortage. It is also clear that the problem is insoluble, since any increase in living standards is automatically nullified by a fresh rise in population. It therefore appears that war is inevitable in the East; and this being so, it is in the interests of the United States to clear out and not become involved. The security of the United States can only be jeopardized if China acquires a nuclear bomb; and if this does occur, then the United States would be much better off to be on good terms with China, and to have allowed South Vietnam to go Communist, than vice versa.

I hope you do not mind my writing to you and expressing these far from original views.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES ROSSETTI.

OAKLAND, CALIF.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your attack on the stupid Vietnam policy of the administration. Keep it up.

J. DUTULTGEN.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
August 24, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I, belatedly, congratulate you on your stand against extension of the war in Vietnam? In both your vote (on the granting of presidential powers) and in your speeches you have represented what is to me the only sensible approach to achieving a settlement in southeast Asia—neutralized, independent states whose territorial integrity must be guaranteed by all the great powers, including China. Without your courage in bringing the facts to light, it would have been difficult for me to understand what had happened during the events in the Bay of Tonkin. It is a pity that President Johnson took the easy way out—of reprisal and of accommodation of the provocative maneuvers of the Khanh regime. I believe that your stand for a sane approach in this area will act as a rallying point for those of us who disagree with Khanh and with China—but who think an intermediate course, with peace and honor, can be achieved. Again, my admiration and congratulations—and please put me on your mailing list.

Sincerely yours,

D. S. BOLEF,
Professor of Physics.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.,
August 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am so glad that you are in the strategic position of power in regard to the situation in Vietnam; I have confidence in your judgment. Of course, you realize that what you and your committee say and do now may affect the history of the world. May you be led aright so that we may see the beginning of an era of world peace instead of world war.

We in our homes can do little but to lay awake nights and pray for you. I hope you are to be our next Vice President. I have watched you in action, approvingly, for many years.

Very sincerely yours,

ELLA LEE COWGILL.

SEVEN VALLEYS, PA.,
August 29, 1964.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: I have just received your letter of August 24. I find here, as I have sometimes found in communicating with other people, that the facts you see and the facts I see are quite different ones. Though I believe the large majority of the American people agree with me, for one reason or another, there are certainly too many who have been hearing and seeing

what you have evidently been hearing and seeing.

It seems open to question even just what did happen in the Gulf of Tonkin. Were there really two attacks or only one? Did the North Vietnamese intend to attack a U.S. ship or was it an error, since the South Vietnamese were attacking the North Vietnamese in this area prior to this with U.S. arms? There is no doubt our men did shoot back and inflict more injury than was inflicted upon them; that is enough to make our air raids on North Vietnam beyond the bounds of moderate retaliation and self-protection.

South Vietnam is a military dictatorship. I fail to see how democracy is advanced by the support of a military dictatorship. Furthermore, the vast majority of Vietnamese are not for the government they now have and arms will not make them for it.

Using napalm bombs on civilian populations is not a way to make friends and allies.

It is very easy to blame the Communists for everything that is wrong in the world here and abroad. But let us examine our own behavior before we decide the other guy is all wrong and we are all right. We violated the 1962 Geneva Convention first. We shipped arms into South Vietnam against this international agreement. Has a single Communist Chinaman been found in South Vietnam? No. But South Vietnamese trained by Americans have been found in North Vietnam. The South Vietnamese are fighting largely with homemade weapons and weapons stolen from American supplies. Were our foreign aid program economic rather than military, the arms would simply not be there, and many now dead would be alive.

Why has the United States refused to have the U.N. handle the situation? Why have we refused the reconvening of the 1962 Geneva Conference?

In Cyprus both sides fight with American arms. Doesn't that indicate something drastically wrong with American foreign policy?

I think we drive people who might be our friends to the Communists. We ship arms to dictators when the people are starving and the Communists promise them food. I agree with your comment about "shooting from the hip" and am certainly glad that Senator GOLDWATER was not handling the situation or we would not be able to argue about it, most probably, but that does not mean that President Johnson took the wisest course.

I frankly think that the South Vietnamese are rebelling, and that we would do well to recall that our own country was founded by revolution and rebellion. I think every day that passes and we fail to take cognizance of the revolutionary world we live in, the worse we make the situation for ourselves. Must we continue a stupid policy because we have begun it? It would seem so, because we certainly cannot win a war in southeast Asia, yet we waste more money, arms, lives futilely. I should like to see that money and those lives go into the war on poverty, into the proposals outlined in your subcommittee's report, instead of the mere drop in a bucket that has been voted.

A letter which I wrote to Senator MORSE on August 7 was in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 21—applauding his stand. I believe Senator MORSE and Senator GRUENING could give you much better arguments against our present policy in southeast Asia than I can, so I will leave you to talk with them although I am certainly available if you wish to argue with me in person at any time. If we are to back up our words with deeds, let us have the U.N. take over in Vietnam, let us examine our own behavior carefully and critically, let us not ship arms and men to back up military dictatorships.

Sincerely,

LINDA SMITH.

GREAT NECK, N.Y.,
August 22, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would, very much, appreciate receiving a copy of your recent speech on the subject of our destroyers patrolling the Gulf of Tonkin.

Please also place my name on your mailing list for future speeches. Yours is a voice that makes it possible for me to point out to some cynics here that our is not a "Yeh" Congress.

Sincerely,

NAT. H. SAUBERMAN.

SCHOFIELD, WIS.,
August 24, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We feel compelled to commend you for the excellent article in the August issue of the Progressive magazine entitled "Humpty Dumpty in Vietnam."

We are glad that there are informed, concerned men like you in the Senate who will courageously speak for the moral, humane solution to our problems.

We are wondering what the economic stakes are in the southeast Asian area that are worth the risk of war? Is it an area of great undeveloped riches that might be opened for investment? Or are there already "great" interests to be "protected"? Can you enlighten us?

Best wishes for your continued, splendid influence where it counts.

Sincerely,

ESTHER DIDDAMS.

SALEM, OREG.,
September 3, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been reading with interest the letters with which you have been filling the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I wonder if you are going to put this one in—probably not as I do not agree with you on your stand on Vietnam. I do believe we are putting out too much in foreign aid to the wrong places and people but I am sure my reason for opposing foreign aid and yours are two entirely different reasons.

I would like to mention that if someone from the John Birch Society had said just one tiny bit as much against the President or any of his policies that you have said, you and your so-called liberal friends would have been screeching to high heaven about them being extremists and radicals, etc.—smear, smear and so on. (I am not a J.B. member).

I have no love for President Johnson and his policies but once in a while he stumbles onto doing the right thing and in this case I agree with him.

You disagreed with the Republicans and left the party (fortunately for the Republicans) and joined the Democrats—now it appears you are heading for leaving the Democrats—where to now—the Wayne Morse Party?

I know this letter will have no effect whatsoever on your policy and statements or any other way but thought I would let you know what I think anyway.

Very truly yours,

MRS. MARY L. HINTZ.

FRAMINGHAM, MASS.,
August 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to congratulate and commend you most warmly for your realistic and helpful position on the war in Vietnam.

Yours sincerely,

PENELOPE TARTON.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
August 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I commend your courageous stand on the Vietnam situation. Events of the last few days confirm the fact that the trouble is political and economic, and a military solution is impossible. The present government smacks of dictatorship and will probably fall, as the past ones have because it has no popular base.

Another item—please, no nuclear force for NATO. It would only increase world tension. The Russians genuinely fear the Germans, and any spread of nuclear weapons is bad.

Sincerely,

EVELYN C. KNAPP.

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun, Sept. 2, 1964]

NEUTRALIZATION ASKED FOR VIETNAM

Sir. In the Forum of August 14 I urged neutralization and withdrawal of our troops from South Vietnam and quoted Senator GRUENING who said: "South Vietnam is not worth the life of a single American boy." Three letters to the Forum have since taken issue with me. They were written by L. W. Metzger, K. J. Rothe, and D. E Zevitas, each of whom claimed that both Senator GRUENING and I were wrong and urged that we continue the war in South Veitnam in the interests of freedom This issue requires clarification.

The majority of the South Vietnamese guerrilla fighters, known as the Vietcong, are not Communists. They are citizens of South Vietnam, not unlike the early American colonists who took up arms against their British overlords who imposed upon them oppressive taxes and curtailed their freedom. The majority of the citizens of South Vietnam were opposed to the military dictatorship of both the Diem and the Khanh regimes, and the present one is no different from the other two. In addition, the people are deadly opposed to the presence of American "advisers" who are aiding and abetting the oppressive totalitarian dictatorship of the present Vietnamese Government.

Senator MORSE spoke the following words in the U.S. Senate:

"For the past 10 years the United States in South Vietnam has violated the Geneva agreements of 1954. For 10 years we have tried to impose a military solution upon a political and economic problem. Our extensive military aid to South Vietnam was a violation of the Geneva accords. Our sending of troops into South Vietnam, even under the camouflage of military advisers, was not only a violation of the Geneva accords but of the spirit and intent of the peaceful purposes of the United Nations Charter itself."

It has been estimated that 70 percent of the citizens of South Vietnam were opposed to the military dictatorship of both Diem and Khanh. And every Senator and Congressman in Washington knows that South Vietnames dictators remain in power only by grace of the Pentagon in Washington. We are helping communism when we demonstrate that our interests lie not with the majority of the people of South Vietnam, but with totalitarian puppets, answerable only to Secretary McNamara and the Defense Department. By ignoring the true wishes of the people of South Vietnam who want only peace, who desperately desire neutrality and an end to the war, we are looked upon as warmongers.

Over 5,000 professors in universities throughout America as well as hundreds of our religious leaders of all faiths have urged President Johnson to seek a negotiated settlement by supporting a neutralized North and South Vietnam. But Mr. GOLDWATER and Secretary McNamara both remain adamant and trigger happy regarding this unfortunate land. Our failure to heed the

voices of our educational and religious leaders will serve only to benefit the Communist cause and to endanger the peace of the world.

President Eisenhower fulfilled the deepest wishes of the American people for peace when he promised, on the eve of his election, to go to Korea to seek an end to the Korean war. I am confident that a move in this same direction of ending the war in South Vietnam by President Johnson would satisfy the deepest yearnings of the American people and guarantee his reelection.

SYLVAN M. SHANE.

BALTIMORE, *August 29.*

NEW BERLIN, WIS.,
August 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: We commend you heartily for the forthright stand you continue to take on the Senate floor in the debate on Vietnam. We agree with you that our Government is on very shaky ground in our warfare over there. Let the dispute be put in the hands of the Geneva conference—and let the U.N. peacekeeping machinery be used there. We trust that more Senators will join with you on this stand.

Sincerely,

RICHARD AND MAXINE FRANZ.

DETROIT, MICH.,
August 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want to congratulate you for your courage and insight in protesting U.S. military involvement in Vietnam. We see this involvement as indefensible in view of our professed interest in furthering international peace through negotiation and arbitration. You are, we hope, not as alone as you may feel at this time. There in an immense national apathy regarding Vietnam, as people avoid thinking of painful circumstances which seem far away and beyond their control. Also, national solidarity is deemed in the national interest where wars are concerned, so that many people who have doubts about the propriety of U.S. actions repress their doubts under the pressure of events.

You deserve great commendation for your efforts.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. CARL R. ANDREAS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 25, 1964.

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

DEAR MR. MORSE: Permit me to congratulate you, belatedly, on your courageous and lone stand on the Vietnam question. This is but another fine act to add to your magnificent record in the Senate.

I would be proud, Mr. MORSE, to be a member of your constituency.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. FLORENCE JONAS.

KENWOOD, CALIF.,
August 26, 1964.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is with a feeling of profound respect that this note is sent to you in an attempt to express gratitude and appreciation for your integrity and insight in speaking on Vietnam and the Tonkin Gulf.

Associated with this is something approaching despair for it is only you and Senator GRUENING who have had the courage and dedication to express a reasoned, objective, and honest evaluation.

Faithfully yours,

H. D. TIBBITS.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORRIS:

Send this on to our beloved and distinguished President (L.B.J.).

GEO.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

I listened to and approved of what you said (acceptance) last night. That goes for HUBERT HUMPHREY too.

But what about Vietnam?

Better save our "neck." Our face won't even show without a neck. The American eagle has too many arrows already. And you have no mandate I know of to defoliate the olive branch further.

The letters that WAYNE MORSE has been getting (and putting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) are not from screwballs or crackpots. That so many average Americans take the time and effort to alert us to the dangers of our senseless meddling—highly provocative too—ought persuade you—as Commander in Chief.

It is possible you have certain "undisclosed" information, hidden—for security or other—reasons for this bold and daring brinkmanship.

One occurs to me. Khrushchev was forced to take a position. And did. He said if in fact we (U.S.A.) were attacked without provocation (and the full factfinding so revealed) he'd go along with what we did. He's still gathering the facts.

The day Lodge got back from Vietnam I was in the District of Columbia. He told the newsmen the only reason to have military in Vietnam was so you could "sleep." Protection from ambush was the inference. The victory, he made clear, was political. Winning the Vietnamese "by persuasion."

The teacher I talked to July 6 at the ski-lodge on Plotcan Rosa (Swiss-Italian border) was an officer in the French Army the last 2 years they were in Vietnam. He'd been in Russia (school) a year, Siberia, Peiping, etc. He made it clear to me the Vietnamese "don't want war." They don't want foreign-military personnel of any kind. Needless to say they "hate" colonialism of any brand.

Why not dispatch some of our best Peace Corpsmen (whose skin is very much the color of theirs) to Vietnam. On invitation, of course. I've lately read most of Shriver's article in the September Geographic. If I thought it would do any good (for them and us) my wife and I would go there. Turn the lock on our business for 2 years).

Yesterday in the mail the passport office turned down my bid to go to Cuba. No reason given. I ask a reconsideration to me, it is un-American to curtail travel. I'd take my own chances. Ask no protection. But I'd behave there like a guest ought to. And try my best by example to better understand their thinking.

I went to Cuba regularly until the passport ban. I've been on both sides of the Berlin wall and the "no-man's land" in Jerusalem (the invisible wall). Was guest in an average home in Novohuzretgh, Siberia, a year ago. Got my own visa right there in Moscow and did it myself. No help. I didn't even ask the (our) Embassy. Nobody pays me a dime to go there (or elsewhere). Where do the dollars come from? I've had no new car since 1938. Gave up tobacco in 1934, never did drink. So (at 56—years old) I never felt better, ain't mad at nobody. I build homes for poor folks, run a small travel agency, and practice law. Been reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since 1934—more and more each year. MCMILLAN (S.C.) first sent it to me through my Vanderbilt Law School roommate whose associate (there in Nashville) was a close relative. Yes, Pat Harrison, Joe Robinson, Wm. Borath, "Cotton Ed" (I was personal guest in his office in 1941—June). Yes even Carter Glass who led the fight against the court-packing scheme—all of them I recall.

But—back to the point—MORSE is right. Vietnamese must settle their own domestic squabble. We've no right to impose our will or "ism" on them.

Negotiate. Use the U.N. As for the 600 million Chinese, they are traditionally our friends. So are the Cubans. Canadians trade with both. Why don't we? How can we tail up puppets like Chiang Kai-shek and Khanh? Claim they're the respected heads of government.

I want to help, not hinder. But you are no servant. And intend to support you. But I'm not going to rubberstamp your policies. That ain't American.

Faithfully,

GEORGE W. KUNKLE.

CHILMARK, MASS.,
August 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I am on your mailing list and read all you send your friends. You are a refreshing spirit in a maze of conformity. I share your views that unilateral military action offers no solutions to communism and that aid to friendly dictators is no service to democracy. Those are the points that occasion this expression of my general admiration.

Sincerely,

ROGER BALDWIN.

SCHODACK LANDING, N.Y.,
August 23, 1964.

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

DEAR MR. MORSE: I want to congratulate you for voting against the recent resolution giving the President further powers to intensify the war in Vietnam.

I have written to President Johnson telling him of my support for the silent vigil for ending war in Vietnam, at the Democratic convention.

Yours truly,

BETTY E. LARES.

NEWBERG, OREG.,
September 3, 1964.

OUR DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have wanted to write you concerning your stand on the Vietnam question, about our policy in Asia, and to assure you that I know you are admired for such a stand. Thank the good Lord we have one man, a statesman Senator who is not a yes man. I have yet to find one when talking about your position who will challenge it upon the premise you have stated.

Of course, these two Portland papers—with their yellow journalism will weave in their lies and walk around the truth and inject that which you never said or meant. Like in their editorial (the Oregonian of Sept. 2, 1964) trying to put across the idea that you are all out against the President and the administration.

I notice that they will not come out and say whether they are opposed to war in Asia and the killing of our boys in an undeclared war and for what—to bolster a government of people who have no desire to even fight for their own freedom. Then as you have stated, where are our allies and what part are they taking? I surely hope that China will not open up and come across like they did in Korea, for as you say we have no business in a land war with that nation with its millions who will fight and die for a bowl of rice.

No doubt there are many who have written to you about this and have stated like I am now that we think you all-out right and if many in Congress were as courageous as you they would stand up and be counted—like the Senator from Alaska (I think) bless him.

Wish you had time to write a book of said doings—about national policy the down to earth truth—perhaps you will some day—I really believe it would be a best seller.

Sincerely yours,

MILLER H. PORTER.

PASADENA, CALIF.,
August 19, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE:

The stories of Lot and the history of Rienzi come to mind when I think of your lone voice on August 5. One lone, brave voice for the mercy of rationality. But you had one to vote with you. Where was Senator McGOVERN, of South Dakota, on that day?

Please send me the congressional report on that day.

The Peace and Social Action Committee of the center where I worship sent you a telegram of support. I send you my continuous, earnest, honest thoughts of prayerful appreciation for your clear-minded, heartening action.

Sincerely,

ROBERTA WALEN.

P.S.—We are in a colossal effort to get a million letters to our officials in Washington before U.N. Day.

R. W.

ASHEVILLE, N.C.,
September 3, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I have not written you to extend our congratulations for your splendid speech opposing the President's blank check for making work as he chooses, but we do want you to know we have been working around the clock telling others about it, and soliciting them to write you and Senator GRUENING for voting against that insanity.

Fred Stoner, editor and publisher, U.S. Farm News, was very happy that you inserted my article on Vietnam in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 20, and, of course, I am also. Would you be good enough to have one of your assistant mail me a copy of it for my files?

With admiration and warm regards,

Cordially,

HENRY B. HANES.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
September 4, 1964.

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

How can we express ourselves adequately to give support to your view? My wife and I heard your speech on KPFK–FM tonight and I want you to call on us as your supporters to tell us how we can help. I would like to order 100 copies of your speech to mail out.

THOMAS F. WRIGLEY.

MONTAGNOLA-TI. (SCHWEIZ),
August 25, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING and Senator WAYNE MORSE, *Washington, D.C.*

GENTLEMEN: Kindly add my name to those of other American citizens who are for a policy of peace.

I deeply admire the courage it must have taken for you to vote against the resolution. I trust that no insults you may have received will detract you from a "hot pursuit" of the course which you consider necessary in the interest of the American people. It happens also to be in the interest of the entire human race which inhabits this tiny planet in the universe.

If I had been a Senator in that vote, I would probably not have dared to vote "no," for fear that my vote might give comfort and aid to the Eastern powers, so that I would have probably answered only "present." But today I realize that your clear no votes have helped the American people a thousand times as much as any help which they might have given, unavoidably, to the Eastern powers.

As a small token of my esteem I intend to mail you, in October, on return from a trip, a few antique maps from my collection of antique maps; namely, maps over 100 years old of Alaska, Oregon, and Arkansas, the latter for Senator FULBRIGHT, as I resided in his State from 1951 to 1961 and admire also his work.

Let no threats from the Birch Society or from the new Burch society push you from your work to settle post-Hiroshima problems not by pre-Hiroshima, stone age methods, but by methods which will permit survival.

Respectfully and cordially yours,

KURT KAUFFMANN,
Ph. D. (Economics).

P.S.—So that you can evaluate my vote of confidence: born 1900 in Hamburg, Germany—from 1937 to 1961 in the United States—since 1945 a citizen—never a member of any Communist or Communist-front organization—non-Communist liberal subscribing to FULBRIGHT's choice of coexistence or mutual annihilation. Traveled in 39 non-Communist countries in 4 continents. I fear that President Johnson will lose at least 100,000 votes of Americans residing outside of the United States because of the archaic system of obtaining absentee ballots, instead of letting a passport be stamped in the nearest U.S. consulate.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
September 5, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: At last a voice cried out this afternoon for morality and justice. In discussions with friends, it was ever the conclusion that our part being played in Vietnam would never bring peace to that country.

In speaking of morality, how can we dare to lend American planes to ferry mercenaries to assist Mr. Tshombe?

My husband and I fully concur with you. Help the underprivileged by teaching them self-help, and in the interim supply food and machinery where necessary toward this end, else we shall be confounded; and by this I mean, new alliances will emerge antithetical to our freedom and security.

Thank you so much for being so brave—it is a lonely position, but I feel so correct.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. ROSANNE ROZIN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 27, 1964.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: I was happily surprised about your courage to dissent the U.S. current foreign policy on the floor of the Senate. I wonder if you could please send me or direct me where I may obtain some of the speeches you made about our presence in South Vietnam. I thank you for your anticipated aid.

Sincerely,

FRANK LANDSMANN.

TUCSON, ARIZ.,
August 20, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your keenly perceptive analysis of, and forthright position on the war in Vietnam are heartening to me. We must be made to recognize the ambiguity in our foreign policy, and face the discrepancy between our professed moral principles and our practice.

Our continuing resort to expediency, rationalized as a necessary response in kind to Communist tactics, carries us, with accelerating speed, toward chaos. Fear has atrophied our minds and destroyed our moral sensitivities. Even the Pentagon knows that the concept of "absolute sovereignty" dissolved when all national borders became permeable, but the State Department goes on operating right out of Bismarck, and or the early texts of Hans Morgenthau.

Full use and constant strengthening of the United Nations is not an option, but a mandatory requirement in the atomic age. The choice is simple, however difficult the implementation; we go backward toward intensified nationalism, or forward through the U.N. toward a governed world.

Would you be kind enough to send me copies of your proposals to the Senate or other statements of your position on Vietnam?

With sincere regard,

ELEANOR BACKUS.

FORT BENNING, GA.,
August 25, 1964.

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

DEAR SIR: In the midst of emotional saber rattling, the cool voice of reason manifested itself in your person.

The incidents which occurred in the Gulf of Tonkin were totally unnecessary, and would have been ludicrous if the gravity of the situation were not so great. Our policy in the Far East, particularly southeast Asia, is about as confused and equivocal as our policy anywhere else in the world.

Senator, I congratulate you on your display of courage by denouncing the policy of the United States during those days of abhorrence. And as a testimonial to you, Senator MORSE, may I kindly have a copy of the speech you delivered on the Senate floor castigating our seal action in Vietnam? A copy of your speech will greatly facilitate and enhance my ability to engage in educational debate with those who differ with me on this subject.

Thanking you for your usual courtesy and cooperation, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH A. FUSARO.

UNION OF AUSTRALIAN WOMEN,
WESTERN AUSTRALIA,
Perth, August 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: We write to congratulate and thank you for your timely criticism of U.S. policy in South Vietnam.

We know that millions of other women throughout the world think the same.

We are emphatic that this war must be brought to an end. The women and children of Vietnam have suffered enough, the threat it presents to whole world is too grave. A peaceful solution must be found.

We had an interview with the counsul for the United States in this city a few days ago. He said emphatically that America was going to stay in Vietnam. We got the impression that there were no plans to explore a negotiated settlement. It seems to us there is no other way out of the difficulty, and a government and a country of the might of the United States should be big enough to do this.

We and many other women disagree with our own Government's actions in sending men, materials, and weapons to South Vietnam. We have organized many messages to this effect to the Parliament which is now sitting.

Thank you for showing us another America, one we feel we could be real friends with.

Your sincerely,

Hon. SECRETARY.

AUGUST 16, 1964.

To Whom It May Concern:

On Sunday, August 2, 1964, about 2:40 p.m., 3 torpedo boats, allegedly of North Vietnam, attacked the U.S. destroyer *Maddox* that was patrolling along the coast of North Vietnam about 30 miles from shore and moving in a south-southeasterly direction at a speed of 15 knots.

On Tuesday at 9:30 p.m. "several" fast surface vessels began approaching from the

south and the west in separate groups, and attacked this time during darkness, using searchlights to spot the destroyers *Maddox* (and *Joy*, which had joined the *Maddox* Monday morning). The attack continued for nearly 4 hours. In the meantime, after the first attack, our President had sent an ultimatum, through channels, to North Vietnam, warning against any further such attacks against our 7th Fleet vessels on the high seas, or else. News reports that I heard indicated that the official message of warning was not received in North Vietnam by the time the second attack took place. Our destroyers were neither one damaged to any mentionable extent, nor were any of the crews injured, according to reports that I have found to read on the two attacks. Even so, our President ordered retaliation of a major magnitude against the PT-boat bases of North Vietnam which the attackers might have ventured from, or which they might venture from at any future time, which was carried out.

On face value, one could readily agree that the retaliation was justified, at least to some extent, if—(1) the attacks were entirely unprovoked; (2) one supposed that North Vietnam had been properly warned; (3) the second did in fact originate from North Vietnam (which they categorically denied according to one initial report); and, if (1) and (3) above were true, (4) even without warning if serious damage or loss of life had occurred to our 7th Fleet vessels and personnel. But let us carefully examine the facts and logic of it all.

One would suppose from the reports that the destroyers had continued in a generally southeasterly direction during those 2⅓ days between attacks, yet the entire coast of North Vietnam is only 150 miles long in that direction, considering the course during the initial attack. That distance could have been covered in 10 hours, or less, at 15 knots, the alleged patrol speed, yet some 56 hours had elapsed. One could thus assume that the destroyers were off South Vietnam before the second attack took place, or had time to make several more patrols up and down the coast of North Vietnam by Tuesday night. And if the second supposition is true, what are we doing patrolling so close to the shores of North Vietnam and Red China day after day and week after week. How would we feel if Russian destroyers and carriers were cruising back and forth, up and down the coast about the same distance out, between Baja California and Santa Barbara, Calif.

North Vietnam denied the second attack, and indeed, some of the PT-boats approached from the south, and none came from the pack of PT-boats that the destroyers had been observing on their radar screens for several hours throughout the afternoon and evening. The quantity of boats in this second attack is not given in the Navy intelligence summary in Life magazine for August 14, even though radar should have been able to count them easily, nor is the position of the action indicated in this report, or any other report in the news or on television that I have come across.

The rebellion against the Saigon regime in South Vietnam has been and is a peoples rebellion—even more so than our own war of independence of 1776. Some 75 to 85 percent of the people are against the current regime. General Khanh has been talking strongly of attacking North Vietnam, and in fact has claimed repeated commando raids into North Vietnam over the past several months, and with only some 2½ million loyal supporters at the most in his country, out of 9 million (1954) population total, who does he expect to use against the 13 million North Vietnamese population (and 700 million Chinese). It is only logical that Khanh would be looking for an excuse or means of involving the active might of the United States behind his goals, in addition to the advisory and material help the south has been receiving for 10 years, and which the French received in material and money to the tune of 78 percent of the effort from our Nation between the years of 1946 and 1954.

Also, in view of the Republican presidential candidate's intense interest in Vietnam as a prime campaign issue, it is entirely within the realm of probability that political motivations were involved in the entire mess—political motivations from within our own country and in direct relation to the November presidential contest. Of course, these are mere suppositions, and anyone who feels that our Nation can do no wrong, that we are entirely interested in peace, that we are really interested in the freedom of the nations and peoples we have become involved with, and that we are above all question as to our integrity—these people will instantly reject my insinuations, and rightly so if their faith in the goals of our Nation and its leadership is well founded. But we are that angelic?

I happen to remember the conflicting Presidential announcements during and following the Bay of Pigs invasion and the U–2 incident. I remember in 1959 how the stock market fell many billions of dollars when good news on disarmament came out of Geneva—and how in a few days the news changed for the worse and the stock market regained all of its losses and more. I remember well how our feelings toward the Soviet Union were changed almost over night at the end of World War II, and completely contrary to several wartime agreements between the three major powers in relation to close postwar cooperation to prevent there ever being another major conflict, and this began taking place within 11 days after F.D.R. passed on. Perhaps the words of Harry S. Truman on June 23, 1941 (the day after Germany attacked Russia) are a livid clue as to why these past 20 years of events have taken place and the solemn wartime vows have been slithered out from under. To quote the then Senator from Missouri, "If we see that Germany is winning the war we ought to help Russia, and if Russia is winning we ought to help Germany, and in that way let them kill as many as possible." (The New York Times, July 24, 1941—as requoted in "The Cold War and Its Origins.")

Our Nation, through its CIA, organized the Bay of Pigs invasion of Castro's Cuba, and as a result of that escapade The Nation magazine asked Fred J. Cook to do a complete report on the CIA (based only on known and published facts), the organization that is responsible to no one but the holder of the highest office of our land, the President of these United States—and which reports to him every morning the world situation and its activities at that moment. The article took up 44 pages of a special issue of the magazine dated June 24, 1961. You may borrow a copy from your local library, or request one from The Nation, 333 Sixth Avenue, New York, N.Y. The article goes into detail on the connections between the German industralists who promoted Hitler into power on the one hand, and Allen and John Foster Dulles on the other hand. It lists many military coups that the CIA was intimately involved in the organization and promotion of: Iran in 1953, Guatemala in 1954, the attempt in East Germany in 1953, and the same in Hungary and Poland in 1956, Egypt in 1952, and many attacks of a commando nature against Red China from Quemoy and Matsu during the 1950's that at least twice brought us to the very brink of war in that area. There are several others of lesser importance as well; and since that article was written, of course, there have been others including the military takeovers of Honduras last fall (when several hundred guards protecting the office of the liberal president were mowed down before they could have breakfast one morning), the Dominican Republic just a few days earlier, and Brazil early this spring; all of which set up right-wing military dictatorships, which our current President recognized as soon as the opportunity presented itself. This was as soon as he took office and got settled in the instance of the first two, and almost immediately in the case of Brazil.

In addition to the above, during April we read in our news of the house arrest of one Prince Souvanna Phouma, the neutralist premier of Laos, by the right-wing elements of the coalition government there. Subsequent to that event we read reports of merging of the right-wing and neutralist elements in Laos, and within 3 weeks renewed military moves on the part of either the Pathet Lao forces—or certain neutralist elements that did not approve of succumbing to the right-wing takeover. And then we began sending numerous air strikes against the dissident elements there and against the Pathet Lao positions. And subsequent yet, we began reading reports of commando raids into North Vietnam, and plans for invasion of the north. And as General Khanh remarked after he was elected president by a 50-to-8 vote of the military junta, "Everything we do is done in close cooperation with American authorities."

It is also significant that many of the regimes that we have been supporting, and those which the CIA helped to set up in power, have been and are still (in most cases) vicious, dictatorial, corrupt, wealth oriented, and generally indifferent to the needs of the people of their respective domains. This was true of South Korea under Rhee, China and Formosa under Chiang Kai-shek, South Vietnam under the Diems, Batista's Cuba, Iran, and many others.

It must be remembered that both political parties in our country have been deeply involved in the French Indochina area since 1946 when the rebellion against the French first began. Truman saw to it that some three-fourths of the effort to suppress the people's revolt was financed by America. Ike and John Foster Dulles saw to it that Vietnam would not be reunited by popular vote (as called for by the Geneva agreements), by building up and supporting the Diem regime and by organizing and creating the SEATO organization. And don't forget that we have sent a great deal of help and military equipment to Franco's Spain (which came into being as a result of Franco's military conquest of the duly elected loyalist government there and which was a proving ground for the war machines of Hitler and Mussolini prior to their initiating World War II), and which we invited to become a member of NATO.

And so I could go on, and on. I am convinced that the general overall events of the past 18 or 20 years, including the commando strikes against North Vietnam (undoubtedly at the direction of our military mission in South Vietnam), and the specific event of ordering 64 air sorties against North Vietnam PT boat bases and oil storage—in an almost infinitely stepped up retaliation compared to damage received by our destroyer patrol—heavily qualifies our President Lyndon B. Johnson as a war criminal, and Senator GOLDWATER right along with him for persistently encouraging such action or worse, and in fact sanctioning beforehand this particular action. On the other hand, these are not alone in their vast responsibility—Truman, Ike, and Kennedy are likewise as responsible, and the majority of Congress as well. Unless, of course, there is some other ethical or moral reason that transcends all else—some other reason why Communists should be treated as if they

were less than human beings—human beings that are making a sincere and sustained effort on the world scene to uplift the lot of the people in the most efficient way that has appeared in all the history of man—and which has proved quite successful for the most part, isolated cases of somewhat serious mistakes (which our politicians, businessmen and the press play up out of all reasonable proportion), notwithstanding.

And now, in view of the above outlined facts and the voluminous evidence that exists to back them up, in view of the imminence of a crucial presidential election just a few short months away, and in view of the only current choice for myself and my fellow countrymen to pick from—a war criminal, or a liar and potentially worse war criminal—I deem it advisable that a third choice be immediately made available and vigorously promoted.

In view of the evidence thus far, and the vote that was taken on the retaliation sanction, there are only two men of sufficient public stature and moral integrity to qualify them for the highest offices of our land. These men, in spite of the nearly overwhelming pressures which were brought to bear upon them to unanimously support the President's retaliation policy (and future acts of a like nature), were the only two, out of nearly 535 Congressmen and Senators, who saw the issue somewhat clearly and maintained a sufficient moral stamina to vote against the retaliation measure. They are Senator WAYNE MORSE, of the State of Oregon, and Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of the State of Alaska, who have consistently stuck to their principles—and to the avowed highest principles of good on which our Nation was originally founded. It is perhaps fortunate that there were only two for this leaves no doubt as to who should be chosen and receive the full support of the American people of good will.

I further propose that a new political party be immediately formed to most properly carry out the purposes and goals of the truly liberal people of our Nation. And in the interests of truth and honesty, and to most accurately portray the principles of good that are embodied in the Golden Rule and Second Great Law of God which emphasizes the twin goals of "Peace on Earth and Good Will to All Men", and likewise the initial example shown by the earliest followers of Christ, Acts 2:44–45, "And all that believed were together, and had all things common; And sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need."—in view of these highest of ideals, I propose that this new party be called the "Christian Communist Party." Those who sign their names to the major tenets of the above declaration, but who nevertheless hold reservations as to the above name for our party, may indicate their reservations by appending an asterisk at the end of the line on which their name appears and initialing same.

Reference sources for the above analysis: "Thunder out of China" by Annalee Jacoby and Theodore H. White, 1946; "A Nation of Sheep" by William J. Lederer, 1961; "The Tragedy of Vietnam" by Helen B. Lamb, at peace centers, 1964; "The Warfare State" by Fred J. Cook, Macmillan Co., 1962; "The Cold War and its Origins" by D. F. Fleming, Doubleday & Co., 1961; "The C.I.A." in the Nation by Fred J. Cook, June 24, 1961; Worldbook Encyclopedia Annuals, 1955 through 1964; World Almanacs and Books of Facts, 1958 through 1964; Encyclopedia Americana, 1949 edition, including items "U.S.S.R.", "Social Reform Movements Since World War I", "World War II", "Pacts and Conferences", "Hungary"; "Looking Backward—2000 A.D. to 1887 A.D." by Edward Bellamy, 1888; and last but not least, The Bible, King James version. Duplication encouraged, or additional copies available from Elton R. Maas, 10696 Tantaw Avenue, Cupertino, Calif., Technocrat.

MANISTEE, MICH.,
August 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You will find the enclosure very interesting.

While Burchett is by no means impartial he has been right far too often in the past to disregard what he has to say.

Your fellow Senators need to read this more than you do. Perhaps some will.

Yours,

JOHN W. HARVEY.

WITH SOUTH VIETNAM'S GUERRILLAS

(By Wilfred Burchett)

I was musing over the image of a nearly full moon repeatedly shattered by our little sampan into a million stars only to reform into a shimmering, golden orb within seconds of our passing. Framed in the delicate profile of bamboo leaves glinting in the dark where the moonlight touched them, everything looked polished and gleaming like a Vietnamese lacquer painting. Suddenly there was a warning signal from our guide; the outboard motor was cut and we veered sharply toward a bamboo thicket on the riverbank. There was the sound of many more outboard motors coming from the direction in which we are heading, and this was disquieting. We were supposed to be in safe territory. Cigarettes were doused, conversation reduced to whispers. Within a few minutes the first couple of a double line of sampans rounded a bend about 500 meters distant, followed by more and more. They were still rounding the bend when the first couple was only 20 or 30 meters from our hiding spot. But long before that, we had heard the sound of women's voices and as they grew nearer we caught glimpses through the leaves of sampans filled to the waterline with women and girls. Each was holding a stick with a papered-over frame on which slogans had been scrawled in big letters and in every sampan there were a few cloth banners with boldly printed slogans, stretched between two sticks.

Our sampan slid out again into midstream and jocular greetings were exchanged as our motor started up again and we moved on downstream past the convoy. By the way the sallies were shouted back and forth and the bursts of laughter that followed some of them, it was clear we were really in safe territory.

"They're off to the district center for a demonstration," said Huynh, my very knowledgeable journalist-interpreter. "There are about half a dozen villages represented here, but there are other convoys moving in by road and river by other directions. The enemy's going to get a nice surprise in the morning." I looked at my watch and it was just after midnight.

"They have to travel by night to avoid planes," said Huynh. "They like to be in town well before dawn before the authorities are around to give orders."

I asked what the demonstration was about, and after a few more exchanges with the boats, he explained that a village in the district had been bombed a few days previously and a new school and library had been wiped out, as well as half a dozen houses. No one had been killed, but they were going to protest about destruction of public property, as the school and library had been built by the villagers themselves. The others were coming "out of solidarity" and to protest against bombings in general. Huynh translated some of the slogans. Apart from those demanding an end to bombings, an end to the destruction of "government" and "public property" and compensation for the damage done, there were others, such as: "Higher pay for our sons in the army," "Regular leave for army men," "Pensions for wounded soldiers," "Compensation for wives and mothers of army men killed and wounded in action," "An end to beatings in the army."

"Which army?" I asked.

"The puppet army, of course," he replied.

"But the people are from the Liberation Front areas?"

"Almost all of them are."

"And they are demanding higher pay for the soldiers that come and shoot them down and burn their villages?"

"It's a correct tactic," replied Huynh. "First of all the population never admit to being 'Vietcong.' They all claim to be loyal subjects of Saigon with the right to 'protection' from the Saigon government. If there are Vietcong around it is only because the 'legal' government has run away, but this is not a reason to bomb their villages. Secondly, being themselves on a strictly legal position, they can claim the Saigon army is 'their' army and should protect them. Also it conforms to the general Front policy of winning the sympathy of the puppet troops. Such slogans give the troops the idea that they are being badly treated and adds to their discontent. But as a tactic for the actual demonstration it is also very effective. Troops find it difficult to repress demonstrators when they are demanding better conditions for the troops themselves. But it is much more than just a temporary expedient. The Front has a whole policy for such things," he said, lighting a cigarette up as extra confirmation that we were deep in Front-controlled territory.

"In cases where there are families in our areas whose sons or husbands have been killed or incapacitated while serving with the enemy forces, we give them material help. We give less than we do to families of our own troops, but we do help them.

We have a special organization that visits bereaved families—including those of puppet troops—to explain front policy and check up on their material needs. They report back and help is allotted accordingly. It may be in the form of money or food, or help with manpower. In the cases where tyrants are executed, or punished by having their properties confiscated—usually their wealth was amassed by plundering their victims, we leave enough for the family to live on. We do not want to alienate a single person unnecessarily and we want to gain the maximum possible to our cause. All that is part of the political aspect of our struggle, to which our leaders pay as much, or more, importance as the military side of things.

We had left the last of the sampans behind by that time and had the river and the moon to ourselves again. I probed Huynh about further illustrations of political strategies and tactics and the nature of politico-military struggle.

"You've already seen for yourself," he continued, "that in many areas there are posts that we could easily wipe out. But if the garrisons are quiet; if they lay off shooting and plundering and listen to the explanations given by the population, we don't shoot. If they shoot—we shoot and we win. They know that. But it is useful for us to keep them there as a target for the explanations. Almost the whole population—except for our armed forces—takes part in this. It goes on day and night. In theory the Saigon troops are forbidden to have any contact with the local population, even their closest relatives. In practice there is contact all the time. But for the past couple of years, the top brass is so worried by the disaffection rate that the garrisons are rotated every 3 months. But our people can do a lot with them in 3 months and, in any case, in the area to which they are transferred, there are others to carry on the good work. Our people live among the enemy or, more exactly, they live among us. Land reform has been carried out and our peasants, by, and large, work for themselves.

The puppet troops are peasant conscripts. When they see this free life going on around them; the landlords and tax collectors either nonexistent or under control—you think this doesn't have an effect? Compared to life in Saigon-controlled areas where the peasants are regimented and ground down like slaves? Especially when the difference is drummed into them day and night by fellow peasants working their own fields right up to the walls of their posts.

"Our liberated areas sometimes reach within a hundred or so meters of a post and the garrison has to depend on airdropped supplies, because we will shoot down helicopters if they try to land and we've destroyed the roads. We could starve them out if we wanted, cut off their supplies altogether. But we allow two or three—no more—to come out and pick up the supplies. We take the parachutes because we need the cloth. But food supplies we let them have. The troops appreciate this attitude. We always make it clear we are against Vietnamese killing Vietnamese and so they are glad to adopt our live-and-let-live attitude.

"Our leaders take the view that these are conscripts who practically have no choice but to serve Saigon, but who also don't want to die by being forced into combat with us. When there are holidays, the villagers go and visit the garrison troops. They are not too cordial toward them, but courteous. They might even bring small gifts, fruit and cakes, and mix them up with their explanations. They advise them politely to stick to the 'traffic lanes' if they come to the village and that if they come without shooting or plundering—all will be well. They will be invited into homes and given tea. But if they leave the main tracks and start uninvited toward the houses or the pigsties, poultry sheds, fruit trees, etc., they will be in for trouble with traps immediately. And if they start shooting they will be in for far worse trouble—if not on that occasion, then the next time they move out of the post. The troops know by bitter experience—their own or those of others—that this is true.

"The population is well educated by the front not to stick their necks out," Huynh continued, "always to be tactful and nonprovocative. For instance, the garrison chief often knows who are the front 'activists' in any village. The posts are built on elevations, the garrison chief has his binoculars. He can see people sticking up posters, writing slogans on the walls, addressing meetings and so on. If it is an area where he can move out and take a patrol into the village to question people, they will reply: 'Sure—there are some Vietcong here. Come and arrest them if you like. But in fact they do no harm. And if bullets start flying innocent people may get hurt. You might get hurt too because it seems they have good military training; know how to handle their weapons.' If troops do come and kill someone, the body will be carried to the post and the whole village will turn out in a protest demonstration. They will let the troops know they are in for a bad time if they set their foot outside their post again.

"Another example. The villagers contribute rice to the front—the garrison chief can see the porters carrying it away, or he will hear about it at least. But for any contribution to the front, a receipt is given. The villager will take these receipts and show them to the soldiers in the post. 'You see,' they will say, 'the Viet Cong made a levy last night. They made us hand over some rice. They say it was necessary for the liberation of the country—to get the Americans out and end the war. We had to pay up—we couldn't help ourselves.' In this way they cover up for themselves and drive another little arrow home at the same time."

Huynh who is famed as a skilled propagandist himself, and a veteran of the war against the French, explained that such tactics were only necessary and possible because, although the people opposed the administrative, political, and ideological positions of Saigon, they still technically were in Saigon-controlled territory and they had to maintain a correct legal status to remain alive.

"So we encourage them to tell the officers at the post all sorts of things," he continued. "A garrison commander may ask if there are guerrillas in the village. 'Yes,' someone will reply. 'We have guerrillas here. My son is a guerrilla. My husband is a guerrilla. Yes—they have guns.' But when they are asked what is the strength of the unit, where the guns are hidden—this they don't know. We encourage the villagers to pass on certain facts that formerly the torture squads could never have wrung out of them. With the changed relations of strength, such facts make good propaganda today. But they never reveal the strength of units or location of weapons.

"When the armed resistance first started," Huynh continued, "parents encouraged their sons to escape from the villages and join the guerrillas. The enemy started shooting fathers of those who had disappeared. The people countered this by protests, claiming the Diemists themselves had killed or kidnapped their sons. A mother would sit up half the night preparing her lad's clothes and food for a few days' journey into the mountains; pack him off in the small hours of the morning and a few hours later, when he was well away, would lead a delegation of wailing women to the district chief, demanding the return of her son who must have been 'arrested.' Or the delegation would complain about the lack of security in the village when the Viet Cong could come and 'kidnap' their lads. The people's initiative and ingenuity in such matters has no limits," Huynh said and went on to explain that in virtually every village, including the Saigon-controlled ones, there were special propaganda teams and exchanges of experience.

"The enemy know, for instance," he continued, as we lay stretched out on the bottom of the sampan under the white brilliance of the stars, the water rippling by, and the outboard motor softly puttering away, "that virtually everybody in every village takes part in making spikes for traps.

"If they are accused of this, they will speak up: 'Yes, the Vietcong make us do this. We have to obey them. You are not here to protect us—what can we do?'

"If they are asked where the spikes are kept, they will show one or two, but not the real stock. 'These are rejects,' they will say, 'the Vietcong refused to pay for these—all the good ones they have taken away.'

"They can reply like this now only because of our strength. The real breakthrough came, however, only when the people themselves started punishing the worst of the bullies." Our sampan headed into a little cove and we started reaching for our knapsacks. Huynh continued his story. "This political work never lets up," he stressed, "and it helps to compensate a lot for the enemy's superiority in arms."

He recalled that before the armed resistance had become generalized, he had worked for a time in the coastal plain areas of central Vietnam.

"At that time, we in the plains had no arms at all, but we knew the tribesmen in the hills had started to defend themselves. Punitive expeditions used to pass through our areas on the way to the mountains and our people used to work on the troops warning them in the most tactful way not to start massacring the tribespeople. It was the only sort of help we could give them at that time. 'We know the tribespeople,' one old man would say. 'They are proud, courageous people—if you do anything wrong, they are certain to kill you. They have terrible traps full of spikes and poison arrows that make you suffer terribly for a few minutes before you die. A pity for fine young chaps like you. We only give you a friendly warning because we are Vietnamese like you.'

"And when they came back again after a few days, carrying their wounded—and plenty not coming back at all—our people would be full of sympathy, would give them tea with remarks like: 'What did we tell you? Keep away from their villages or you'll all be killed.'"

Listening to Huynh, I realized that the South Vietnamese were displaying real ingenuity in the part of guerrilla warfare.

During an earlier rest period, I had been talking with some tribespeople about their various hunting methods. Kpy Plui, a Jarai tribesman who once served in the French Army and is now a famous hunter from Kontum Province, after giving me an exciting account of how his people hunted tigers and wild pigs, came down to the less dangerous business of the monkey hunt. They pick half a thousand to a thousand and more at a time.

I asked what they did with such a quantity of monkeys.

"We keep them in cages and eat them as needed. The bones are boiled down for medicine. But the very big ones, we keep for propaganda teams.

"And what about the propaganda aspect?" I asked.

"We choose the biggest ones—about 15 to 20 kilograms. We dress them up in black pants and shirts, make up their faces a bit to look like Diem—in his time—and Harkins or Nguyen Khanh now. We draw caricatures on the back of their shirts, tie streamers with slogans to their legs and smuggle them into Saigon and provincial capitals. We turn them loose around the marketplace early in the mornings, or in main thoroughfares just as people are going to work. The monkeys are a bit puzzled at first, but then they start leaping around with the slogans streaming out. People are delighted as they always are with monkeys. The police don't know what to do. It is awkward shooting at them, like shooting at the leaders themselves. Anyway they would cover themselves with ridicule trying to shoot them. So they start chasing around trying to catch them and rip off the streamers. The more they chase them and leap around, the more the people enjoy the spectacle. It is a very effective form of propaganda but it is useful for other things too. No more than three people can gather together in the streets, even in the market. The police will arrest them—even if they have only gathered because of an argument or some market bargaining. But when the monkeys and the police are chasing each other around, people can get together and our propagandists can get in some quick work."

Even lowlier creatures than monkeys figure in the fantastic arsenal of weapons the South Vietnamese people are using—and not only for propaganda. There are front-controlled villages—in Mo Cay District of Ben Tre Province, for instance—the defense of which is primarily entrusted to bees. Chi Nguyet (Sister Moonlight), another of those jewels of girls from Ben Tre, a madonna-faced beauty with a mischievous smile, told me of how from 1960 on the Diemists tried to convert her village into a strategic hamlet.

"A lot of us girls went in protest to the Provincial capital, but they arrested us all and beat us up," she said. "Then all the women of the village came to Ben Tre with their children and demanded our release. They kicked up such a row and started organizing so many other women from Ben Tre to support them, that the governor was glad to get rid of us. But then the Diemist troops had it in for our village. They kept coming, stealing pigs and chickens and always trying to force us to build fences and dig moats and

wall our village in. But we refused. In our area, as in many other parts of South Vietnam," she continued, "there is a specially big and ferocious type of bee. They don't store honey, but their sting is terribly painful; half a dozen of them can kill a fully grown man. We studied the habits of these bees very carefully. Among other things they have four sentries on permanent duty in daylight hours. If they see something they don't like, they call out the whole hive and they will attack whatever disturbs them. We learned to handle them very carefully; by *pasting sticky* paper over the hive entrance we could move the nests about.

"One day we had word that an enemy platoon was heading our way, so we set some hives in trees near which they had to pass; dug some traps in the road and attached strings to these, leading to the hives. The patrol came along and sure enough one fell into the trap and tore the paper off the hive. The bees attacked immediately and the troops ran like mad buffalo, some stung by the bees, other falling into our spiked traps. We were sure they would send for help, so we set up some more hives. Sure enough a company of troops started out by road and some more landed near the village by helicopter. They could not come too close because fields just around the village were spiked with poles. When the enemy troops came near, they saw piles of earth as if from freshly dug traps. The officer in charge must have ordered the earth cleared away to uncover the traps—which is what we had expected. The hives were hidden in the earth and were actually broken up by the troops. There was a terrible commotion when they were disturbed in such a rough way. They attacked like dive bombers, many hundreds of them. In no time at all, the troops were racing back toward the helicopters, the bees after them until they had taken enough revenge, I suppose," she said with her charming mischievous smile.

"We were very encouraged by this victory and started to rear the bees especially for our defenses and for those of neighboring villages. When I left," she concluded, "we had over 200 hives set up and the enemy had not dared to come near us for a long time."

When I met Sister Moonlight, she was far from her native village, taking part in a regional conference where experiences of such unusual types of warfare were being exchanged for application in other areas.

The use of money, propagandists and garrisons of bees are further illustration of what a people's war means even in the nuclear era. I doubt that any general staff in the world could plan from on top the use of such weapons. It is the grassroots nature of the struggle in South Vietnam that produces them. When people are defending their own homes and hamlets their resources are without limit.

Successive garrisons to Sister Moonlight's village were, of course, politely warned by the villagers of the ferocious nature of the bees in the area and that if they were coming on a friendly visit, it was better to have some of the locals steer them past the hives of bees that had invaded the area and also never to fire guns near the village because this enraged the bees terribly and "everyone will suffer."

Writers, theater workers, and journalists, I found, engage in almost simultaneous politico-military activities.

Tran Huu Trang, the well-known Saigon writer and dramatist who is president of the Writers & Theater Workers Association—also of the NFL central committee, told me that members of the association, arms in hand, took part in all major attacks.

Journalists also collect their stories of military operations while actually taking part themselves and work almost literally "with a pen in one hand and a rifle in another."

A pigtailed girl who was introduced to me as Sister Thien—not her real name because her family is still in Saigon and she goes in herself from time to time—told me something of the difficulties she and her colleagues have in producing a student paper for the Saigon-Gai-Dinh area.

"For a long time we printed secretly right in the center of Saigon itself," she said, "actually in Diemist printing shops. But things got too hot, so we bought a printing plant of our own and smuggled it out of Saigon to set up here in the jungle."

"Smuggled it out of Saigon?" I asked, knowing that Saigon is probably the most tightly controlled city in the world.

"Yes," she said with a cheery smile. "We took the whole thing to pieces. The print was taken out in the carrying baskets of scores of 'market women'—actually us girl students—the baskets topped off with unsold fruit and vegetables. The rollers and cog wheels and things were a bit of a problem, but we greased them well and attached them to the bottom of the sampans. They had a long ride in the water, but cleaned up all right later. We shipped the whole lot out in a couple of nights—right under the noses of the Diemist flics. Our problem was to print in Saigon and smuggle copies out into the countryside and other provincial capitals. Now its the opposite. We print outside and smuggle the copies into the capital. We publish 5,000 copies for Saigon and once they get down to our 'letter-boxes'—our liaison agents, they are quickly distributed and pass from hand to hand until virtually every student gets to read them. It is a very popular paper and our main correspondents are the students themselves, smuggling their articles out by the same network we use to smuggle them in. Of course we keep changing our communication channels to fool the police. So far we have had no mishaps."

And so it goes on. A ceaseless, relentless battle of the minds of everyone, from students to soldiers; from peasants to government officials and high-ranking army officers, with never a trick left unplayed. This battle is being won hands down by the Liberation Front. The Saigon regime—despite the U.S. experts on psychological warfare—has little to offer in return and no real means of counterattack.

AUGUST 31, 1964.

DEAR SIR: First, I want to thank you for your protest of the Gulf of Tonkin raids. Since your speech was not in any of the Chicago papers I just got it (excerpts rather) from another source.

Have been writing letters to the papers for a year about Vietnam and my luck is no better than yours. Not one has been published although other letters have. My last effort was an open letter to my Congressmen and Senators.

If you have any copies of that speech I would very much like some. Perhaps I can raise a little indignation among a few of my friends.

Thank you.

Yours for a better world,

MYRON R. BRUNDAGE.

SAN PEDRO, CALIF.,
September 1, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My appreciation for your recent stand on the war in Vietnam and bless the people of Oregon for keeping you in the Senate.

B. J. MCMULLAN.

VISTA, CALIF.,
August 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I agree with your views regarding our policy in Vietnam and wish to commend you for your opposition—I believe our reprisal attack was unwarranted. In fact, I am not sure the attack on our destroyers was not provoked.

Sincerely,

Miss FLORENCE JAMIESON.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.

Congratulations Senator MORSE: You are the voice in the wilderness—your courageous statements on Vietnam give those of us who agree renewed courage and faith in our own sanity. I am constantly reminded of Lincoln's rejection of the war with Mexico.

Mrs. MARIE ERDMAN

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
August 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your great fight to bring peace to South Vietnam.

Now that Senator HUMPHREY is choice for Vice President why not suggest he go to South Vietnam as peacemaker.

Maybe he can help settle this senseless war. (It's obvious our military is going from bad to worse.)

Keep up your great work for peace. It is appreciated by everyone I know, but they just don't take the time to tell you.

J. F. MCEVOY.

SCHENECTADY, N.Y.,
August 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: The news from South Vietnam lately is getting so lopsided that my imagination cannot keep up with it. I thought we just got finished distributing $300 million and a lot of halos. And now the people in South Vietnam are throwing rocks at our boys and demanding that their leaders turn in their halos.

B. COPPOLA.

AUGUST 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Could you please send me two copies of your remarks in the Senate against passage of the Vietnam resolution, the "predated declaration of war." Also, do you have a digest of the legislation you have been instrumental in getting passed, or blocked, in the last few years? I wish whatever you have were contagious down there in Washington. Did you get my wire?

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL Z. WINTROUB.

AUGUST 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to congratulate you, along with Senator GRUENING, for voting against the resolution to grant advance approval of the President's decisions regarding military steps in Vietnam war. Very little coverage was given your courageous speech in our newspapers but the full text was printed in August 15 edition of National Guardian.

We would like to send copies of your speech to a number of friends and would much appreciate several copies if you have them available for mailing.

Thank you.

Mrs. LEE C. POOLE.

BROCKTON, MASS.,
August 17, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I feel you are owed a debt of gratitude for your perseverence in your stand in regard to the war in Vietnam. I hope we have a political settlement of the struggle there.

Cordially yours,

LOIS BAKER.

FARGO, N. DAK.,
August 24, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are to be commended for your stand in South Vietnam. It is a pity that your colleagues cannot perceive the situation there as you and Senator GRUENING of Alaska see it. While there are a

few of us, professors of the arts, history, and humanities, who agree wholeheartedly with your stand, the majority I talk to advocate the get tough policy. It is a shame that the press and TV cannot enlighten people more to the issues of the day.

Sincerely,

PHYLLIS LAHTI.

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.,
August 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I applaud the courageous commonsense you have displayed with respect to the Vietnam crisis.

There has been a disturbing lack of realism about Vietnam in American policy.

Keep talking.

Sincerely,

DAVID C. HUNTINGTON.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
August 17, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: History will vindicate you and Senator GRUENING for your stand against U.S. aggression in southeast Asia.

Thank you again.

N. DUBINA.

AUGUST 18, 1964.

SIR: Most heartily agree on your stand that we should get out of southeast Asia and stop killing. Please do send me your speeches on these events.

Sincerely,

JOE CASTRO.

SLATERVILLE SPRINGS, N.Y.,
August 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are so proud of you for your courage in speaking out against our participation in the illegal war now being stepped up in Vietnam. It took real character and gumption to vote against the congressional resolution giving President Johnson "a free hand" in further involving our men, our money to support (once more) an unpopular military dictator in a suffering country. Senator GRUENING also voted against this vast expenditure in human life and resources. Bless you both.

Sincerely,

HAZEL ROOT BRILL.

NORWALK, CONN.,
August 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your stand in relation to South Vietnam based on your recognition of our Government's violation of the U.N. Charter and your insistence that the U.N. procedures be used.

Yours is a welcome voice in the wilderness.

HELEN C. HUBBELL.

SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCED HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a short time ago, the Senate voted its approval of legislation which included social security financed hospital insurance for the elderly.

We approved that program because the overwhelming mass of evidence indicated the need of older Americans for a dignified means of meeting the high costs of necessary health care. The facts are inescapable that the existing means of financing hospital and related care—Kerr-Mills and private health insurance are either inadequate, inappropriate, or both.

I am proud that the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly of the Special Committee on Aging, through its well-documented reports, was able to bring to the attention of the Senate the best available information concerning Kerr-Mills and private health insurance. Every effort was made to insure that those reports were complete, accurate, and objective.

No attempt was made to gloss over the positive aspects of the Kerr-Mills program of Medical Assistance for the Aged of private health insurance coverage. Both function effectively in some places, for some older people, at some time. But, based on the facts certain conclusions were unavoidable.

In sum, it was quite obvious that what was being done, and what was available to do the job, were inadequate to the task. Kerr-Mills MAA is an uneven, erratic, and often inequitable program. It is a public relief program which requires that the elderly, through redtape, interview and investigation, confess that they are unable to meet their needs.

While it has some value as a "last ditch" form of help, Kerr-Mills MAA cannot possibly be justified as the basic Federal answer to the health care financing needs of our elderly.

With regard to Blue Cross and other private health insurance, we found that only one in four of our elderly hold hospital insurance meeting the standard of adequacy established by the American Hospital Association. More importantly, we found that private hospital insurance coverage for the aged, under the pressure of rising costs of care and competition, is rapidly becoming even less adequate at the same time it becomes more expensive.

Our report on private coverage entitled "Blue Cross and Private Health Insurance Coverage of Older Americans," was released in July of this year. It was unanimously endorsed by the eight majority members of the subcommittee.

The report, I believe, is informative, authoritative, and revealing. Spades are called spades in forthright fashion. Needless to say, revelation and exposure usually draw criticism. Our report was no exception.

I respect the health insurance industry, which in most cases has done the best it could to offer some coverage to the aged. Unfortunately, the peculiar economic and health circumstances of the elderly create needs beyond the capacity of the commercial insurance industry. I must say that I have substantially less respect for the organization which purports to speak for most of the large health insurers—the Health Insurance Association of America.

The Health Insurance Association of America is registered with the Congress as a lobbyist. It has been in the forefront of those opposed to medicare. While it poses as an objective source of information on health insurance, it has functioned as a source and propagandizer of doctored data—designed to put medicare in a bad light.

Our report details a series of techniques employed by the Health Insurance Association which substantially distorted the facts concerning the number of older people covered by private health insurance. The sad thing about all this is that many people accepted and used this data as accurate. Many Members of the Congress have, in good faith, relied upon the misleading misinformation produced by the Health Insurance Association of America.

During the course of hearings on hospital insurance proposals before the Senate Finance Committee, the Health Insurance Association made a vitriolic, self-serving attack on the report issued by our subcommittee.

The evasive tactics employed by the Health Insurance Association in seeking to discredit our findings serve only to strengthen our conviction that our original conclusions are valid.

The first tactic used by the HIAA is their statement that our report "questions the integrity of the private insurance business." This is of course nonsense. What our report questioned, was the accuracy of the information supplied by the Health Insurance Association of America. The effort of the HIAA to paint all criticism of its activities as criticism of the whole health insurance industry is deplorable. The Health Insurance Association of America does a serious unjustice to an important industry in equating its questionable activities with the entire health insurance business.

Reputable elements within the health insurance industry did not demonstrate the same sense of panic exhibited by the HIAA upon publication of our report. For example, an editorial in the highly respected trade publication "Insurance," referred to the report as a "sobering document" pointing "to the urgency of a long, deep, searching look at the current status of the business."

The editorial went on to say that "There are many policies offered that are totally inadequate," and suggested that the industry consider establishing minimum standards of benefits. Now this is what I call a constructive and responsible comment by an important voice of the insurance industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the magazine "Insurance" be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

FACTS AND FIGURES

The McNamara report to the Senate, concerning the role of insurance in meeting the health costs of those over 65, is a sobering document.

A report published last week of the relative merits of the various hospitalization and medical expense policies of 100 insurers—and editorially lauded by the New York Times—is likewise a sobering document.

These both give evidence of a congealing public interest and concern about the availability and adequacy of health insurance for the Nation's older population.

Two basic elements comprise the basis of both these reports. One is the nature of the contractual coverage offered; the other is the matter of statistical authenticity of the comment on this whole matter of health insurance.

It certainly points to the urgency of a long, deep, searching look at the current status of the business.

Are the statistics on which public comment is based adequate?

Are the many and varied policies offered to the public adequate?

Whatever the cost involved, an immediate effort should be made by the industry to establish a minimum standard, for the measurement of a covered risk, for the coverage included in a policy, and for the material reported.

It is common acceptance that there are many policies offered that are totally inadequate. The $5 and the $10 policies are clearly inadequate. Many of the very low premium contracts with somewhat broader coverage are inadequate because of limitations.

It might be warrantable for the industry to draw up a minimum standard for a policy contract for hospitalization and surgical expense. This would not be telling any company what it would have to include above that minimum. But it would set a floor below which no one could call it an adequate policy for these coverages. It might as well be faced. Others are going to do this, if the business does not—in fact, they are doing it now. And it would do much to clear the air and guide the public.

Such a move would be worth a tremendous amount of time and money on the part of the health insurance companies.

Private health insurance has written a great history and has a powerful story to tell.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the second tactic employed by the Health Insurance Association was an accusation to the effect that our report "totally" omitted any mention of the "dramatic growth" in health insurance coverage of the aged.

Again, I say "nonsense." Obviously, a substantially higher percentage of the elderly hold policies today than were covered 15 years ago. The point is that there has been a very sharp decline in the rate of growth in coverage of older persons in recent years. This has been coupled with a decreasing ability on the part of those who now have coverage to pay the increasing costs of policies which become less and less adequate to their needs.

Our report quoted a portion of the HIAA testimony before the Ways and Means Committee in which the Health Association claimed a 28-percent increase between July 1961, and December 1962, in the number of aged holding health insurance. If true, this certainly would have been evidence of "dramatic growth."

But the subcommittee's report thoroughly demonstrated that the "growth" reported by the HIAA was in need of very drastic pruning. Their figures were grossly inflated and exaggerated.

In our report, we characterized as inaccurate and misleading, HIAA testimony before the Ways and Means Committee which stated in part:

> Today the aged have available coverage through (1) individual company mass enrollment programs, first introduced about 5 years ago and affording coverage irrespective of condition of health, which have already enrolled over 2 million senior citizens.

We pointed out that the three companies offering such coverage had reported to the subcommittee that they had, under the most liberal interpretation, no more than 750,000 different older people covered under such policies at the end of 1963. By "different older people" we mean, of course, individuals holding one or more policies. In fact, however, probably not more than 600,000 different persons are so covered. Certainly this is a far cry from the "over 2 million" claimed by the Health Insurance Association.

The source cited by the HIAA in support of its now-discredited claim was one of its own documents which stated:

> Through a development of the last 4 years, a mass enrollment approach whereby all persons 65 years of age and older in a given State can be insured regardless of present or past condition of health, well over 1 million aged persons have become insured.

The Health Insurance Association of America spokesmen now maintain that they were misunderstood by the subcommittee—that their testimony was designed only to indicate that over the years more than 2 million people had signed up at one time or another for coverage—not that 2 million were covered at the time of their testimony.

The patent falsity of the HIAA's explanation is demonstrable, apart from the fact that phrases such as "have already enrolled," and "have become insured" indicate current coverage.

First, to take their explanation at face value would indicate the existence of a problem of enormous dimensions. Most of the policies issued by the three companies offering the type of insurance involved here were issued during the last 3 years.

What the HIAA is now saying is that of the more than 2 million people who took out those policies during those few years only 600,000 still have protection.

Even allowing for terminations because of death, their explanation, again at face value, indicates that the overwhelming majority of older people who took out these insurance policies were unable to hold on to them.

Without wishing to do so, the HIAA makes a very strong case here for enactment of a Federal program of hospital insurance for the aged.

Second, all available data indicates that not more than 1 million different people were ever insured under these three programs since their inception. No data has been offered to dispute this conclusion.

The HIAA appeared before the Senate Committee on Finance to testify in opposition to the several hospital insurance proposals under consideration. Included in their testimony were cost estimates for the Gore amendment purporting to show that the cost figures of the Social Security Administration were grossly underestimated.

Included in their supporting data was a reference to a 1960 study made by the New York State Department of Insurance which indicated high utilization of hospital services by insured older persons. The citation appears on page 591 of the transcript of the recent Finance Committee hearings.

The figures cited are described as "NYS Insurance Department studies—1960 study, mass enrollment 31-day maximum." The clear inference here is that the New York State Insurance Department made this conclusion from data it had developed. But this was not the case.

The State of New York collected hospital utilization information on 19 different insurance plans plus Blue Cross programs in order to develop a composite rate which could be used by insurers in offering coverage to aged persons who converted group insurance to individual policies upon retirement.

The type of insurance plans reported to the insurance department covered four kinds of group conversion policies—offered by six reporting companies—two types of group policies—reported by five companies—one type of individual mass enrollment policy—one company reporting—four types of individual policies—seven reporting companies; and several Blue Cross types of coverage.

Among all these different plans of insurance and the many tables developed by the State insurance department, the Health Insurance Association selected the data of one company—reporting on a mass enrollment plan.

It follows, of course, that the particular program selected indicated the highest rate of hospital utilization of the many plans reported to the insurance department. That same plan offered data on utilization for males and females and for both sexes. The HIAA included in its testimony only the utilization rate for males—again, the highest possible figure.

Thus, in testimony before the Finance Committee, the Health Insurance Association of America described this one insurance policy as though it were an official State estimate of composite hospital utilization rates. They reported only the highest utilization rates reported by any company for any plan, and then reported only the utilization rate for the higher of the two sexes.

This selective distortion was not, of course, mentioned in their testimony.

Mr. President, there are those who advocate that the Federal Government must pay greater attention to the activities of the insurance industry. I think they have a point. Activities such as those of HIAA certainly warrant further review of the Federal role in the insurance picture.

The Congress has a right to expect that witnesses before it will testify fully and forthrightly. Anything less than that—and the HIAA has given us less than that—trifles with the legislative process of the Congress.

NEEDED: A DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this 88th Congress has made some of the greatest substantive gains for the conservation and development of the Nation's resources in our history. Wilderness areas have been reserved. The land and water conservation fund will develop Federal and State recreation areas. The Water Resources Research Act will assist the States to establish water research centers at our great land-grant universities. The States will be helped to foster commercial fishing. Significant protection has been given the Nation's fishery resources by the Territorial Seas Enforcement Act. The Job Corps will do again for our young people and for our forests and lands what the Civilian Conserva-

tion Corps did in the 1930's. New national parks, monuments, and seashores have been authorized. The Pacific coast inter-regional, extra-high-voltage, electric intertie has been made possible by congressional definition of the basis for inter-regional exchanges of surplus power. A Public Land Law Review Commission has been established and interim legislation enacted to assure the orderly management of the public domain pending modernization of the land laws. Much minor legislation also has been accomplished.

Surely, this is a record of which every Member of the Congress can be justly proud—a record which fully justifies the title "The Conservation Congress."

Yet, in our justifiable concern for substantive progress, we have largely ignored procedural modernization of the management of the Nation's resources. Only the proposed Water Resources Planning Act addresses itself to the way we manage our resources and it offers no fundamental solution to the problems we have created for ourselves.

Essentially, we have permitted ourselves to drift into the morass of government by committee. Between 1775 and 1787 this Nation learned the basic lesson about committees. Committees are useful, nay probably essential, to reach concensus. Committees can represent different points of view, provide a forum for the exchange and reconciliation of ideas, and agree upon a common course of action. In short, they are appropriate for legislating but committees are not suited to carry out decisions. Administration must be assigned to a responsible official who is given the power and the resources to carry out the decision reached by the responsible legislative authority.

This lesson is fundamental. The Founding Fathers demonstrated their thorough comprehension of it by establishing the Congress to reach concensus through discussion and deliberation and by assigning all executive authority to one man—the President.

In the management of our natural resources, we have permitted the erosion of this basic principle until today we have Government by administrative committees—which means that we simply have a bureaucratic system for dividing up the work to keep everyone busy and to hide responsibility—a system which itself consumes a vast amount of our top administrative talent.

Congress itself has brought on this administrative chaos by the simple process of distributing responsibility for natural resources among too many different agencies in too many departments. Consider the facts: Primary responsibility for water resources is fractured into four major departments and two independent agencies. The Department of the Interior contains the Bureau of Reclamation, the Office of Saline Water, the Office of Water Resources Research, and the Geological Survey which measures streamflow and conducts certain other water research activities. Interior has an Assistant Secretary for Water and Power and with a staff which specializes in this field. Water is a major responsibility at Interior. The bulk of water resources construction and management, however, is assigned the Civil Works Branch of the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army in the Department of Defense. There it is strictly a sideline inherited from the early 19th century when the corps was the only effective engineering organization of the U.S. Government. Although Army officers hold key command positions, the bulk of the civil works activity is handled by regular civilian civil servants, just as in the Bureau of Reclamation.

Two other agencies have important water construction and control responsibilities. The Soil Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture has a small watersheds program which involves the construction of significant impoundments on the upstream reaches of many rivers. Effective use of these dams requires coordinated programing with other river regulation agencies.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, an independent agency, builds and operates all water regulation installations on the Tennessee River. Since the Tennessee is a tributary of the Mississippi, its work must be coordinated with the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and Soil Conservation Service.

Water pollution has become a major national problem, however, and we have assigned responsibility for pollution control and river basin planning to prevent pollution to the Public Health Service, which is in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

To complicate matters still further, the Federal Power Commission is authorized to grant licenses for the construction of hydroelectric dams on rivers. Because of the requirement that such dams must be consistent with comprehensive development plans the Federal Power Commission also views itself as empowered to develop and promulgate comprehensive river basin plans, thus duplicating the planning work of the construction agencies. In several instances the Commission has flagrantly gone its own way despite the clear-cut recommendations of other Federal water development agencies and even in the face of contrary Congressional action. The Hells Canyon and Mountain sheep license cases are only two examples. It also has been subverting the intent of Congress in the Federal Water Planning Act by granting 50-year extensions of hydroelectric licenses on flimsy amendments to existing licenses.

Threats of additional valley authorities 15 years ago to end this bureaucratic jungle, led to the development of an elaborate system of interagency committees for each river basin and even to a National Interagency Water Resources Committee. Lately, pending the passage of the Water Resources Planning Act, an ad hoc Interdepartmental Committee on Water Resources has been set up. It has produced much good work in the setting of standards for project evaluation, but most of this has been done with great labor by a staff committee composed of highly competent civil servants, each representing his own department. Unavoidably the result has become the lowest common denominator upon which negotiated agreement could be reached.

Budgetwise, Congress insists upon better unity. We consider the budget for the civil works activities of the Corps of Engineers in the same budget bill with the Bureau of Reclamation, the water research offices, and the power marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior.

Similar diffusion marks outdoor recreation, despite our efforts to bring order by the establishment of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The bureaucratic division of labor is already plunging ahead. This is what we find:

The bulk of recreational responsibility is in the Department of the Interior, under the Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management. The National Park Service is responsible for more than 200 areas, including the recreational features of the major storage reservoirs of the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is responsible for the coordination of Federal recreational activities, working through an interdepartmental council composed of Cabinet officers. It also is developing a national and regional outdoor recreation plan and will administer the land and water conservation fund to provide grants-in-aid for State and local recreational development and to assist Federal agencies to develop the recreation potential of lands they manage. The Bureau of Land Management operates recreational facilities on the public domain which are compatible with other multiple-purpose use and makes public land available to States and local governments for recreational use at special low rates. The Bureau of Indian Affairs fosters recreational development of tribal reservation lands, both to provide recreational opportunities for the Indian people and other American citizens and to improve the economic conditions of the Indian tribes.

Hunting and fishing are also in the Department of the Interior under the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, which reports to the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife. The Bureau provides other recreational opportunities such as hiking and picnicking which are compatible with wildlife refuge purposes. Although these programs are directed between two Assistant Secretaries, the Secretary of the Interior at least has responsibility for all and can insure their consistency and their balance.

Three other agencies, however, maintain major, separate outdoor recreation facilities: The Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture; the Corps of Engineers in the Department of the Army in the Department of Defense; and the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has turned over much recreational management to State and local governments in its service area. Both the Forest Service and the Corps of Engineers serve more visitors each year than the National Park Service.

Still other agencies are involved in outdoor recreation in some way. The Urban Renewal Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency has

an open spaces program which enables metropolitan local governments to purchase lands for recreation, esthetic and related purchases. The Soil Conservation Service's small watershed dams have recreational value for swimming, boating, fishing, and other water-related activities. Federal Power Commission licensees protect migrating fish and open impoundments for public recreation. The Area Redevelopment Administration has made numerous loans to foster recreational development where that activity offers the best hope for permanent economic support to a community. One count cites 27 Federal agencies which have responsibility for some phase of outdoor recreation in the United States.

A third type of confusion stems from the separation of our two principal land management agencies in the first decade of this century. When the Bureau of Land Management was still dedicated to the philosophy of disposing of the public lands as rapidly as possible, the setting aside of our precious forests in a separate agency, the Forest Service, dedicated to the philosophy of permanent sustained-yield management in the public interest, was essential. The politics of the Theodore Roosevelt administration led to the establishment of the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture rather than as a sister bureau in the Department of the Interior.

This arrangement has made no sense for a generation or more. The Forest Service is a land management agency, not a rural service agency. It has few, if any, vital coordination relationships with other bureaus in Agriculture. It has many and continuous coordination relationships with its sister land management bureaus, all in the Department of the Interior: the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. Congress has long recognized these facts of life and handles the Forest Service budget along with the regular Interior budget, separately from the Department of Agriculture budget. Separating the Forest Service budget from the Department of Agriculture budget greatly weakened the ability of the Secretary of Agriculture and the chief executive to exercise the constitutional authority of the President over this agency.

Recently we have seen choice examples of what happens when one conservation agency is alone in a different department from the bulk of its sister agencies. Both in the Accelerated Public Works Program and in the Job Corps, the Forest Service, solely because it is located apart in the Department of Agriculture, has been treated as the equal of all the other land management agencies combined. The four Interior agencies manage more than 600 million acres of public domain, three times the Forest Service total; serve more annual vacation visitors; provide special services to the Indian people, which has no parallel in the Forest Service; and have a combined annual budget about twice that of the Forest Service. Yet the Accelerated Public Works program allocated $64 million to eight Interior agencies of which the Bureau of Indian Affairs received $21 million; the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, $21 million; National Park Service, $11 million; the Bureau of Land Management, $11 million; and $63 million to Agriculture, virtually all to the Forest Service. The Job Corps is dividing its camps 50–50 between Interior and Agriculture. Five bureaus, including the Bureau of Reclamation, are participating at Interior; only the Forest Service is involved at Agriculture. Is this a rational decision or a rational allocation of the taxpayers' money, or is it the result of encrusted bureaucratic powers immune to rational executive direction dividing the spoils?

It is time to end such administrative confusion and the multiplication of such administration expedients. Two kinds of constructive action are needed to modernize natural resources management. First, basic tools of sound management need to be systematically put into practice; secondly, basic administrative reorganization should unify responsibility and make the new tools effective.

Two new tools are especially needed for effective management of the Nation's resources: long-range planning and capital budgeting. Other tools are closely related.

Capital budgeting, based upon sound economic analysis, is long overdue. We have been treating Federal expenditures for natural resources as though they were comparable to normal expenditure programs for other Government services, such as law enforcement, operation of the courts, collection of taxes, maintenance of the Armed Forces, and representation of the Nation in other countries. They are not comparable at all.

Natural resources are a basic source of wealth. Money expended for construction of a hydroelectric dam or for the replanting of a forest is not simply expended for a necessary service. It is invested in a permanent asset which thereafter will produce wealth for the Nation far exceeding the initial expenditure.

All businessmen, indeed all of us in our private lives, make a distinction between operating expenditures and capital investments. None of us would think of regarding the cost of a new home as a sum to be paid out of one year's salary. Debt service and mortgage retirement are the costs we calculate in our personal annual budgets. Personal or business liabilities, such as mortgages, are offset in our personal and business ledgers by the capital assets we have acquired. A business, or an individual, is solvent if his assets exceed his liabilities.

Not so the Government. When it builds a major electric transmission line, for example, it treats the expenditure as though it were for paper clips and reams of paper—money which goes for necessary operating expenses. True, the expenditure for the line is recovered through charges to the users, but for budget purposes, and in debt analysis, it is treated as an operating expense.

Our national debt is treated as though the Nation had no marketable assets. Decisions to invest or not to invest are made, in the last analysis, not on the proper basis of whether the investments are sound and in the public interest, but on whether such investments will raise the total dollar expenditures above the total dollar income of the Nation for the next budget year. We thus force capital investment to compete with necessary operating costs in shaping the annual budget, and because it is easier to put off building a new dam or reforesting a denuded hillside than to curtail going services, we hamstring needed new capital investment in natural resources.

This is nonsense reckoning. If the Nation's capital assets are increased more than the debt is increased by a capital investment and if the investment can be recovered together with the costs of operating, maintaining, and servicing it, then the investment should be made. It is a sound, prudent move. Every businessman in the Nation, faced with such an opportunity to borrow money to make a profitable investment, would seize it instantly. The principal restraining consideration for economically justified Government investments should be whether the investment can be undertaken without needlessly inflating prices; not whether it will raise the annual expenditures above the annual income during the construction period.

The obvious solution is to treat sound capital investments under an entirely separate budgetary concept. Proposed capital expenditures should be balanced against the capital assets they will create. The national debt should be balanced against the Nation's present capital assets. Where it is feasible, as in the construction of electric transmission lines, we should also give serious consideration to authorizing self-financing powers to the responsible Federal agencies so that revenue bonds rather than general obligation bonds may be used to obtain the necessary investment capital. The TVA self-financing system is an existing successful application of this principle.

Long-range planning is a second needed tool. Despite much noise about long-range planning, little has actually been done in the Government. Much of what has been put out as long-range planning is merely promotional literature for bigger and better bureaucratic activities.

Well designed long-range plans should oblige each agency to set forth clearly and precisely what its goals are or what the agency believes they ought to be. Each goal should be justified by public need, present or demonstrably forthcoming, based upon sound inspections of national population and economic change, and by economic and other analyses which prove that the achievements or services to be expected are worth the costs to be incurred.

The accomplishment of the goals should then be scheduled by the specifying of objectives or targets which can be stated in measurable terms and scheduled for accomplishment by set times through specific programs of action. Manpower, costs, and time schedules should be prescribed.

Once a long-range plan is laid down, an agency should be held to it, with changes being reviewed and approved as often as circumstances require.

Such a system permits orderly budgeting from year to year to accomplish the plan; fosters coordination of activities among agencies to accomplish related objectives; and enables responsible policy-level officials to make coherent choices to alter agency directions, to speed or slow programs, or to change relationships among them. Robert McNamara has introduced such a long-range planning system at the Department of Defense. It is paying handsome dividends, not only in immediate cash savings in our defense effort, but in enabling the Nation, through its Secretary of Defense, to make rational choices among alternative courses of action to optimize the Nation's effective defenses within the resources which the Congress feels it can afford to allocate to defense. Had we comparable systems for the rest of the Government, the President should be able to make similar choices among very diverse programs. And it is believed he would quickly find that we have grossly neglected to invest in the underpinnings of our wealth—the Nation's natural resources.

Lacking such a system we will continue to allocate resources by interagency peace treaties negotiated by interagency committees composed of top level career civil servants.

Retooling, then, will not be enough. Drastic reorganization of natural resources administration must be undertaken if we are to end government by committee and the bureaucratic game of dividing the spoils. Halfway measures will not suffice. A bold and sweeping reorganization is required if we are to regain effective policy direction of the Nation's basic wealth.

All Federal programs primarily intended for the management of the Nation's natural resources should be brought together in a single Department of Natural Resources. I do not propose to change programs, like those of the Small Business Administration, which may affect the management of natural resources as an incidental part of their general activity. I do intend that all agencies having major responsibility for the management of federally owned resources should be united under one Cabinet officer.

Specifically this requires four major changes:

First, all the land management agencies save the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, should be under one Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management. This means that the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should be responsible to the same Assistant Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources. This will fix responsibility both with land and outdoor recreation.

Second, all water resources management should be under one Assistant Secretary for Water Resources. This means specifically that the civil works functions now assigned the Corps of Engineers, the pollution control functions now assigned the Public Health Service, the small watershed program now assigned the Soil Conservation Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Office of Saline Water, the Office of Water Resources Research, the water data gathering and analysis services of the Geological Survey, the hydroelectric licensing functions now assigned the Federal Power Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority intact, except for its power functions, should be responsible to the same Assistant Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources.

Third, power marketing responsibility should be assigned an Assistant Secretary for Power who would be responsible for the power generating and transmitting functions of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the remaining regulatory duties of the Federal Power Commission which should be transferred intact. He could then systematically go about planning, fostering, constructing, and managing a national power supply system in cooperation with the various generating and distributing agencies, public, cooperative, and private, to insure the Nation a boundless supply of low cost power.

Fourth, although the Bureau of Indian Affairs has many land management responsibilities, its primary duties now are in the education, adult vocational training, industrial development, social welfare and related fields of human services. Only a minor fraction of its budget goes for land management functions. The same is true of the Office of Territories. These agencies have no proper place in a Department of Natural Resources and probably should be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Such a reorganization should permit us to eliminate all of the elaborate interdepartmental river basin committees which have been engaged in the business of carving up the rivers to keep each of their member agencies busy. It should permit elimination of the elaborate Inter-Departmental Outdoor Recreation Council and permit real recreation planning leadership through the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. It should facilitate the systematic assignment of all Federal forest lands to the Forest Service and the blocking up for permanent multiple-use management of the bulk of federally owned rangelands by the Bureau of Land Management. It should facilitate common arrangements for fire control, road construction, and law enforcement among Federal agencies which administer adjoining lands. It should allow for the rational assignment to the National Park Service of all important areas to be managed primarily for recreation by the Federal Government. Instead of a bureaucratic jungle of interagency committees, the Nation should behold an orderly, rational administrative structure, properly responsible directly to officers appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate who are in a position to give effective coordinated policy direction to the Nation's resources programs.

We should then be able to act intelligently to introduce long-range planning, capital budgeting, modern machine records systems, and other tools of efficiency to the end that our Nation's resources may serve us, and our children, and their children and beyond, with all of the necessary materials for the good life.

In effect I am suggesting that we modernize our national resource agency function by adopting the long overdue recommendations of the first Hoover Commission and establish a Department of National Resources.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF PUBLIC POWER TO U.S. ECONOMY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before this Congress adjourns sine die, I wish to make a brief speech on some of the contributions that the public power program has made to the economic progress of our Nation within the last 21 years.

CRUCIAL ISSUES FACED OVER TWO DECADES

All of us can be proud of what was achieved through the work of the American Public Power Association and the cooperation of those of us in the Congress who worked with public power groups in developing, not only for our generation but for future Americans, a strong and lasting public power program with its yardstick protection of rates paid by power consumers.

The years that have passed since the first convention of the American Public Power Association 21 years ago have produced significant events. I recall distinctly and with satisfaction our success in obtaining congressional approval of TVA's New Johnsonville steamplant in 1948, the dramatic revealing of the ugly facts of the Dixon-Yates deal back in 1954, and our success in obtaining passage of self-financing legislation.

It gives me satisfaction to recall that I have been a part of the group of legislators who worked for adequate appropriations for Federal power marketing agencies in the Southeast, Southwest, and the Pacific Northwest, and who backed public power development at Niagara and St. Lawrence.

In 1954 a group of us vigorously opposed the atomic energy giveaway program which former Senator Knowland of California sought to steamroller through the Senate; in 1956 many of us supported efforts to secure public participation and control in the field of nuclear power, and in 1957 we fought attempts to restrict the small reactor program which benefits consumer-owned electric systems.

It was my bill for a high Hells Canyon Dam, which public power groups supported magnificently, as did a majority of the Members of the Senate, that provoked the historic congressional fight for comprehensive development on the Snake River. We worked for authorization of the Hanford nuclear powerplant, which will be the world's largest atomic station. We fought the "no new starts" policy and supported an all-Federal transmission grid for the Colorado River storage project.

NEED FOR CONSTRUCTIVE CONTROVERSY

There is a great dearth of constructive controversy in this country today. The prevailing tendency is to wrap potential public disputes in platitudes and hope that the problem will go away. When answers are required and the facts get in the way, they are frequently reshaped to fit preconceived solutions. Politicians are prone to procrastination, as a natural defense against antagonizing voters, and there are plenty of special interests to whisper in any available Congressional ear that retention of the status quo is essential to the American way of life.

But the fact of the matter is that the American way of life has been built on the byproducts of great debates which have raised issues to peaks of principle, visible to all citizens to agree with or attack. This country was born as the result of a revolution, developed its Constitution in a classic controversy over the elements of democracy, determined to preserve the Union in a bitter struggle which divided the Nation into two armies.

Today in this country we live in an aura of affluence. It is true that 5.4 percent of our total labor force—some 4.3 million workers—are unemployed, and that one-fifth of American families—representing an estimated 35 million people—have average annual incomes of less than $3,000. But these hard facts seldom touch the lives of most of us. Thirty years ago it was different. We were in the midst of a deep depression. Unemployment touched nearly every family in some fashion. Your family was considered extremely lucky if it possessed a $3,000 annual income, or even half that amount.

With affluence comes complacency. If times are good, why rock the boat? Apathy relinquishes the reins of leadership to those who seek to perpetuate or expand their own power, whatever the cost to the public interest. If you are fed a few false "facts" in the newspapers or find you have been fleeced by a few cents or a few dollars in a business transaction, apathy tells you that you can shrug your shoulders because it does not hurt much.

PRIVATE COMPANIES SECURE SUBSIDIES

What hurts you a little can help someone else a lot. Private power companies know this. Based on a 6-percent rate of return—normally considered reasonable for electric utilities—200 private power companies overcharged their customers by almost half a billion dollars in 1961, according to a study by the Federal Power Commission. Some 47 million consumers each contributed an average of $10.55 to this utility windfall.

Instead of seeking ways of correcting this abuse, the U.S. Congress this year rewarded private power companies by prohibiting the Federal Power Commission from requiring them to pass on to consumers immediately a totally unwarranted 3-percent tax credit—a reduction in utility costs which will put millions in the pockets of these companies. This is only the most recent of a long string of tax favors, including fast tax writeoffs, liberalized depreciation, and tax-free dividends which have been handed out to these companies over the last decade. Today the private power companies continue to collect taxes from consumers which the companies do not pay to the Federal Government but hold for their own use. At the end of 1962, accumulated "phantom taxes" amounted to $1.6 billion.

FPC statistics for 1962 show that net profits for the Nation's private power companies were up 9.5-percent over 1961, compared with a 5.8-percent increase in net profits for all industries, and a 3.1-percent increase in net profits for manufacturing industries. Private power companies netted 15.3 cents out of each revenue dollar in 1962, while the comparable figure for all industries was 3 cents, and 3.1 cents for manufacturing industries. Preliminary figures for 1963 show that the private power companies enjoyed another 6.3-percent boost in profits for a new record of $2.2 billion.

These companies tell you in expensive advertisements in national magazines that they are the quintessence of "free enterprise." But I tell you that they are subsidized monopolies, sheltered against risk, provided with a guaranteed rate of return on their investment after taxes, and granted special powers by Government. They are in business to perform a function affected with the public interest, and their response to this responsibility has been to attempt a "snow" job on the American people.

UTILITIES SEEK TO CRIPPLE REGULATION

Hundreds and thousands of dollars are annually siphoned off from monthly electric bills to finance the massive propaganda and public relations campaign of the private power companies. They are heavily engaged in political activity to promote the interests of management and shareholders—at the expense of their customers. I have run for public office in the face of their financing efforts, and I know. It is difficult to recall a Federal hydroelectric project that they have not opposed, although when the dam is constructed they are usually eager to purchase power—at dump rates. They have fought the antimonopoly preference clause for years.

The companies like to claim that they are regulated in the public interest. Even the casual observer is aware of the fact that State commissioners have never effectively controlled the rates of private power companies. And when the Federal Power Commission started to get tough, the companies' answer was to launch an effort to destroy effective regulation by legislation and political pressure.

Legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives which would reverse the recent unanimous decision of the Supreme Court in the Colton case upholding the authority of the Federal Power Commission to effectively regulate sales of electric energy at wholesale in interstate commerce. It would cut the heart out of part II of the Federal Power Act, a portion of the statute which is of vast importance to local public power agencies who may seek relief from unfair or discriminatory power purchase contract provisions imposed by private power companies. It would eliminate meaningful regulation of increasingly large and integrated power companies. This proposed amendment of the Federal Power Act will be pushed by powerful forces who oppose any effective curb on their activities. FPC Chairman Swidler has declared that passage of this bill would take us "back to the Insull days as far as Federal regulation is concerned." You and others must help bring to public attention the reasons why this bill should not be enacted into law.

Wrapping themselves in the flag is a favorite power company tactic. To hear their story, they are more American than Betsy Ross. Shrouded in the stars and bars, shouting accusations of oppression by government fiat, they raise the cry of "freedom." And for once, at least, they are right. The issue is freedom—freedom of choice by any community to determine for itself how it will provide itself with electric service.

The history of the private electric power industry in this country reveals one stark fact: Competition by example is the only truly efficient way of regulating electric rates. The "yardstick" function of local public power systems is a major bulwark against excessive charges. Your organization is dedicated to the concept of more power at lower cost for greater numbers of Americans. Fulfillment of this goal benefits your local community, but it also advances the economic interests of electric consumers throughout the United States. I urge that you press forward to implement this goal.

The private power companies fear the competition you provide. Even though they control 80 percent of the industry, they attempt to brainwash the American public into believing that the public sector constitutes an active, aggressive threat to their existence. If they do not clean up their own house, perhaps this is true. But the remedy lies in their own hands. They cannot solve the problem by blustering about "socialism," beating their breasts over patriotism, or resorting to "guilt by association" tactics. The answer is to compete and provide—as the companies say they are "ready, willing and abe" to do—better service at lower cost.

Electric rates in the Pacific Northwest are the lowest in the Nation. We are fortunate in possessing strong municipal systems, public utility districts, and rural electric cooperatives. Twenty Federal dams on the Columbia River system supply low-cost power and energy, marketed by the Bonneville Power Administration under the preference clause. Here are all the elements that the private power companies constantly criticize.

Yet the public power programs of the Pacific Northwest have helped, not hindered, the growth of privately owned utilities. In 1937, the year the Bonneville Project Act was signed into law, the major private power companies in the Pacific Northwest realized net profits of $6,900,000. In 1962, their net profits were $45 million—a 559 percent increase. The gain for the total U.S. private power industry during this same period was only 320 percent. While dividends paid stockholders by the Pacific Northwest com-

panies boomed by 1,660 percent, the average for all U.S. private companies was 333 percent.

PUBLIC POWER DISTINGUISHED BY DEMOCRATIC CONTROL

These facts about the Pacific Northwest make mockery of the elaborate and erroneous logic of the companies about unfair competition. They may claim that the "yardstick" concept is meaningless, but as far as the consumer is concerned, it has one overriding merit: It works. And as long as we have available active, vital consumer-owned utilities, distinguished by local, democratic control, it will continue to work. In your systems there is no conflict of interest between the consumer and the stockholder, because they are one and the same. You can devote your system to good service and low rates, and your community and its citizens will be the beneficiaries.

We in the Pacific Northwest know the benefits you can provide. Twenty-five years ago, few of our farms had electricity, but today 99 percent of our rural areas have the advantage of light and power. Pacific Northwest families use 10 times as much electricity as they did in 1940, and 2½ times as much as the national average.

The private power companies like to rant and rave about the taxes they "pay" to aid local economies. But they know as well as you that they are only tax collectors. Listen to Edwin Vennard, managing director of the Edison Electric Institute, in his book "The Electric Power Business" published by McGraw-Hill in 1962: "Taxes, like labor and fuel, are an expense and, like other costs, are included in the price of the commodity. Thus, in effect it is the customers who pay the company's taxes." And the companies deliberately ignore taxes, payments in lieu of taxes, and services provided at cost which local public power agencies contribute to their community.

TECHNOLOGY MUST BENEFIT CONSUMERS

Undoubtedly all of you have studied statistics predicting the fantastic future growth of the electric power industry. By 1980, power requirements of the American people are projected as three to four times greater than today. The enormous savings possible in relatively small reductions in cost of electricity are staggering when we consider these demands. A reduction of only one-tenth of a cent per kilowatt-hour can mean $3 to $4 billion more in the pockets of consumers two decades from now.

Will consumers realize the huge economic benefits which can accrue from technical advances such as large generation units and extra-high-voltage transmission which the experts say will set new standards for electric production in 20 years? I think the answer here will largely depend on you.

There is an ever-increasing concentration of power in the private sector of the electric industry. While in 1917 there existed more than 4,000 private utility generating systems, in 1962 the figure was less than 400. These remaining companies have intensified their attacks on you and related programs. With mammoth assets—12 percent of all capital invested in business in this country—they are prepared to buy their way into a monopoly position by purchasing your systems wherever they can.

I believe it is essential to the cause of low-cost power that public power systems not only survive, but prosper. I believe that a major policy of the Federal Government should be to insure that the competitive influence that public power systems represent will continue to be felt in all parts of the Nation.

To accomplish this, the American people must be assured a source of low-cost wholesale power, created either by public power generation or purchased from a friendly supplier. The Federal power program and the preference clause remain a principal protection for our power systems in many parts of the country.

DEVELOPMENT OF HYDROELECTRIC RESOURCES REQUIRED

We have developed only 25 percent of our potential hydroelectric power. Many useful multiple-purpose projects remain for authorization and construction as part of our comprehensive river basin development program. We cannot—and should not—leave to private parties the development of multiple-purpose sites. Let them develop low-head dams.

Availability of public development is the only method we have available to insure full comprehensive use of our limited water resources. The failure of the House to pass my Hells Canyon bill is only one example of the economic waste which results from neglecting to fulfill this conservation duty. Public development is essential where power revenues are required to finance other purposes, such as irrigation. Nor can a private corporation be expected to invest heavily in non-revenue-producing features such as flood control, navigation, and wildlife enhancement. Some projects, such as proposed giant dual purpose nuclear desalinization and powerplants, are of a size and importance that public control is necessary and desirable.

Public development can create the economic lever of competition and apply it to reduce costs of electricity in an industry which is monopolistic in nature and insulated from the normal forces of "free enterprise." It permits taxpayers to obtain directly the full monetary benefits of water resource projects. Only with public development can we successfully advance the philosophy of more power at lower cost through promotional rates which encourage use and production.

Viewed in the perspective of total Federal expenditures, amounts invested annually in land and water resources development are small—always less than 2 percent of the total Federal budget. Since 1900, the United States has spent $21.5 billion on programs of the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and TVA combined—less than one-third the amount budgeted for defense today in a single year.

Specific power policy issues face Congress today. The advice and action of public power groups can play an important part in determining whether or not these issues are resolved in the public interest.

INTERTIES MUST SERVE PUBLIC INTEREST

On the Pacific coast, the Congress has just approved the construction of an extra-high-voltage interconnection linking the electric systems of the Northwest and Southwest to permit sale and exchange of surplus power and energy for the mutual benefit of all parties—public and private—in the two regions. Benefit-cost ratio of such an intertie is estimated at 4 to 1. It is a lucrative proposition, and many are eager to exploit it.

This facility should be a common carrier, available to all on equal terms, and fully responsive to public needs. Special interests who seek profit at public expense or organizations who seek to satisfy their own needs without proper protection of the rights and requirements of others should not be allowed to dominate this transmission system.

Recently a top private power company executive in the Northwest was candidly quoted in the Wall Street Journal as saying, "Who controls transmission controls the works." He is right. It is for this very reason that I say that Congress and the administration has a clear and compelling responsibility to guarantee that interregional interconnections such as those proposed between the Northwest and Southwest do not become instruments of monopoly.

We need other high-capacity interties in this country. Advances in transmission technology can provide great advantages to consumers in terms of cost—but not if we allow the uninhibited construction of "transmission tollgates."

This is not just a matter of applying advanced technology. Hand-in-hand with full scale power pooling on a nationwide basis must go means to insure that consumers share the benefits and that economies are not promoted solely for profit. Supertransmission on a regional scale adds a new element to the electric power business—which is a public business no matter who owns or operates it. Electricity is an essential of everyday life and we must guarantee that giant powerlines do not create a new form of monopoly which will allow a few men to control both the current and the cash register.

FEDERAL LINES NECESSARY FOR PROPER PROTECTION

I believe that the utilities which seek to build major transmission across State lines should be required to go before the Federal Power Commission and prove that their plans are in the public interest. I support regulations adopted by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture which require that when a private electric power transmission right-of-way is granted across Federal lands, excess capacity be made available to Federal power systems for transmitting power to preference customers; it makes sense to avoid wasteful duplication of facilities and destruction of useful land. But neither of these policies is enough by themselves. We need publicly owned lines to provide a standard of cost competition.

Congress last year approved appropriations for construction of two large Federal lines to interconnect the Northwest and Southwest, subject to passage

of regional protective legislation and good faith negotiations on other proposals to do this job. Nine non-Federal entities have offered to build all or part of such a system, but the Secretary has found their proposals are not fully responsive to criteria issued by the Department. These proposals should be rejected if they do not provide maximum benefits, for the foreseeable future, to the largest number of people at the lowest possible cost—and without creation of monopolistic control by a particular State or utility. Experience has indicated that only when Federal transmission lines are activated or easily accessible are preference customers and the Federal Government—which owns and operates power projects in both the affected regions—assured a fair deal.

BUDGETING PERSPECTIVE DEMANDS CAPITAL BUDGET

There are other issues which Congress should face, but which it has avoided. One is the capital budget. We need a capital budget to put the Federal power program in proper perspective. Investment in hydroelectric projects represents creation of an asset which will pay back its full cost plus interest. Power is a "paying partner" in multiple-purpose projects. In the last decade, taxpayers realized better than $1 billion from sale of electricity from Federal projects.

But today we lump self-liquidating costs for power together with governmental operating expenses such as typewriter ribbons and carbon paper. Establishment of a capital budget would be a basic fiscal reform, permitting a meaningful distinction between current and capital outlay, and I have pressed for such a budget since 1947. A capital budget represents a sound business principle. It should be pushed by your organizations, and all Americans interested in accurate examination of national expenditures.

There are issues which will be tested in the courts. One is the erroneous decision of the majority of the Federal Power Commission awarding a hydroelectric project license to a group of private power companies for development of the middle Snake River—even though the Federal Power Act clearly specifies that in this case preference must be given to the competing application of public agencies. This ruling by three members of the Federal Power Commission is wrong on the law, it is injurious to the economic interests of the Northwest and the Nation, and it should be reversed.

Federal power programs and the preference clause are no panacea for the preservation of competition in the electric industry. You will have to take action—individually or in cooperation with each other—to develop fossil-fuel or nuclear steamplants to meet your needs. There are many difficulties in the way of joint endeavors, and no general solution to these problems. But you already have examples of projects of this type, and many of your meetings here are devoted to discussion of the manner and method of extending this approach.

This I do know. Those of us in Congress who believe in the case for competition in the electric industry look to you for aid in supplying answers to increasingly complicated questions of public policy in this field. I hope that you will attempt to supply them.

I am suggesting that public power groups should spark the constructive controversy that is required in this area. The private power companies seek primarily to perfect their claim to a divine right to sell electricity. Regulatory commissions have proven incapable of resisting external or internal pressures applied by the power companies. Users of electricity are largely unorganized and inarticulate. That leaves consumer-owned electric systems to advance the new ideas which may be required to deal with bigness in the electric business.

Few people enjoy engineering arguments or picking a fight. Our society makes it tough on the individual or group that wants to change the system and shake up vested interests. I have been subjected to harsh criticism on a number of occasions, and I have had the treatment. That is part of the job of any U.S. Senator who is worth his salt. All of us have a responsibility to work for what we think is right. The case for competition is right. It is verified by experience. And it is well worth fighting to maintain.

As the Congress adjourns sine die tonight, I wish to give assurance to my friends and supporters that I shall continue in the next session of Congress to serve as one of the watchdogs of the Senate seeking to guard and protect the public's economic interest in maintaining and strengthening the public power yardstick in connection with hydroelectric power development throughout the United States.

For 20 years, I have sought to carry out the trust that liberals before me such as Robert M. LaFollette, Sr., Robert M. LaFollette, Jr., George Norris, Hiram Johnson, Clarence Dill, Burton K. Wheeler, William Borah, and Charles McNary, left as a legacy of obligation to those of us who have followed them here in the Senate in respect to protecting the rights of all the American people in their natural resources, including in particular the potential electric power resources of the rivers of America.

It is easy for many people to forget that each generation is, in fact, a trustee of God's gifts of natural resources to the people of our country. Each generation has a great obligation of seeing to it that they leave our natural resources in a better position than that in which they found them. Members of the Congress have a solemn duty to help develop the natural resources of the country for the benefit of all the people rather than for the benefit of the selfish economic interests of exploiters and profiteering ravagers. If the liberals in the Congress of each generation ever fail to carry out the trust that we have inherited as a legacy of legislative obligation from those liberals who have preceded us in the Congress, we will fail in our obligations to both man and God.

Earlier today, I spoke of the great record that the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. LEE METCALF], has made in this session of the Congress in a series of notable speeches in which he has called attention to the false propaganda and misleading statements and unsound claims and programs of some of the private utilities of the country. It is important that friends of sound conservation of our natural resources and the many members of public power groups who have come to learn the importance to our economy of the preservation of the public power yardstick in the development of hydroelectric power see to it that Senator METCALF and others in the Congress who stand with him do not stand alone but are backed up by strong public opinion support in the local communities of America which are served by hydroelectric power.

In closing this speech, I want to make it perfectly clear that in the next session of Congress we shall continue to do everything we can to protect and develop the legitimate rights of public power programs and at the same time, give assurance to the private utility companies that we recognize that they, too, have a legitimate contribution to make to the maximum development of the electric power resources of the Nation.

I never have favored the elimination of private power companies. In fact, I have always favored supporting a power-pooling program that would assure to the private power companies their fair share of the power resources of our streams for development at low head dams.

What I have fought is the selfish programs of private power companies based upon the objective of eliminating all public power systems and requiring that all power developed at multiple-purpose hydroelectric dams must be transmitted over the lines of private power companies. We all know that if the private power companies ever obtain monopoly control over transmission of power in this country, there will be no more public power yardstick, and the consumers of electric power will pay through their economic nose. A monopoly of power transmission in the hands of private power companies means exorbitantly high rates for both the private home consumer, the businessman, and the manufacturer.

The Northwest intertie program which was just authorized by the Congress of the United States represents a great step forward in providing legal instrumentality for private utility companies and public power groups to work together for the common good and at the same time, to the economic advantage and prosperity of each group.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, 2D SESSION, 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and a summary on the activities of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during this session of Congress.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON

I herewith submit a summary of activities of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service reflecting the accomplishments of the committee during the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

I congratulate all the members of our committee for their fine efforts in behalf of the committee, the Congress, the agencies of Government under our jurisdiction, and particularly the nearly 2 million Federal employees whose lives and well-being are affected by our work. I am also deeply appreciative of the fine work of the committee staff. All the staff have done their jobs well. I think it a singular achievement that all of the bills we reported received the unanimous support of both the majority and minority of our committee. Without their cooperation and assistance, our job would have been more difficult, and perhaps could not have been accomplished at all. I thank them very sincerely.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, 2D SESSION, 88TH CONGRESS

During the 2d session of the 88th Congress, nine Senate bills, four Senate resolutions, one Senate Joint Resolution, two commemorative stamp bills, and eight House bills were referred to the committee for consideration. The committee (or subcommittee thereof) held 13 days of public hearings on seven Senate bills and five House bills, 2 days of hearings on three executive nominations, and 2 days of hearings on postmaster nominations subject to rule 8 of the committee. The committee met in executive session on 20 occasions.

The committee received 1,278 postmaster nominations, of which 1,085 were favorably reported to the Senate and subsequently confirmed; 11 were withdrawn by the President, and only 182 were pending at the conclusion of the 2d session of the Congress.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

The outstanding accomplishment of the committee in 1964 was the Government Employees Salary Reform Act. The committee began its work on this bill shortly after it was introduced in the House in June 1963. Our first hearing was in September 1963 and the committee continued its consideration of this bill until it was referred to this body on April 28, 1964. I recall no measure which has received more careful study than H.R 11049. There has never been such a comprehensive bill for Federal salary legislation. It fulfills the promise enacted in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962. It provides increases for all employees and executives of the Government. It establishes new methods for classifying post offices throughout the Nation. It is truly a landmark. The committee held 8 days of hearings on this bill and met in executive session in the early morning and late evening. After 15 executive sessions this bill was unanimously reported to the Senate. It was signed into law by President Johnson on August 14, 1964, and today stands as one of the five most significant accomplishments of this Congress and the Kennedy-Johnson administration. We of the committee are deeply proud to have played a roll in its enactment.

A second major law considered and reported by the committee was the Dual Compensation Act. This bill consolidated and modernized all of the laws regarding the employment of retired military personnel in the Federal civilian service. In repealing more than 50 different statutes—some of which were enacted in the 19th century—the law established a simple and easily administered policy for employing former military persons. It is the product of almost 10 years work and represents a fine example of executive and legislative cooperation in developing a new statute.

H.R. 5932 extends health and life insurance to certain teachers temporarily employed in the public schools in the District of Columbia. It also provides retroactive pay increases to certain Federal employees not compensated under one of the major salary schedules. This bill is presently awaiting the President's signature.

The committee favorably reported the following bills each of which has been signed into law by the President:

H.R. 5377, extending legislative retirement computation benefits to the Architect of the Capitol and his employees.

H.R. 7235, changing the method of paying employees of the Clerk of the Supreme Court so that fees collected by the Clerk shall be paid to the Treasury and salaries of the Clerk and his employees shall be paid out of appropriated funds.

H.R. 4818, H.R. 3545, and H.R. 9425, all of which relate to the nature of duties and employment of employees of the Bureau of the Census. The purpose of these bills is to simplify and modernize census taking methods and reduce the expenses of taking the decennial census.

H.R. 5708, to extend health and life insurance to certain U.S. Commissioners who perform full-time duties.

The committee considered and favorably reported the following bills which were passed by the Senate and referred to the House of Representatives:

S. 1974, correcting a technical deficiency in the language of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act regarding the designation of a beneficiary.

S. 564, extending second- and third-class mailing rates to volunteer fire companies.

PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to direct the attention of the Senate to a little publicized but highly constructive contribution of American private citizens and groups to our Alliance for Progress with Latin America. Through a program known as "Partners of the Alliance" various clubs and private associations on the State and local level undertake to work directly with the people of communities in Latin American countries for the completion of various development and civil improvement projects. Among the participants in the program are American civic clubs, business and professional organizations, trade unions, and private individuals.

In the case of each project the cooperating group in the United States provides assistance, either in the form of money or technical assistance, goods, for the implementation of a local self-help project in Latin America. The contributions are private and voluntary, involving no public expenditures by the U.S. Government. The Partners of the Alliance program is thus geared to personal involvement and responsibility on both sides in striving for the long-term success of the Alliance for Progress. The contributions of the Partners of the Alliance are necessarily small in amount and scope but the psychological importance of the program is very considerable because of its encouragement of the spirit of self-help, which is probably the most important single requirement for the long-term success of the Alliance for Progress.

The Partners of the Alliance program is sponsored by the Agency for International Development but implemented by American civic groups and other private organizations all over the country. In my own State of Alabama, for example, the Partners of the Alliance program was initiated last spring by the Mobile Junior Chamber of Commerce, which has launched a people-to-people program with Guatemala.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point two documents—a speech given last July 15 by Mr. James Boren, Director of the Partners of the Alliance, and a list of projects implemented through the Partners of the Alliance programs.

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

SPEECH BY JIM BOREN, DIRECTOR, PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE, FFA CONVENTION, TEXAS, JULY 15, 1964

The Partners of the Alliance is a State and local level program through which civic clubs, business and professional groups, trade unions, trade associations, and individuals can work directly with the people of an Andean village, a jungle colony, a valley community, or a slum improvement association. It is a program in which any person or group who has a sincere interest in helping our neighbors in the other Republics of the Americas can participate.

Our experience in Peru has demonstrated that the Partners of the Alliance concept is a sound and workable one. There were villages in Peru, where I worked for 2 years, in which the people had built schools but lacked the materials for the roofs, the doors, and the windows. We found that $150 to $350 would provide such materials for most of these schools. Other villages were conducting night literacy classes for adults—classes in which the adults, after long hard days of difficult work, were sharing stubs of pencils and straining their eyes to see the small blackboard which was lighted by candles or perhaps a kerosene lamp. In some instances, where the altitude of the Andes would permit safe operation, we helped the villages obtain pressure lanterns. In most instances we helped them with a small generator—an electric generator which runs for 5 hours on a gallon of gasoline and lights seven 50-watt bulbs. This was the Alliance for Progress for the people of these villages. This lantern or generator was not given to the village; it was a part of an alliance effort. They had to do something as their part of the partnership program such as building a larger blackboard across the front of the room or building a latrine by the school or rerouting a sewage ditch or building or improving a footbridge across a river.

The people of the village of Cuyochico near Cuzco were digging an irrigation ditch through the rock of a mountain. Their tools: picks and iron bars. We helped by providing a jackhammer unit. Later, when the Communist march was made through the streets of Cuzco, the entire Cuyochico area did not have a single participant in the march. The important aspect of this project was that it was a response to self-help on the part of the villagers.

Possibilities for direct partnerships are limitless. When a village has built its own community center and dug a well for a pure water supply $285 can provide a pump to

help lift the water to the village. When a barricade (slum) improvement association has a self-help project under which it is building community buildings such as schools for medical posts, the provision of a cement mixer and a few wheelbarrows can make significant contribution to the peoples' efforts to help themselves. I could go on and on * * * hand tools, equipment for small medical posts, small collections of books in Spanish for community or barriada libraries, and first aid kits for villages. These are not pretty little stories pulled out of the air * * * these are specific illustrations of what has been done in Peru.

This direct partnership alliance of a club in the United States with a village or other group is not an adoption program in which a city or a State patronizingly adopts a Latin American state or city. It is a partnership program that has as its base the direct assistance to help people help themselves. It is not an old clothes charity program * * * it is a direct alliance between a U.S. group and a Latin American group to work toward the establishment of a lasting and constructive relationship. This is not a program in which mayors merely exchange keys to the cities and establish pen pal committees. This is rather a program through which mayors and groups and individuals can do something constructive as working members of a direct alliance.

As of this date there are 11 programs in motion. Utah is now beginning to implement a 23-point program with Bolivia; the Idaho Partners of the Alliance are moving forward with a program with Ecuador which will include assistance with a town plan program; Oakland County (Mich.) Partners of the Alliance now have a permanent representative in the Valle del Cauca of Colombia and the program is moving forward; 15 school districts in Oregon have developed a program through which 15 educators from Costa Rica will spend their summer vacation working with schools in Oregon as resource people for Spanish and social studies classes and in return they receive inservice training in methods and teaching aids; Alabama is organizing to work with Guatemala; the Tucson-southern Arizona partnership team is preparing a report for southern Arizona groups concerning a program with El Salvador; Texas has organized its Partners of the Alliance group and is initiating its program with Peru; Ohio will soon send a team to Parana in Brazil; Illinois is moving in the first stages of an alliance with the state of Rio Grande de Sul in Brazil; the Colorado Society of Engineers has adopted a resolution indicating its interest in fostering a partnership program with the state of Minas Gerais in Brazil. Other groups are working in Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Indiana, Florida, Nevada, and California.

From time to time I am asked, "Why isn't the government-to-government program taking care of these needs? Why are we as taxpayers now asked to do more?" There are several answers to these questions. From the standpoint of the basic concept, the Alliance for Progress is an alliance of all of the peoples of the free world. It is an alliance which is only partially articulated through the government-to-government programs. From the standpoint of operations, the identification of people with people in a direct alliance is important. If the Alliance for Progress is to succeed and if economic, political, and social stability is to become a reality in this hemisphere, the private sector will be a major factor in that success.

In our official government-to-government programs, we are working with our sister republics to help them build their own institutional capabilities to resolve their own problems. It takes time, however, to build institutions and we should reflect upon the history of our own country in this respect. It takes time, for example, to develop an agricultural extension service that can meet the needs of the great rural areas; it takes time to build a savings and loan system to the point that it can foster a private enterprise housing program; it takes time to develop credit institutions which can meet the needs of small business and agricultural supervised credit; it takes time to establish cooperative institutions that are effective tools for problem solving. In short, it takes time to help build institutions to the point that they have impact upon the people. The Partners of the Alliance program can help buy the time to carry out this vital but longer range economic development program.

The funds appropriated for our programs must go to this basic business of building institutions and infrastructure. If we were to spend the limited funds available to us for the type of impact projects which I have described as being the core of partnership activities, we would be building for failure because without effective institutions there can be no economic or political stability. On the other hand, if we only concern ourselves with the more impersonal business of institutional development, we may be building for failure in that there may not be time available to us to carry out the basic program of the alliance.

The Partners of the Alliance is a program which recognizes that the greatest asset of a nation are its human resources. The history of our own Nation is replete with the deeds of men who built a nation from a wilderness, a wilderness of the physical elements and a wilderness of societal disorder. The recognition of the role of the people was reflected by the present President of Peru, Fernando Blaunde Terry, when he spoke of 1956. He said.

"Cada vez que observo de alguna altura. Every time I look from some height upon a Peruvian village I ask the same question and I get the same inspiring answer.

"As I look at the humble town with its colorful bell tower, I inquire of my guide: Who built the church? and the guide replies: 'The people built it.' Again I ask: Who built the school?, and he answers again, 'The people built it.'

"And following the winding dirt road amongst the mountains I ask once more: 'Who made this road? and again, resounding now in my ears like a triumphal march I hear in these eloquent words the history of all of Peru's yesterdays, its present, and the prophesy of its future: 'The people built it.'

"The people built the road, the church and the schools.

"The people raised the terraces and dammed the torrent.

"Once there was an earthquake and they recovered their debris and rebuilt their homes.

"And when it was required of them they gave of their sons to the army; and they suffered the nation's indifference without complaint.

"They were denied their ancestral rights of freedom to choose their own leaders and goals. Rulers were imposed upon them. Their properties and income were taken from them. But they could not be deprived of their traditions.

"And the people went on building roads, schools, and churches. Because, fortunately, though Peru's small villages have been forgotten villages, they have not forgotten their own heritages."

And, it is the people who shall determine the success or failure of the Partners of the Alliance, and I am asking for your help in this vital endeavor. To those who express concern about the problems of communism in this hemisphere, I say that the opportunity is at hand to translate words into action. To those who wish to help people help themselves and to help give meaning to hope. I say that the way is open through the Partners of the Alliance.

Projects implemented through Partners of the Alliance programs

Country	Project	Assistance requested	Implemented by—
Colombia	Villa Restrepo (Tolima) (sewing cooperative)	Materials: Buttons and thread for producing household maids' apparel.	Pan American Assembly, Chicago (M. Larson).
	Hospital Infantil (Bogotá)	Antibiotics and hospital equipment	Direct Relief Foundation, Santa Barbara, Calif.
	Valle del Cauca and city of Cali	Technical assistance in municipal budgeting and planning.	Oakland County (Mich.) Partners of the Alliance. John Madole sent to Valle del Cauca as permanent representative.
	Valle del Cauca	Exchange of 2 university students from each of 2 partners' areas.	2 Oakland County students are presently enrolled in the Universidad del Valle, and 2 Valle students are studying at Oakland University. Scholarships provided by each institution.
	Trade school (Cali)	Supplemental equipment for mechanics training program; the trade school was constructed by the barrio residents (with assistance of Peace Corps volunteers).	Oakland Committee Partners.
Peru	Arequipa Rural School	School materials: blackboards, etc	West End School, San Rafael, Calif.
	Ayacucho Industrial Art School	(2) Dyepots (for wool dyeing)	Sunset High School, Dallas, Tex.
	Braille watches (40)		By Zale Jewelry Co., Dallas, Tex.
	Camisea Community (literacy programs)	(2) Coleman lanterns	Pan American student forum, Navasota High School, Navasota, Tex.
	"A Little Library" for an Indian village		Texas Partners Committee.
	"A Little Library" for (Lima) barriada		Do.
	Portable generator	1 portable generator	Woman's Democratic Club, 10th Congressional District, Virginia.
	do	do	Pedernales Electric Cooperative, Inc., Austin, Tex.
	do	do	Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association, Texas.
	do	do	AmpChamp, J. T. Rutherford, Washington, D.C.
	Scholarship for a young farmer leader at Institute of Rural Education.	4 months training	Circle K Club, Baylor University, Waco, Tex.
	Yungay Community (Callejon de Huaylas)	Roof for school for orphans of the 1962 avalanche	Cmdr. Roy Powell, Washington, D.C.

Projects implemented through Partners of the Alliance programs—Continued

Country	Project	Assistance requested	Implemented by—
	Rehabilitation Institute (Lima)	Shop equipment	Texas Rehabilitation Association (Dr. David Wade).
	Yuncay Community (Urabamba)	Materials for construction of 2 bathhouses (roofing materials, cement, pipes, showerheads, etc.).	Justin F. Kimball High School, Dallas, Tex.
	Huancabamba generators (literacy programs)	Generator for night literacy classes	Alton Marshall, Albany, N.Y.
	Huaura Institute of Rural Education	For local purchase of handtools and cloth, "seed stock" for cooperative store.	Mount Vernon High School, Alexandria, Va.
	Navan community (farm-to-market road construction self-help project).	Wheelbarrows and picks for construction	Texas AFL-CIO.
	Chain saw for La Convencion Lares project	Gas-operated chain saw to help expedite efforts in La Convencion Lares project.	Funds sent by Pan American student forum clubs and Midwestern University of Wichita Falls, Tex.
	Pucara (Junin) cooperative chicken project	$395 to purchase materials to establish a cooperative chicken project.	Funds sent by Pan American student forum clubs and Midwestern University of Wichita Falls, Tex.
	La Convencion Lares (Cuzco) water project for 5 communities.	$535 for the purchase of materials and cement mixer for the construction of 5 water tanks.	Through funds for special projects USAID/Peru.
	Pampa de Comas (knitting cooperative)	2 knitting machines	Pan American Development Foundation, Washington, D.C.
	Picha community (Michiguenga) (literacy programs).	3 Coleman lanterns	Texas Good Neighbors, Travis High School, Austin, Tex.
Ecuador	Conococto Hogar Indigena	4 sewing machines; 1 typewriter	Boise Valley Idaho Jaycees.
	Pelileo (metal and carpentry shop for high school)	$100 for purchase of materials and tools for construction of benches and stands.	Idaho Partners of the Alliance.
	Gonzalez Suarez, "Cooperativa Forestal" (reforestation project), at altitudes of 10,000 feet in desolated Andean highlands.	4 tents and sleeping bags	Boise Cascade Corp., Boise, Idaho.
	Cumbaya and Quito, needles and syringes (requested by Mrs. Kokabatsi, president, Woman's Federation of the World in Ecuador).	2,000 disposable needles and syringes to inoculate the children for diphtheria, typhoid, and typhus.	Dr. Hal Reynolds, Caldwell, Idaho.
Costa Rica	San Jose streetsweeper (vacuum type)	To help clean city of volcanic ashes	Excess equipment reconditioned by city of San Jose, Calif. Shipping financed by Partners of the Alliance.
	Educational training	Inservice training for 15 Costa Rican educators who will also serve as half-time resource teachers (Spanish and social studies) in 15 Oregon school districts.	15 Oregon school districts (arranged and coordinated by Superintendent E. Cooper of Eugene, Oreg.), half of the transportation through AID.
Bolivia	Santa Cruz, Gabriel Moreno University Library	Shipment and packing of books from Massachusetts to Bolivia (paid by Partners of the Alliance).	By Massachusetts Rotary International (District No. 793).
	(23) Braille watches	Supply pooled with amount given to PAU/OAS	Zale Jewelry Co., Dallas, Tex.
	Design plans for simple cooking stove	4-S Clubs of Bolivia	4-H Club of Utah.
Chile	San Gregorio Cripple Children Home (Santiago)	Materials to construct furniture	Evelyn Mayer, Colorado Springs, Colo.
Nicaragua	Hospital equipment (Managua)	Hospital equipment and supplies	By Mercy Hospital, Fort Dodge, Iowa.

AWARD OF THE ELOY ALFARO GRAND CROSS AND DIPLOMA TO DR. EDMUND G. GESSMANN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] on the occasion of the award of the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma.

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

AWARD OF THE ELOY ALFARO GRAND CROSS AND DIPLOMA TO DR. EDMUND G. GESSMANN

Dr. Edmund G. Gessmann received the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma on September 4, 1963, in the Masonic Club of New York and in the presence of an assemblage of dignitaries and friends.

Dr. Gessmann was decorated by Stanley W. Wakefield, right eminent past grand commander of the grand commandery of Knights Templar of the State of New York and American deputy provost of the EAIF.

Dr. L. Lester Beacher, American deputy provost of the EAIF, was master of ceremonies, and the invocation and benediction were offered by the Reverend John Brett Langstaff, B. Litt., and past grand prelate of the Grand Commandery of Knights Templar of New York. Austrian Consul General, Dr. Johannes G. Wilfort, representing his Government, delivered an eloquent address calling attention to the great opportunities which the United States offers its citizens.

Dr. John Maurice Keesing, international provost of the EAIF, also paid tribute to Dr. Gessmann. Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost of the EAIF, in a brief speech outlined the aims and purposes of the foundation and said that Dr. Gessmann was unanimously voted this high honor in recognition of his efforts in behalf of crime prevention, prison reform, and juvenile delinquency, his radio programs and his lectures, and because his achievements and accomplishments comes within the framework of the aims and purposes of the foundation.

Thank you very much R. W. Dr. Lester L. Beacher, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, who are gathered here this evening for the sole purpose of honoring Dr. Edmund G. Gessmann in recognition of his outstanding public and private services to mankind. You know, my dear Dr. Gessmann joins a goodly company of distinguished Americans who have been decorated and similarly honored in the past. They include President John F. Kennedy, past Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower, Harry S. Truman, Herbert Hoover. Other dignitaries include Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Commissioner Robert Moses, who is now running the World's Fair, also J. Edgar Hoover, who typify the caliber of men who have received this high honor. Of course. many would like to know just what this foundation represents and who Gen. Eloy Alfaro was. The foundation was authorized by the official decree of the then President of Panama in 1949 in order to perpetuate the memory of Gen. Eloy Alfaro, who was President of Ecuador at the turn of the century, and the type of dynamic leader who settled all the problems of South America during the period when he was active. Indeed, if we had another Gen. Eloy Alfaro today there would not be any crisis in Cuba, Venezuela, or other South American country. This is the type of man who is needed in South America today in order to stop the Soviet Union in its ruthless path of aggression.

We in the United States are actuated by the best motives, but in a final analysis it will require another Martines, a Bolivar or Alfaro to bring about peace in this world. The aim and purpose was to perpetuate the memory of this leader and the foundation has devoted itself to the task of encouraging the liberal ideals and principles for which this great Ecuadoran laid down his life almost a century ago. He expanded and fostered the public educational institutions of his country, increasing the commerce, industry, and trade in general. If he were alive today, I am sure that he would be in the forefront of the fight to preserve the Western Hemisphere and Pan American unity, which would constitute a perpetual bulwark against the attempt of any form of foreign despotism to plant tyrants heels on even the tiniest portion of the soil of the Americas, as the Soviet Union and Castro with his fellow Communists have actually done in Cuba, 90 short miles from the coast of Florida. General Alfaro was a rebel and a conspirator, but his rebellion was directed against hatred, injustice, discord, and tyranny. He was the leader of a generation fired with the hope and desire that responsible united political action would enhance the prosperity of their country and the welfare of the people. His work was one of the greatest contributions to the good will, the mutual understanding, and the love of liberty, the democracy, and the peace between the people of the world.

The philosophy of this great patriot General Alfaro, known and recognized as the Abraham Lincoln of Latin America was based principally on his service to his fellow human beings, and to the cause of international peace. He translated these ideals and principles of Masonry in action. As a matter of fact, General Alfaro was one of the founders of Masonry in South America. He was an honorary 33d degree. His son, the late Ambassador Alfaro, also was a Mason, a Shriner, and an honorary 33d degree, also a graduate of West Point, as were likewise the three grandsons of the General Alfaro, who are now the officers of this foundation.

The public and private activities of our guest of honor, Dr. Gessmann, come within the framework of this type of service to humanity. In recognition of this fact, the foundation unanimously voted him this highest honor, the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma. I believe, that I am safe in stating that of all the former distinguished recipients heretofore mentioned by our master of ceremonies and those that I have mentioned and many other distinguished personalities from all over the world if they were here they would congratulate and welcome

Dr. Gessmann to this highly selected group of distinguished Americans who have been approved to carry out the aims and purposes of the foundation.

ANNUAL REPORT INTRODUCTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it has been my custom throughout my congressional career to report to my constituents in New York State on each session of Congress and on my own activities during the past year.

This is my 16th such report, and it is one of the most gratifying, for the year 1964 was a year of historic legislative performance on a number of issues of national concern to which I have been devoted during my terms in the House and Senate.

The principal achievement, a historic milestone, was enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the most comprehensive civil rights legislation in history. This triumph was preceded and made possible by another historic vote—the vote to invoke cloture, thus cutting off a Senate filibuster for the first time in history on a civil rights bill. Justice and bipartisanship determined the issue, and it was the culmination of years of effort, in which I am proud to have played a hard-working role.

The votes on cloture and on the civil rights bill represented the Senate's finest hours. No votes could have done more to revive the Nation's faith in the Senate and in the Congress, for it was evidence that, at long last, we were prepared to do justice in our Nation after decades-old wrongs of racial segregation and discrimination had gone unabated—and that we were master in our own legislative house.

Among the other major achievements in which I was particularly active during the past year were:

A $11.5 billion tax cut—the biggest such tax reduction in history—which was long overdue to revitalize our domestic economy; a Federal program of aid to urban mass transit systems, which though modest was the first recognition by a normally rural-oriented Congress of the urban mass transportation crisis; an extensive housing bill; an antipoverty program to deal with the appalling discrepancy between our national image of prosperity and the national reality of our poor and underprivileged; creation of a National Commission on Automation and Technology, to deal with the impact of technological change upon production and employment.

Of special satisfaction to me was the enactment of a bill providing for a National Council on the Arts, a program which I have been sponsoring for the past 16 years; and the establishment of a Fire Island National Seashore, creating New York's first national park.

Other important measures enacted were: a Mental Health Facilities Act and Mental Health Retardation-Child Health Act, both firsts in a neglected field of Federal action; a heretofore stymied National Wilderness Act, which preserved 35 million acres of federally owned land from commercial use; and measures to strengthen control over pesticides.

In all, 23 measures which I sponsored and 24 others which I cosponsored were enacted into law during the 88th Congress. An additional 25 measures which I either sponsored or cosponsored were passed by the Senate, as were 3 of my "private bills."

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The performance of the 88th Congress, which in 1963 had gotten off to a dawdling and dreary start, was on the whole impressive. But there were also some major failures, and a great deal of unfinished business remains.

Most distressing of all was the failure to enact a program of health care for the aging, which I had coauthored and which passed the Senate and went on to fail in conference. Also disturbing, especially in view of the tragic assassination of President Kennedy, was the failure of the House to concur with a constitutional amendment which I cosponsored and which passed the Senate, to improve the procedures for presidential succession and to provide for vacancies in the Vice Presidency. The Warren Commission report, while laying to rest the conspiracy theories concerning the assassination, made recommendations for the protection of Presidents in the future, and Congress must act on them early in the new session.

Other programs which must be dealt with as we move into 1965 and in which I am especially concerned are proposals to eliminate the discriminatory national origins quota system from the U.S. immigration laws; to establish a code of ethics for Congress with provision for disclosure of financial interests; to solve endemic unemployment and spur U.S. economic growth; to update our archaic antitrust laws; to begin to treat addiction as a disease not solely as a crime and to promote narcotics research; to develop a unified export-expansion policy; to devise a better international monetary system; to permit the televising of Senate sessions; and to provide a uniform closing time for polling places throughout the Nation in presidential elections.

The foregoing represents the highlights of the past year. I will now go into the details of the 2d session of the 88th Congress:

NEW YORK STATE AFFAIRS

Legislation to establish a Fire Island National Seashore, which I cosponsored with Senator KEATING, was signed into law creating New York's first national park to provide recreation opportunities for millions. Also enacted was legislation, for which I worked long and hard, to compensate the Seneca Nation of Indians in western New York for the loss of their homes by Federal construction of the Kinzua Dam.

A monumental effort to insure that New York receives a fair share of Federal programing was made on several fronts. A steady 10-year decline in the value of prime defense contracts awarded in the State was halted, although individual defense firms were adversely affected by an overall cutback in defense spending. New York's share of the Nation's defense contracts increased from 9.9 percent in the 1963 fiscal year to 10.2 percent in fiscal year 1964.

During hearings on military procurement by the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am a member, I told Secretary McNamara that if the administration wanted to claim credit for cuts in defense spending it must accept and discharge the responsibility in alleviating economic dislocation caused by such cuts in communities heavily dependent on defense plant employment.

In order to encourage full use of the resources available under existing Federal programs, I cosponsored, along with Senator KEATING and the steering committee of the New York Congressional Delegation, a conference attended by approximately 400 local New York officials at which useful Federal programs were explained. I have urged community, business, and labor leaders to form regional committees to make plans to counter the effects of further cutbacks or shifts in defense spending. To further assist the development of the State, I helped present a case to NASA for location of the electronics research center in New York and worked to obtain new Air Force facilities in the State. I cosponsored legislation for the construction of a Federal mint in New York.

The Defense Department's plan to close military installations throughout the country included the phaseout of Rome (N.Y.) Air Materiel Area facilities—ROAMA—and significant employment cutbacks at the Brooklyn Navy Yard. The burden of proof that these actions would provide meaningful economies and would not adversely affect our national defense efforts must be met by the agencies proposing them. Congressman PIRNIE, of the Rome area, Senator KEATING, and I requested a detailed analysis of the claimed savings by the Comptroller General, who concluded that part of the estimated savings was not attributable to the proposed closing and the remainder could not be identified because the Air Force had destroyed detailed supporting papers. Despite this information, the decision to phase out ROAMA has not been altered.

I also cosponsored amendments to the military construction bills to prevent use of Federal funds for construction of new facilities to replace facilities ordered closed. I was assured that the Preparedness Subcommittee would examine carefully any request for expenditures of this type.

Together with the New York congressional delegation I worked to get a fair share of work for the Brooklyn Navy Yard. I introduced legislation to authorize the Armed Services Committee to conduct a comprehensive study of the defense role of naval and private shipyards and to examine the impact upon local communities of curtailment of shipyard operations. Joined by seven other Senators, I introduced an amendment to the defense appropriation bill requiring the Defense Department to prove the need and to allow consideration by congressional committees before any Navy yard could be shut down. I cosponsored a second amendment to this bill to require that an equal percentage of new

ship construction be assigned to Navy yards to remedy the imbalance of new construction now being assigned to private yards. I shall continue to do all I can to improve the work and employment situation at the Brooklyn Navy Yard and to keep it open and functioning as an indispensable element of national security.

I worked to insure that flight safety standards would not be compromised at the Elmira, Poughkeepsie, and Utica airports despite FAA plans to consolidate flight service stations there. In addition, I supported legislation to provide funds for development of a number of New York ports and waterway facilities.

Congress passed my resolution extending an official welcome to out-of-State and foreign visitors to the World's Fair. Some 43 Senators also joined me in introducing a bill to establish the annual celebration of American Indian Day.

CIVIL RIGHTS

This will undoubtedly be remembered as a landmark year in the struggle for equal opportunity for all because the first truly meaningful Civil Rights Act in a century was enacted after a record-setting, 2-month filibuster in the Senate was shut off. I am deeply gratified to report that I played a full role in the successful struggle. The fact that cloture was finally achieved—for the first time in history on a civil rights bill—was a triumph of bipartisanship. In the House, 78 percent of the total membership, including 81 percent of the Republicans and 59 percent of the Democrats, voted for the measure on February 10; and on June 10, 71 Senators voted for cloture, including 81 percent of the Republicans and 65 percent of the Democrats.

After a decade of seeking meaningful Federal legislation, our success this year was the result of a most heartening, nationwide interfaith effort to awaken the white majority to the deep moral issue involved in the Negro struggle for equal opportunity. Another important factor was the effective organization of civil rights proponents during the Senate's long stalemate on the bill, with teams of bipartisan captains made responsible for each of its major segments.

I was Republican captain for what I consider to be the historic hub of civil rights legislation, titles III and IX, authorizing the Attorney General to participate in civil injunction suits to insure equal protection of the laws to all against excessive police action and efforts to stop lawful demonstrations. Along with others I repeatedly engaged in debate with the filibustering opponents of the bill to set the record straight on what it provided, and to answer a mail and advertising campaign—financed in part by the tax moneys of a Southern State—which greatly distorted the issues. I sought especially to clarify the provisions of the bill, which I have long advocated, authorizing withdrawal of Federal funds from State and local programs which discriminate on account of color, and to support the constitutionality of every provision especially that guaranteeing nondiscrimination in public accommodations.

I participated fully in the negotiations which led to the so-called Dirksen amendment, which was substituted for the House-passed bill. The amendment retained the fundamental structure of the measure—in some respects strengthening it—and helped to amass the two-thirds vote needed for cloture. During the consideration of more than 100 additional proposed amendments, I fought to keep the provisions true to the bill's initial promise.

The act, in my judgment, fulfilled that promise although in many respects it could have been considerably stronger if compared to the 1960 platforms of both parties, the unanimous recommendations of the Commission on Civil Rights, and the bills long introduced by me and by other Members of Congress. Its major significance is its recognition of Federal responsibility and authority in every important field of civil rights: voting, public accommodations, publicly owned facilities, public school desegregation, nondiscriminatory use of Federal funds in State and local programs, equal employment practices, and participation by the Attorney General in equal protection of the law suits.

The enormous need in certain areas of the Nation for a Federal presence was tragically demonstrated by the murder of three young civil rights workers—Michael Schwerner, James Chaney, and Andrew Goodman—who had been participating in a Negro voter registration drive in Mississippi. The Mississippi project was courageously continued, but in some locations violence and intimidation have followed the scheduled departure of the student workers. I am making every effort to get the Justice Department to use its full authority—greatly enlarged by enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—to give adequate Federal protection to civil rights advocates in southern areas, to insure the right of every American to travel in any State, and to get the authority of the President to back this effort.

That the civil rights problem is a national and not a regional one was made apparent by an outbreak of riots in New York City, Rochester, and other major cities. I supported the steps taken by responsible civil rights leaders to prevent such acts by anyone, no matter how deeply we may feel about the frustrations brought on by discrimination. Anarchy will surely destroy everyone's liberty and opportunity and undermine the very law just enacted.

At the same time there must be a determined effort to eradicate the causes of so much discontent and resentment in large segments of the Negro community. There is an increasingly greater need for training and education to catch up with the accelerating pace of automation, and I have urged business and industry to join fully in this effort with educational institutions and Federal and State agencies.

The yearlong dispute over the New York City schools did not involve segregation in violation of the Constitution, but racial imbalance in only 19 percent of the city's 860 schools. I supported city and State educational authorities in their development of an affirmative plan to achieve better racial balance in the 19 percent beginning with the pairing of 8 elementary schools along the lines of the so-called Princeton plan.

DOMESTIC ECONOMY

The major economic measure enacted in the 88th Congress was the $11.5 billion tax rate reduction, which I had been among the first to support in 1962 as a vital first step to spur growth of our lagging economy. The bill reduced the rate scale for individuals from 20–91 percent to 14–70 percent and for corporations from 52 to 48 percent in two steps. It also made the tax structure more equitable in a number of ways, including a provision I had long sponsored for income averaging for taxpayers such as artists and proprietors of small businesses, whose incomes fluctuate widely from year to year.

As I have in the past, I voted against repeal of the 4-percent credit for dividend income in excess of $50, which along with the present $50 exclusion of dividend income, I believe is a sound partial effort to ease the impact of double taxation upon such income.

I supported amendments which would have repealed wartime created excise taxes on cosmetics and luggage, including ladies' handbags, and on jewelry and fur purchases up to $100 because I feel these items cannot be considered "luxuries." I offered an amendment, which was rejected, to repeal the 10-percent excise tax on admission to live theater and musical performances, and voted, as I always have, to reduce the oil and gas depletion allowances. I supported an amendment, modified at my suggestion, which would have permitted working students to deduct from their taxable income their own expenditures for tuition, room and board.

I believe that the tax cut alone, important as it is, will not cure endemic unemployment which continues to hover above 5 percent in a period of unprecedented prosperity. Revision of our antitrust laws, stimulation of profit sharing and stockownership, expansion of exports, and machinery to avoid crippling national emergency strikes are also necessary as incentives to expand investment and create new jobs. I was most gratified that a measure establishing a Presidential Commission on Automation, which I had long proposed, was finally enacted into law. At hearings called at my request, I pressed for revision of antitrust laws which inhibit international trade.

A bill which I had long cosponsored was enacted amending the Davis-Bacon Act to include fringe benefits within prevailing wage determinations under Government contracts. I cosponsored another successful measure which required registration of contractors in order to aid migratory farmworkers.

I supported enactment of the bill authorizing the continued use of the date 1964 on newly minted coins until the current acute coin shortage is alleviated. And I participated actively in committee consideration of a measure which would require the disclosure of certain

information needed by consumers in credit transactions.

In his budget message, President Johnson estimated spending at $122.7 billion and revenues at $119.7 billion. To me, the budget demonstrates the size of our responsibilities in the world, but it also requires careful scrutiny to minimize the deficit and guard against national waste and inefficiency. When I was not convinced that the need for expenditures had been demonstrated adequately, I voted for reductions, as in the case of certain aspects of the Interior appropriations and National Aeronautics and Space Administration bills.

I sponsored a measure to establish a bipartisan commission on Federal expenditure policy to assist the executive branch in modernizing and streamlining the budget. And a bill which I cosponsored was passed by the Senate requiring periodic review of Federal grant-in-aid programs.

URBAN AFFAIRS

The Housing Act of 1964 extended basic housing programs, such as urban renewal, low-rent housing, and housing for the elderly, but also contained a number of important innovations. My amendment was accepted to include in urban renewal the development of air rights sites for low- and middle-income housing in crowded urban centers. Additional relocation assistance which I sponsored was provided for small businesses and individuals forced to move because of urban renewal. Another provision I sponsored required effective enforcement of housing codes instead of demolishing structures which can be made safe and sanitary. I also supported the new program, proposed by House Republicans, providing rehabilitation loans in urban renewal areas to achieve the same goal, and I fought for the appropriation to begin this needed program. A provision which I offered made the increasingly urbanized larger counties eligible for urban planning aid for the first time. My proposal to permit the FHA to correct structural defects in homes with FHA-insured mortgages, when relief cannot be obtained from the builder, was also included in the bill.

The mass transit bill, vital to our traffic-jammed urban areas and long a program I have cosponsored, finally became law, and I fought for the first appropriation to begin its implementation.

Enacted was a measure I have long sought providing legal assistance to indigent persons accused of crime in the Federal courts. But no action was taken on my proposal to begin to meet the grave national problem of drug addiction as an illness rather than as a crime, despite support from the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse and from various legal and medical experts in hearings held by the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, in which I participated as a member.

ASSAULT ON POVERTY

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 had my active support, after adoption of my amendments strengthening local coordination of programs. Called the Antipoverty Act, this measure provides for a Job Corps and a work-training program for unemployed youth, a work-study program for college students, an adult education program, a domestic Peace Corps called VISTA, and loan programs for small businesses and small farms.

Based on conclusions drawn in a seminar on poverty called by New York University at my suggestion last May, I proposed amendments integrating State camp programs with the Federal program and requiring that unemployment compensation should not be considered as income for those participating in the program. I also received a written commitment from the Director that the Small Business Administration would administer the small business provisions of the act, and the Farmers Home Administration the farm provisions.

My proposal to give Governors the authority to accept responsibility for and administer Federal antipoverty programs in their States was not accepted, but the Senate passed a more stringent amendment permitting Governors to veto private projects. The House deleted my unemployment provision, broadened the Governor's veto power, and attached a loyalty oath amendment that endangered final passage of the bill. I strongly opposed the loyalty oath, but at my request the Justice Department ruled that the provision would affect only Job Corps enrollees and others directly receiving Federal funds, not recipients of loans or those taking the training programs.

My amendment allowing State officials to have a voice but not a veto in shaping programs under the Appalachia bill was the only one accepted by the Senate before it approved this measure to provide public works and economic programs over a 5-year period to assist the development of the 10-State region. I voted for the full 1965 authorization of $15 million for the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offense Control Act, which was adopted, and worked to obtain more adequate appropriations for the child day-care program which provides assistance to working mothers.

EDUCATION

As a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I helped to shape and enact into law a number of urgently important education bills. The extension of the National Defense Education Act for 3 years gave a necessary measure of stability to this vital program. The loan program for college students was substantially increased and its scope broadened to allow additional thousands to complete their college education. My proposal to extend loans to part-time students to help those working their way through college was accepted. I supported a substantial increase in the number of National Defense fellowships and the inclusion of English, reading, history, geography, and civics in the program.

The Nurse Training Act, which I actively supported, authorized a $287.6 million, 5-year program for construction, rehabilitation, and improvement of nurse training schools and included an $85 million student loan program with a 50-percent forgiveness provision for those who work 5 years in a public or private nonprofit hospital or institution. I also supported the Public Health Training bill which authorized grants for traineeships in public health nursing and engineering.

Scholarship aid for higher education students is urgently needed. Since the House opposes undergraduate scholarships, I have sought to substitute for this an undergraduate loan program under which students could obtain 50-percent forgiveness by becoming teachers and another 50 percent by maintaining scholarship standards set by the States.

HEALTH AND MEDICARE

A Federal program of medical care for the aged passed the Senate in the form of the Gore-Anderson-Javits amendment to the social security amendments bill, only to fail in the House-Senate conference. The amendment, put together during Senate debate, was similar to a bill I introduced in January based on the recommendations of the National Committee on Health Care for the Aged, which had been formed at my suggestion. It would have established a hospitalization and nursing care program under social security financing and a private medical and surgical insurance plan made available nationally for about $2 per person a week.

The amendment included principles I have been advocating for years: The incorporation of private enterprise into the program to act as a governor on the expansion of governmental activity in this field; the inclusion of everybody over 65 years old; and the establishment of a separate social security trust fund for the health care program. I will continue to work for a meaningful program of health care for the aged because I am convinced it is essential for the dignity and the security of our older citizens. I am confident we will soon succeed.

I voted for the social security amendments bill which provided for a $7-across-the-board increase in benefits and other improvements, including an increase from 18 to 22 in the maximum age of students who can receive benefits, which I have worked for and sponsored for years. I opposed the deletion in committee of a provision to extend coverage to self-employed doctors, the only group of significant size now excluded.

The continuation and expansion of the Hill-Burton Act was enacted, including $202 million for modernizing and improving older hospital facilities and for diagnostic and treatment centers, as well as for new hospital construction. I actively supported this measure.

I helped refine the definition of psychotoxic drugs in a Senate bill which strengthened Federal controls over barbiturates and amphetamines—the so-called pep pills—and supported the bill which provides 4,000 additional nursing care beds for veterans. I am giving careful attention to developments in connection with the Surgeon General's report on smoking and health.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Vietnam was the key cold war battlefront as the congressional session neared an end, even while we continued to face difficulties in the Congo, Cyprus, and the Middle East. I have stood firmly behind a no-back-down position on Vietnam, which is the key to all southeast Asia.

I voted for the resolution backing the President in his retaliatory action following North Vietnamese torpedo boat attacks on the U.S.S. *Maddox* in international waters in the Gulf of Tonkin. I have also continually supported basic U.S. objectives: to enable South Vietnam to resist Communist infiltration and to secure peace and stability under a freely elected government. In Senate speeches I have made it clear that I am for continued U.S. help in the Vietnamese struggle for freedom because there is no other realistic choice, but I have opposed extending the U.S. role in the struggle.

Also, I have urged that our allies in the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty Organization be invited to take an active part in support of the resolution to maintain international peace in southeast Asia, since their interests in this region are as great as ours. I got assurances that the United States will continue to press for the maximum contribution of the SEATO nations. If the situation in southeast Asia could be stabilized and if North Vietnam, Communist China, and the Soviet Union gave real assurances actually to keep hands off Laos and South Vietnam, the United Nations would then have a reasonable chance for a successful overall settlement of the regional problem.

In the Senate I answered the now famous speech of Senator FULBRIGHT in which he charged that U.S. diplomacy is to a large degree based on myths, not reality, and I reaffirmed the validity of the basic direction of our bipartisan foreign policy as sustained by four administrations since World War II. I urged that the present lull in the cold war be used to strengthen Western unity and to accelerate the economic development of nonindustrial nations rather than placing our primary effort on negotiating with Communist nations.

In a speech in Santiago, Chile, I proposed the formation of a Latin American Common Market combined with a broader Western Hemisphere Free Trade Area to integrate and accelerate economic development in Latin America. This concept is getting much attention as the most helpful to Latin American economic development.

Civil conflict in Cyprus created a series of crises in which war between Greece and Turkey, both NATO allies, seemed imminent. I supported U.S. policy which would agree to any final solution that would contribute to the peace and welfare of the entire Cypriot population, both Greek and Turkish, through self-determination and safeguard the rights of the individual to equal justice and civil liberties. We have a major interest in maintaining peace in the eastern Mediterranean, and must do all we can, directly and through the United Nations, to assure that objective.

Concern over the Middle East was heightened by United Arab Republic President Nasser who continued to maintain more than 30,000 troops in the Yemen war zone in spite of his pledge to the United States to withdraw, by his threats against Israel and by his continued use of former Nazi scientists to develop warplanes, missiles, and other offensive weapons. With my colleagues, I urged the President to offer Israel a collective defense treaty or military assistance to counter the effect of the United Arab Republic designs on the peace of the area.

I warned that Congress was approaching a showdown on U.S. policy toward President Nasser, and pointed to a long list of congressional actions since 1955 that sought to restrain the executive branch in persisting to give aid to the United Arab Republic without conditions. I also protested the International Monetary Fund loan to Egypt pushed through at U.S. insistence—as not being in accord with sound banking principles or international policy under which the Bank operates.

I denounced persecution of Jews in the U.S.S.R. and called for a great "wave of indignation" to rise up protesting the Soviet Union's oppressive acts and failure to permit Jews to practice their religion in their own way, to be free of discrimination and to rejoin their families in other lands. This denunciation of anti-Jewish acts by the U.S.S.R. included protest over an anti-Semitic book published by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences; while similar protests from many parts of the world eventually persuaded the Soviet Union to disavow and ban. I also testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in support of a Senate resolution denouncing Soviet discrimination against Jews, and cosponsored the amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which denounce such persecution. I will continue to protest Soviet anti-Jewish policy.

I fought against—and came within seven votes of defeating—Senate ratification of an ill-advised international agreement with Austria for return of property, seized during World War II, to 52 Austrians whose claims had already been dismissed by the Justice Department on the ground that they were either Nazis or applicants for Nazi party membership.

In the Senate, I urged continued support for the United Nations, supported the development of a U.N. force for peace-keeping purposes and called for cooperation in solving the U.N.'s financial crisis brought about by the refusal of the Soviet Union, France, and other states to pay their fair share of U.N. peace-keeping costs, notwithstanding the World Court's decision upholding their legitimacy.

AID AND TRADE

I supported the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964 for which $3.25 billion was appropriated. I believe that much larger sums are necessary to do the job adequately, especially in Latin America where we should concentrate assistance in countries that are able and willing to make the greatest use of it. I also believe that a country that does not carry out social reforms should not receive aid and that our aim should be to give the developing countries a feeling that their greatest hope is with the United States and the free world.

The Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid, which I proposed and Congress adopted as part of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, was appointed in May and began to explore methods of bringing the vitality of the private enterprise system into the foreign aid effort.

The committee is Chaired by Arthur K. Watson, president of the IBM World Trade Corp., and includes distinguished representatives of our universities, foundations, labor unions, and the professions.

The Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America—ADELA—which grew out of the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarian's Conference, of which I am chairman, became fully operational in September. ADELA seeks the greater participation of West European, Canadian, Japanese, and American private investment capital in Latin American development through a multinational investment company. In June, Adela made its first joint investment, in a Colombian steel forging plant, with the International Finance Corporation, an affiliate of the World Bank.

I cosponsored a bill to establish a Peace by Investment Corporation which would make capital, raised by the sale of stock to millions of small investors, available to businesses and development projects in underdeveloped countries. The bill is based on the work of my brother, Benjamin A. Javits, and Leon Keyserling, a former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. I also helped to initiate and sponsor the Executive Service Corps which has been formed by the private sector with the cooperation of AID and which is now beginning to make managerial personnel available to countries needing special skills to advance their economic growth.

I fought hard to sustain the principles and objectives of the Trade Expansion Act in the face of rising protectionist sentiment in the Congress. I believe the reciprocal reduction of trade barriers benefits American business and labor and strengthens our economic bonds with the free world nations. I believe enactment of the strict buy-American provisions of the Mass Transit and the expanded Food Stamp Acts and quotas on the importation of meats will have serious consequences on the forthcoming Kennedy round of trade negotiations and on Western unity. I will continue to oppose bills restricting our international trade.

Despite basic improvements in our balance-of-payments position, the administration persuaded Congress to enact an interest equalization tax on foreign security issues sold to Americans. I opposed this measure as a major departure from our policy of encouraging the free international flow of private capital and because it would not be able to meet its objectives. I offered an amendment which would have exempted from the tax new foreign security issues if not

more than a given percentage—to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury—were sold to U.S. citizens. I also offered a substitute bill which would have given the President standby authority to establish a voluntary capital issues committee to limit the sale of new foreign security issues if a balance-of-payments emergency arose.

I supported U.S. adherence to the International Coffee Agreement in the belief it was vitally important to the economic development and political stability of Latin America. The Senate accepted my amendment to the food-for-peace bill authorizing the President to use the program to help friendly nations in becoming independent of trade with Communist China.

With colleagues from other east coast States, I fought to eliminate controls on the importation of residual fuel oil which is essential for schools, hospitals, and other large consumers. We succeeded in gaining an 11-percent increase in the imports allowed during the quota year, temporarily alleviating a supply problem on the east coast.

IMMIGRATION

I continued to press for substantial revision of our outmoded immigration national quota system and participated in hearings on the many pending bills including my own and an administration measure which I cosponsored. When no further action was taken, I introduced a further measure which would have utilized the more than 175,000 existing unused quota preference numbers for skilled technicians and relatives of U.S. citizens in addition to some 51,000 other quota numbers left unused in the last fiscal year. Failure to act on even this urgently necessary stopgap device was a tragic mistake.

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

Concerned about the fact that the Nation for the second time in 20 years is without a Vice President—an officer whose function has grown in importance so greatly—I joined in sponsoring a constitutional amendment, which the Senate passed, and which differed from my own proposal by authorizing the President to nominate a Vice President in such circumstances, subject to ratification by both Houses of Congress. The proposal sent to the House also included a much-needed constitutional procedure in the case of presidential disability.

Controversy over the Supreme Court's ordering of reapportionment of State legislatures tied up the Senate for a month at the end of the session. I have long believed that there is need for fairer representation for many of our urban and suburban areas, which have often been disadvantaged by apportionment established when the country was less centralized in urban areas. Also, there may be a case for a constitutional amendment limited only to permitting the people of any State, if they wish, to choose by referendum to have one house of their legislature apportioned, like the U.S. Senate, with reference to a factor other than population, and I introduced such a proposal. There was much concern that lower Federal courts may be pressing State legislative reapportionment too rapidly in the light of some States' electoral procedures. I do not believe, however, that the Congress may constitutionally impose a rule of decision upon the Federal courts, particularly in cases involving constitutional rights already pending before them. I accordingly proposed that the Congress instead express its request to the Supreme Court, through a "sense of Congress" resolution, that adequate time be given to comply with the Supreme Court decision consistent with each State's electoral processes. A similar proposal was finally adopted by the Senate, breaking the deadlock, but was later rejected in the Senate-House conference.

I introduced a bill, which received important network support, to meet the vexing problem of widely broadcast computer projections based on early voting returns by establishing a uniform closing time for polling places in presidential elections, taking into account the variations in time zones across the Nation. I supported the bill, passed by both Houses, which would have suspended the "equal time" law and permitted television debates between the major party presidential candidates as in 1960, but it was blocked.

I testified before the Rules Committee investigating the conflict-of-interest scandal surrounding the resignation of Senate Majority Secretary Robert Baker and urged adoption of measures which I have repeatedly introduced and which, if adopted, might well have prevented such cases. When the Senate considered a proposed code of ethics, I voted to make it effective without further delay, to require full financial disclosure by Senators and staff, and to establish a permanent Senate investigating committee to enforce the code. I also sought to give the new committee the power to give advisory opinions. When further evidence about the Baker case was revealed, I voted to reopen the investigation and to have it conducted by the new committee.

I continued to press for a general overhaul of congressional procedure, the need for which was so apparent in the 2-month civil rights filibuster, but the Senate adopted only two minor rules changes, one calling for germaneness of debate during at least 3 hours each day, and another permitting committees to meet during a small part of the Senate session each day.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Concerted efforts by Congress resulted in passage of the $557 million pay raise bill for 1.7 million Federal civil service and postal employees, as well as for Cabinet members, Federal judges, Congressmen, and Senators. These increases will help the Government retain well-qualified people, and are an important step in recognizing the need to pay Government employees at a rate comparable to that of private industry.

Federal Government retirees are experiencing difficulty in sustaining themselves, and the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee has held hearings on legislation to grant them graduated scale increases of 3 to 9 percent.

I also supported a significant pay raise for military personnel which was signed into law; and cosponsored legislation requiring a review of the inadequacies of the present draft law which hinders the careers of so many of our young people. The President later acted on this proposal by requesting the Secretary of Defense to conduct such a study.

I consulted often with the Postmaster General to make sure his economy plans would not curtail vital mail services. Improvements recently authorized included extension of window services in some cities, opening of courtesy windows for emergency mailings until midnight and the resumption of financial services on Saturdays. The Post Office Department agreed to make further adjustments in the future, if needed.

AGRICULTURE

The Senate Agriculture Committee tied programs for wheat and cotton together in a bill I was forced to oppose because I felt the wheat program was contrary to the best interests of New York farmers. Although I also had grave doubts about the desirability of the multisubsidy cotton provision of the bill, I believe it was the only available way to keep foreign producers from having a cost advantage over U.S. textile manufactures in buying raw cotton. The wheat certificate plan in the bill was similar to the one rejected by our Nation's wheat farmers—and two-thirds of New York's wheat producers—in a referendum last year. I joined in introducing an amendment to allow separate consideration of these two programs by striking the unsound wheat provision. It was defeated by a narrow margin.

I introduced another amendment to the wheat-cotton bill to establish a commission to examine the adequacy of our agricultural policies and goals, and received assurances during Senate debate that hearings would be held. Congress enacted legislation to establish a National Commission on Food Marketing to examine problems of pricing, marketing, and competitive practices in the food industry.

Also passed was the food stamp program, which I supported, to allow needy people to increase basic food purchases through regular commercial channels. Legislation to improve pesticide registration and labeling procedures, which I cosponsored, was also enacted. In addition, I strongly supported the increase in funds for the special milk program, and the important soil conservation and food for peace programs.

Following meetings by major milk producer organizations to discuss serious drought conditions in upstate New York I urged the Secretary of Agriculture to supplement emergency loan aid and extension of grazing privileges on land diverted from production with much-needed additional assistance including the offering of grain at reduced prices. This assistance was granted to farmers in a large number of the counties affected.

FACTUAL INFORMATION ON THE COUNCIL FOR A LIVABLE WORLD

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask that as a part of my remarks a timely and factual report on the Council for a Livable World—prepared by a group of Senators and their staffs—be inserted in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL FOR A LIVABLE WORLD

INTRODUCTION

The Council for a Livable World is a secret political organization with a satchel full of money. It will probably be operating in your State, attempting to select your U.S. Senators and Representatives this fall.

The council has money; money counted in the millions of dollars. And it has demonstrated in the past it is willing to spend as much as is needed to elect the kind of Senators and Representatives it describes as "thoughtful" men. By "thoughtful" the Council for a Livable World means men who agree with its position and will work to achieve its aims.

What are these goals?

Briefly, they include unilateral disarmament, stripping the United States of its muscle, turning this country into a fourth-rate power at the mercy of the international wolfpack.

The organization is practically unknown; its founders and supporters would like to keep it that way. Council membership lists are secret. Even members don't know for sure who their fellow members are.

The Council for a Livable World collects large chunks of cash from these members—some estimate it at $1,400 to $1,500 daily—and disburses it to "thoughtful" candidates.

The council is dedicated to becoming a potent political force in the United States, if not the dominant political force. It claims to have tipped the balance in the election of one U.S. Senator before it was 6 months old.

It openly boasts it is collecting money for other Senators or senatorial candidates. These contributions range from a few hundred to $22,000.

As early as 1962 council founder and president, Leo Szilard, claimed a devoted membership of 2,500, each contributing 2 percent of gross earnings for political action. Figured on a conservative average salary basis of $10.000 this amounted to $500,000 annually in the slush fund.

Dr. Szilard's goal then became a 2-percent contributing membership of 150,000 with an annual take of $20 million—$40 million for each congressional campaign year, or $80 million for a presidential campaign.

Since then, the council's goal has been scaled down to what its board of directors considers more realistic, a contributing membership of 20,000 with an annual kitty of $4 million.

Even by modern political spending standards $4 million judiciously disbursed will make a large difference in any election.

And the council attempts to use judgment. Money is not to be profusely donated in the big-population States where campaigning is more expensive; it is spent in the smaller States of the Midwest and West where a political buck packs a bigger punch.

The council, in short, is a secret, well-financed political organization with money burning in its pockets and with shrewd spending habits.

HISTORY

Council for a Livable World is the fusion of two brainchildren of the late Dr. Leo Szilard, physicist turned politician.

The council was born in June 1962 when two previous organizations, the Council for Abolishing War and the Lobby for Abolishing War, were dissolved and their membership transferred to the new organization at a meeting in a Washington, D.C., hotel.

Scientists who had worked on the political perimeter from the end of World War II until 1961 suddenly found they had new status, new power under the present administration. Many of these men, including Dr. Szilard, had actively opposed use of the atomic bomb in Japan, opposed development of the hydrogen bomb, and opposed creation of a nuclear deterrent force by the United States under the Eisenhower administration.

These same men strongly supported free interchange of secret information with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries and advocated limited or total disarmament, internationally controlled or unilateral.

In 1960, former Secretary of State Christian Herter, by departmental order, created the Disarmament Agency within the Department of State. The scientist-politicians approved the move but soon discovered it was not enough for their purposes.

With the Disarmament Agency relegated to a secondary position in State the scientist-politicians found it difficult to operate freely. They determined it must get at least semi-independent status with more direct control from the White House where they felt more at home, more comfortable.

Their first intensive effort was in this direction and they were successful. Almost at once the White House took command, drafted legislation, and submitted it to Congress for approval. The scientist-politicians had succeeded so far.

However, there was still a drawback—Congress.

This new breed, the scientist-politicians found the atmosphere in Congress not to their liking. They found they had little in common with the men in Congress and little rapport with a majority of them.

To offset this, Dr. Szilard in late 1961 formed his Council for Abolishing War. It immediately attracted others in the academic world who felt as he did, who had the same views on diminishing defense. Purpose of the organization and its sister organ, the Lobby for Abolishing War, was twofold: to inform Congress and to elect Congressmen.

The twin organizations did not accomplish their purpose fully and in June 1962 the Council for a Livable World was created.

Success, according to the Council for a Livable World, was immediate. By campaign time Dr. Szilard was able to state the council had a membership of 2,500. Council for a Livable World has since stated this membership poured $22,000 into the campaign of Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, and maintains this money made the difference between victory and defeat for Senator MCGOVERN.

In an undated memorandum on Council for a Livable World stationery from Bernard T. Feld, president, and H. Ashton Crosby, executive director, the following paragraph appears:

"This organization—the Council for a Livable World—was formed in June 1962, and participated in the November 1962 congressional elections with impressive results. The most outstanding example was GEORGE MCGOVERN, who received from supporters of the council over $20,000, representing about one-fifth of his total campaign expenditures. MCGOVERN was elected to the Senate by a margin of less than 600 votes—the first Democratic Senator from South Dakota in 26 years."

ORGANIZATION

Council membership is largely drawn from the academic world. However, scientists and technicians, engineers, and professional men in private industry also have been solicited for membership and many have joined the ranks.

Exact membership of the group is not known. The only known statement of membership is that made by Dr. Szilard in 1962 when he claimed 2,500. Indications are, however, the membership and contributors' lists have grown dramatically since that time.

Membership is not confined to the United States. At least one resident of Geneva, Switzerland, is listed openly as a contributor in 1962.

A majority of the board of directors are scientists or scholars drawn from the academic world. One of the cochairmen, with Dr. Szilard, was William Doering, professor of chemistry, director, division of sciences, Yale University. Dr. Bernard T. Feld, president, is professor of physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

A notable exception to this academic approach is James G. Patton, president of the Farmers Union, who is also listed as a member of the board of directors.

Working with the board is a committee of scientific advisers. This list contains many outstanding names of the scientific world. The scientists' committee works closely with the board and, together, they might well be described as the apex of the scientific-political effort in the United States.

It is believed a number of other professional and political organizations including SANE, S.O.S., and at least one group dedicated to advancement of socialism are contributing substantial amounts of money to Council for a Livable World. In this area fact is hard to separate from "report" because the council keeps its financial records as secret as its membership rolls.

LEO SZILARD

To appreciate fully the motivation of the Council for a Livable World it is essential to understand the man who created it and who hand-picked the people carrying on its work—Dr. Leo Szilard.

Until his death this year Leo Szilard was the council. It was his brainchild; it was his project from the beginning. It was Leo Szilard who outlined its program, who developed its political techniques and who contributed its political philosophy.

Dr. Leo Szilard was born in Hungary and received his early education in physics there. He took graduate work at the University of Berlin but fled under the Nazi pogroms of the 1930's to England and then to the United States.

In this country Dr. Szilard taught physics and became closely associated with Enrico Fermi in the development of nuclear science. In the late thirties, fearing Nazi scientists were making real progress in the development of a nuclear explosive, Dr. Szilard became one of the leaders, along with Dr. Fermi, in the movement to cloak U.S. work in the field in secrecy.

At the same time he and Fermi led the drive to get the United States into the nuclear race. They took their proposals to Dr. Albert Einstein and urged him personally to contact Franklin D. Roosevelt with the idea. They convinced Einstein and he presented what basically was the Szilard approach to development of the bomb to the President.

During World War II Szilard and Fermi teamed up at the University of Chicago to do the basic research job which led eventually to Hiroshima.

Having developed the bomb, Szilard suddenly cooled to the idea of using it. He led the small group of American scientists who protested to President Truman against making use of the bomb against Japan. It was his contention the Japanese people should be warned of its existence and be given a chance to quit the war.

President Truman's refusal to accept the Szilard proposal apparently pushed the scientist all the way over to the left. He devoted the next few years first, to opposing further nuclear armament, then to opposing development of the hydrogen bomb and to supporting Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer in his clearance case before the Atomic Energy Commission.

It was also during this period that Szilard began his long correspondence with leaders of the Soviet Union. First he wrote, over State Department protests, to Stalin and Molotov, later to Khrushchev. This latter correspondence culminated in a tete-a-tete with Khrushchev in New York. Khrushchev was in New York for the U.N. meeting. It was at this time that he made a mockery of international procedure with his shoddy, shoe-pounding appearance before the world body. The performance didn't appear to bother Szilard, however.

His appointment with the Kremlin dictator started out as a 15-minute interview, ended up as a 2-hour conference. Neither party ever revealed fully the extent of their talk.

Meanwhile, Szilard had teamed with Lord Bertrand Russell of England and Cyrus Eaton—American bankroller of leftist causes—in an extragovernmental series of talks with Communist scientists. Szilard, along with Russell and Eaton, helped create the first international conference of scientists which became known as the Pugwash Conferences, named for Eaton's plush hideaway at Pugwash, Nova Scotia. Szilard was a regular at succeeding conferences.

With the change of administrations in 1961 Szilard suddenly found he had comparatively free access to the White House, to the Disarmament Agency and to high-level Government circles. But there were stumbling blocks to achieving his goals—mostly in Congress.

It was at this time he and other scientists began working on the activist program which evolved into the Council for a Livable World. Szilard was its early money-raiser, appearing at dozens of campus gatherings across the country, addressing hundreds of meetings of faculty and students urging his program and outlining his proposals for political action.

He had sprung full blown into politics.

TROIKA

To achieve its goal—a totally defenseless United States—the council has adopted a troika approach:

1. Infiltration of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

2. Extragovernmental conferences with Red scientists.

3. Buying U.S. elections.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency came to life through a departmental order by Secretary of State Christian Herter in 1960. A year later, in September of 1961, the Agency was given congressional approval. William C. Foster was appointed its first Director and Adrian Fisher his deputy.

The Agency has sponsored a number of research projects, contracting them out to universities and private, nonprofit corporations. In turn, these contracts are sublet to individual scientists, scholars and lawyers.

A number of these contracts can be traced back to Council for a Livable World members or its financial contributors. Council for a Livable World thus had found a new source of income: the tax dollar. Samples:

Contract No. ACDA/ST–5, "Inspection and Control in Disarmament Agreements," prime contractor: Institute for Defense Analysis; one of the major contributors: Donald Glaser, professor of physics, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., a member of the scientists for a livable world committee of the council.

ACDA/GC–33, "Quis Custodiat? Controlling the Police in a Disarmed World," by Roger Fisher, Harvard Law School, representative of Council for a Livable World at hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, April 10, 1962. Fisher also participated in contracts numbered ACDA/IR–8, ACDA/ST–5, ACDA/IR–7.

ACDA/DAS–25, "Factors Affecting Soviet attitudes on Disarmament," Matthew Maselsom, a Council for a Livable World member.

Freeman J. Dyson, listed as an adviser to Council for a Livable World, also served as a scientific consultant to ACDA for 35 days during the period January 1 to August 30, 1963.

Richard Barnet, an adviser to Council for a Livable World, codirector of Institute for Policy Studies, listed by institute as deputy director of political research, ACDA. (ACDA lists him only as a consultant.)

ACDA/IR–8, "Political Control of an International Police Force," by Hans Morgenthau, an adviser to Council for a Livable World under contract to the Institute for Defense Analysis.

ACDA/WEG–9, "Factors on Arms Inspection and Reassurance," by Bernard Feld, president of Council for a Livable World. Dr. Feld also took part in contract ACDA/WEC–2, as a subcontractor for the Raytheon Corp.

Council for a Livable World lists as a member of its science committee a Hudson Hoagland. One John H. Hoagland, perhaps not related, took part in no fewer than five ACDA contracts.

University of Chicago Professor Robert Gomer, a member of Council for a Livable World, participated as a subcontractor in at least one ACDA contract.

The list is impressive enough to indicate heavy participation in the research operations of the Disarmament Agency by Council for a Livable World, espousing its cause of a disarmed, helpless America in a world of continued tensions, continued armaments.

This activity is made all the more frustrating since taxpayers find themselves paying for this Council for a Livable World adventure in politics whether they approve it or not.

Origin of some of Council for a Livable World's ideas and tactics becomes eminently clear when members' close ties with Communist colleagues—well tutored in the art and skills of power politics—are examined. At least eight leading figures of Council for a Livable World have attended one or more of the Pugwash Conferences where Americans gathered in secret with scientists from Russia, Poland, and other Red nations to exchange information.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has examined the Pugwash meetings carefully and issued a staff analysis during the 87th Congress, 1st session.

Said the report:

"In most of the contacts that have thus far taken place, the free world scientists, although they have sometimes argued strongly, have not been able to compete with their Communist counterparts. The extensive use which the Communist propaganda apparatus has made of the Pugwash Conferences is proof enough of this.

"The free world scientists have no central guiding political ideology. The Communist scientists have such an ideology.

"The free world scientists are under no discipline. The scientists from the Communist bloc countries, when they attend international conferences, do so under the discipline of the Communist Party.

"The free world scientist, brought up in the tradition of freedom of criticism, is frequently critical, and sometimes overcritical of his own government. The Soviet scientist—especially the Soviet scientist who represents his Government abroad in any capacity—has been conditioned to blind obedience to government policy.

"The free world scientist has been accustomed to an exchange of views with fellow scientists based on a common regard for the truth and scientific objectivity. The Soviet scientist knows from his own sad experience, that, whenever there is a conflict between a scientific objectivity and Communist dogma, it is scientific objectivity that must yield.

"The free world scientist comes to his meeting with Soviet scientists with an open mind, full of trust and a desire to communicate and cooperate. The Communist scientist comes to these conferences with carefully defined political directives. It is his duty to attempt to shape and exploit the conference in a manner which will best serve the ends of Soviet imperialism."

Internal Security Subcommittee investigators identify the following Americans (all members of Council for a Livable World or its predecessors) as having attended Pugwash Conferences:

First Pugwash Conference, July 6 to 11, 1957: Leo Szilard, Herman J. Mueller, John Edsall.

Second Pugwash Conference, March 31 to April 11, 1958; Morton Grodzins, Leo Szilard.

Third Pugwash Conference, September 14 to 20, 1958: Charles Coryell, Bernard Feld, Morton Grodzins, Herman J. Mueller, Leo Szilard, Victor Weisskopf.

Report from Moscow on Disarmament and World Security (roundtable discussion of sixth conference impressions): Alexander Rich.

Moscow conference, November 27 to December 5, 1960: John Edsall, Bernard Feld, Morton Grodzins, Leo Szilard, Alexander Rich.

"The Pugwash Conferences," staff analysis prepared for the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee of the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, 87th Congress, 1st session, GPO Washington, 1961.

Having meshed its international and Disarmament Agency gears, Council for a Livable World found itself blocked in only one direction—the U.S. Congress. Having learned realism, the council set about changing this realistically—by spending huge sums of money to elect Members of House and Senate who believe as they do.

The council's method of spreading this political largesse is ingenious. Council for a Livable World itself doesn't like to write large checks made out to individuals or to campaign committees. Instead it instructs its members (and being scientists the instructions are a neat formula) on how to do it as individuals.

Having first evaluated candidates, Council for a Livable World on November 15, 1963, outlined its program in a letter to supporters:

"You will remember that last spring we asked council members to consider making the second half of their 1963 contributions to a senatorial candidate who would be up for reelection in 1964 and that we suggested that these candidates would be chosen from the following list: QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota; ALBERT GORE, Tennessee; PHILIP A. HART, Michigan; FRANK E. MOSS, Utah; GALE W. MCGEE, Wyoming; EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Maine; EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Minnesota.

"All of these candidates are worthy of support, but on the basis of their relative need for support, the council recommends that priority now be given to Senators BURDICK [sic], Moss, and MCGEE."

How was this "priority" support to be given? The following form to be filled out by contributors was enclosed:

COUNCIL FOR A LIVABLE WORLD,
Washington, D.C.

I enclose my contribution in the amount of $——— for the second half of 1963 to the

Council for a Livable World to be used as follows:

☐ I would like to contribute to the general funds of the Council for a Livable World for political or other purposes. (Make checks payable to "The Council for a Livable World.")

☐ I would like to contribute to the campaign fund of a senatorial candidate in the 1964 elections. (All checks should be made out directly to the candidate, but sent to the council for transmittal.) The following are recommended as guidelines for those who otherwise have no strong personal preference:

—— If your last name begins with letters A–K, contribute to the campaign of Senator QUENTIN N. BURDICK.

—— If your last name begins with letters L–R, contribute to the campaign of Senator FRANK E. MOSS.

—— If your last name begins with letters S–Z, contribute to the campaign of Senator GALE W. MCGEE.

Other senatorial candidates:

—— ALBERT GORE.
—— PHILIP HART.
—— EUGENE J. MCCARTHY.
—— EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

Name _____
Address _____
City_____ State_____ ZIP code __

These oblique instructions are cunning in the extreme and demonstrate a shrewd and devious political brain behind the movement. They contain two safeguards, one for the council and the other for the candidate involved. Note the instructions accompanying box No. 2: "(All checks should be made out directly to the candidate, but sent to the council for transmittal.)"

By following these instructions the candidate would receive a batch of checks from individual citizens and would not have to identify the money as having come from a secret political organization which selected him for support. Few sharp-eyed observers would question a contributors' list containing merely individual names; many might question a large, lump-sum check from Council for a Livable World.

This system also places the council beyond having to comply with the reporting law in Washington, D.C. As a political organization it had not, itself, contributed directly to any candidate; it had merely recommended candidates for others to contribute to as they saw fit.

A third point: by transmitting the checks CLW would be able to keep tabs on who got the money, how much, and from whom.

The contribution formula was also contained in the instructions. If your last name began with the letters A–K, contributions should go to Senator BURDICK; L–R, to Senator Moss; S–Z, to Senator MCGEE.

Scientific, no?

Also devious.

Six months later, May 5, 1964, the council had expanded the list of those in whom it was interested by adding the names of two incumbent Members of the House, Representatives JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, Democrat, of New Mexico, and RALPH R. HARDING, Democrat, of Idaho. By May 5, Representative MONTOYA had announced his intentions of running against Senator E. L. MECHEM this fall.

This time the contributions formula had changed slightly and contributors were urged "* * * unless you have special 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: MONTOYA, A–D; MCGEE, E–K; MUSKIE, L–P; Moss, O–S; HARDING, T–Z."

The council felt impelled to make an explanation of its support for Congressman HARDING:

"You will note that with its recommendation of Congressman HARDING for support, the council is departing from its 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."

The council is not only realistic in an immediate sense, it looks to the future.

The Council for a Livable World has made other departures. Evidence has come to light it is attemping now to swing primary as well as general elections. An indication of this broadened interest came in a news dispatch from Harrisburg, Pa. It detailed contributions received by Genevieve Blatt, a Democratic contender for the senatorial nomination. In her filed statement with the Secretary of State she listed $1,000 contributed to her campaign by the Council for a Livable World. When the council filed its lobbying expense statement with the Secretary of the Senate for the second quarter of 1964 an interesting "lobbying" expense item appeared: "Genevieve Blatt, Philadelphia, $1,000." Miss Blatt, after a closely contested primary battle, was finally declared a winner. The Council's contribution, according to the second story of her filing with the Pennsylvania secretary of state was the second biggest to the Blatt primary campaign fund.

Its tenacles spread out.

The council's success in getting members to contribute to political campaigns can be demonstrated by the following tabulation accompanying its May 5, 1964, letter soliciting funds: Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. Political contributions—1963–64.

Letter and questionnaire to the Council for a Living World supporters, November 15, 1963 (copy attached).

	Through 1963	From Jan. 1, 1964	Total 1963–64
Senator Burdick [1]	$10,171.50	$4,180.34	$14,351.84
Senator Moss	6,003.00	1,986.33	7,989.33
Senator McGee	5,769.00	2,689.83	8,458.83
Senator Gore	115.00	15.00	130.00
Senator Hart	100.00	60.00	160.00
Senator McCarthy	330.00	1,766.00	2,096.00
Senator Muskie	252.30	120.00	372.30
Congressman Donald Fraser		20.00	20.00
Jerome Ziegler		25.00	25.00
Total	22,740.80	10,862.50	33,603.30

[1] Senator BURDICK, after receiving funds from CLW members, claims to have returned every cent of it.

$530 currently on hand of unallocated political funds transmitted to CLW by supporters but unspecified as to candidates.

RACE AND IMMIGRATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Harry Golden discusses the subjects of race and immigration in the interesting perceptive fashion which is his and which has influenced, for good, many of the public debates and decisions in this country. He treats the subject in a most unusual but penetrating way.

I am especially pleased that this address by Mr. Golden was delivered at a meeting held at Michigan State University on August 20, 1964, at the conference of Cursillos in Christianity. The Cursillo movement is a magnificent, developing one in this country and has helped many of us to understand better our reasons for helping to recognize in one another the Creator of all of us.

This combination of a distinguished American Jew speaking as a guest and lecturer to the Roman Catholic Session of Prayer and Dialog is one that I hope will receive the widest attention. I ask unanimous consent that the address by Mr. Golden be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

It is a great honor for me, a Jew, to participate in this Cursillos in Christianity, a Roman Catholic session of solemn prayer and dialog.

When the late Pope John XXIII announced his intention to write a new social encyclical some of his closest collaborators suggested that it might not be necessary to treat themes which had already been explored by his predecessors. They made specific reference to the Rerum Novarum of Leo XIII, and Quadrigesimo Anno, of Pius XI:

"No," said John, "the world travels faster than we do. We must adapt daily and totally so that we do not limp along behind. Otherwise we will be outrun. By whom? I leave that to you to figure out."

Pope John's call for total awareness and total involvement in the area of social justice, has had a phenomenal result. I believe it was the first time in modern history that the reign of a Pope was as exciting to millions of Protestants, Jews, Moslems, and indeed to Free Thinkers too, as it was to the Roman Catholics themselves.

I would like to discuss two problems which I believe are involved in this need for total awareness, and total involvement. Race and immigration, and how we resolve these problems may very well be the key to America's victory in the struggle for the moral leadership of the free world.

We hear of the "white backlash" and are told we must fear it. We hear this at the very moment we hear America is the leader of the free world. Hearing both we know nevertheless we can believe only one.

If indeed America is the leader of the free world, then we must fear nothing. Leading the free world is not a position easily come by nor easily held. It takes sacrifice and blood. And more. We are the leaders of the free world because America is more than just a people. America is a moral idea, the idea of liberty and justice for all.

I believe it is shameful of us to suspect that Americans will vote against their own interests out of some secret fear. It is more than shameful for any of us to believe that Americans want to deny the blessings and benefits of America to 19 million other Americans.

I cannot believe this. It isn't true.

I believe a good one-word description of the American dream is mobility. The opportunity to move about as free men without special permission or registration card. The opportunity to move from one place to another place, from one income level to another income level, from one station in life to another station in life. And yet for nearly 100 years we have tolerated the very negation of the American dream as it involves our neighbors of the Negro race.

Let us examine the challenge. We have all heard people say, the Irish immigrants did not need FEPC to make their way in America, the immigrant Jews who couldn't even speak the language, did not need any freedom rides or sit-ins to make their way, and so on with the Poles, Italians, and others. I'll come back to this challenge presently.

America's welcome for the immigrant was often less than enthusiastic. We have had

9 or 10 nativist movements during the last century. Yet despite these nativist movements it must be said that the sense of America as a refuge for the oppressed was never really far from the consciousness of the people of this country.

What therefore is at the core of the problem of the Negro in relation to the millions of foreigners who have entered the open society of America? It is not necessarily that the Negroes are poor, that they live in substandard housing. When novelist James Baldwin states the problem in terms of his own terribly deprived childhood in Harlem, I am not deeply impressed. I saw poverty just as great as Baldwin experienced, among the Jews and Poles on the Lower East Side of New York, among the Italians in Little Italy, among the Irish in the Hell's Kitchen district of New York's west side. The important thing to remember about these immigrants is that they could get out. We knew almost by instinct that if we studied, learned, worked, strived, and sacrificed, the open society of America was waiting for us. Oh, there may have been pinpricks at the social level, but they were of little consequence really. America beckoned to us, come and join us as part of the corporate whole, there's room for all, in America there are no superfluous men.

It is not therefore that the Negro has been poor and has lived in substandard housing, but that we have long since established the political, the economic, and the social compulsions which have kept him securely locked in—locked in his ghettoes in the North and cut off entirely from the center of life in the South. Unlike the rest of us strangers he could not get out. And we should remind ourselves that we kept him locked in during the years of the greatest industrial-urban expansion and wealth accumulation in the history of the world.

And let us not be overly proud that so many of us did achieve this passage into the open society without FEPC, or like they say, pulling ourselves up by the bootstraps while the Negro remained in his ghetto.

The best answer to this has come from a young Boston Irishman, the late John F. Kennedy. In an interview he granted me in June of 1963, he addressed himself to this idea. It was a brilliant insight, and I was permitted to quote him as follows:

"The Negro has no hope of subterfuge or pretense, he cannot change his name to alter his origins, nor can he change his religion, nor can he move from cities to isolated areas, the Negro needs legislation every step of the way and I hope to be able to give it to him."

These words coming from a young man, even though he was President of the United States, were tremendously impressive, they confirmed a truth which has come to many of us after 20 years of study.

The Negro must have legislation "every step of the way" because he is born not only into a desperate economic and social complex, but he must struggle against a psychological complex which demeans every American, white and Negro. We cannot help recognize the black man, and there are many whose recognition triggers terror, or contempt, or condescension, or paternalism, or fear. This is a conditioned psychological response that only reason dissipates, but there are many who are unreasoning. And do not let anyone tell you that law cannot do the job. There are Negroes working today in the carding rooms of the textile plants of my State, for the first time in history. This did not come about because the white mill workers were suddenly possessed of an overpowering love. It has come about because of Mr. Kennedy's equal employment directive. If you discriminate in employment you lose your Government contract.

And behind all of this are a few simple facts which in themselves are amazing in that they have so rarely been explored and yet they involve not only human dignity but human life itself. Because behind all of this law and sociology is the simple fact that in 1960, four Negro women died in childbirth for each white woman who died in childbirth; that Negro infant mortality was five times greater than white infant mortality; that tuberculosis which is twelfth as the cause of death among whites is second as the cause of death among Negroes, and these simple facts tell us the story of the locked-in Negro community within a civilization which is the most opulent on earth and which also considers itself the most Christian of all countries on earth.

I referred to race and immigration, but their relationship is close and we may reasonably consider both problems as central to the perpetuation of the American dream.

The McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, still on the books, admits 154,647 immigrants a year, under quotas based on the 1920 ratio of foreign born in the Nation's population. President Truman declared it discriminatory and inadequate for national needs, saying some deportation provisions were so vague as to allow "thought control."

When President Eisenhower urged revision of the restrictive measures of the act, the late Congressman Walter successfully guarded provisions allowing almost free access to the United States of immigrants from the Nordic and Anglo-Saxon countries and restricting the number from the Mediterranean, Middle Eastern, Balkan, Eastern European, and Asian countries.

Thus the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act permits those to come who are likely not to want to, and restricts those who do want to.

The restrictive features of the McCarran-Walter Act strikes me as paradoxical in a civilization professing Christianity. While we have no state church, one can say nevertheless, Christianity is an important factor in the life of most Americans.

Certainly what helped make Christianity a universal religion was that the early church recognized the value of the foreigner.

Pope Hildebrand believed the Gospel would be spread most effectively by missionaries as dissimilar to the people to whom they preach as possible. It was this Pope's deep understanding of the foreigner's vitality which led to establishing celibacy among the clergy around 1070. The clergy were thus made "strangers" in their surroundings and in its way the prohibition against marriage helped the church seal its tremendous political success.

More to the point is that we can relate the success of Christianity as a universal religion to the success of the United States as leader of the free world.

Christianity came at a time when travelers could go from Babylon to York without a passport. Think how this helped to spread an idea.

In the second and third centuries, the highways of Europe and Britain were filled with monks in black robes bearing crosses. By the time of St. Augustine, there already was a "McCarran-Walter Act" all over Europe but the missionary work had been sufficiently accomplished and Augustine was able to consolidate the great victory by "marrying" Christianity to the arts. Had there been no free movement, however, we have the right to conjecture that the people of the northern forests of Europe might have held on much longer to Wotan, the Anglo-Saxons might have taken Mithra to their hearts, the god they had borrowed for a time from the Roman legionnaires, and other peoples might have held on much longer to their gods who lived on mountain tops, in the trees, and in the oceans, rivers, and streams.

Christianity was quick to grasp the significance of the classical stranger in world history. Jesus was born in Bethlehem, a little town the great Greeks and the equally great Romans had never even heard of. And a mere handful of "strangers," Jews from Judea (St. Paul among them) were able to "conquer" the great Roman Empire with all its vast works and all its far-reaching institutions. They did it with an idea, but they also did it because they were "strangers."

In the United States as late as 1900, fewer than one-third of our people could trace their ancestry further than a native-born grandfather. Essentially we were all foreigners. Indeed, based on European standards, all Americans even today, in 1964, are foreigners, except the American Indian. What the freedom of movement in the first two centuries did for Christianity, the free access to the United States from its earliest beginnings to 1920 did for America—it made us.

When the Congress passed the first of its anti-immigration bills, one of the arguments to which it harkened was that the Italians came to America and worked here for 10 or 15 years, saved every nickel, and departed then for home. Congressmen even gave President Woodrow Wilson a carefully documented survey of how many millions of dollars this cost America, money which left here and entered Italy. President Wilson read this document, then vetoed the bill, saying, "Yes, but they left us the subways they built, didn't they"?

The immigrants, particularly the immigrants after the Civil War, gave America its gulf stream of vitality.

Why should this be? Is the "foreigner" better than the native? Of course not. In fact the foreigner or the stranger does not think himself as good as the native and it is this sense of inferiority, this hope to be like the native, that has given him this vitality through all history.

Just as the three great monastic orders in France were founded by a German, a Hungarian, and an Englishman, and Christianity was established in the Anglo-Saxon world by Italians and Spaniards, so were the great industrial, intellectual, and scientific institutions in America founded by foreigners from Scandinavia, Germany, Ireland, Britain, Italy, Poland, Russia, Hungary, Rumania, Austria, and all the other lands in the world, 43 million immigrants in 100 years from 70 different countries.

It is a vitality we may have lost since the first law restricting immigration passed over the veto of President Wilson in 1920. When we become comfortable in our environment and there are few challenges we lose some of our drive.

Another 50 years of "racial" and "ethnic" restrictions and we will all look like Davy Crockett. Not that Davy Crockett was bad looking, but he didn't look like the Swedish farmer in the Midwest or the Irish laborer laying the railroad ties or the Jewish medical student or the Polish ironworker or the Chinese merchant in San Francisco or the Italian restaurateur in Connecticut or for that matter, the Mohawk Indian who works in high steel.

Realistically, the "open door" policy is out of the question. But there are reasonable and providential revisions possible. And they are American. I refer to the proposals made by Senator PHILIP A. HART of Michigan. He asks for the total number of admissible immigrants to be one-seventh of 1 percent of the total population instead of one-sixth of 1 percent of the white population according to the 1920 census. He would revise the "national origins" quota system by a formula based on the relative population of the countries of the world.

The section of our country which is only now entering the industrial age is the old Confederate South; significantly, this is the one section that had no immigrants, no foreigners, no strangers. There was great comfort in the homogeneous society, yet today when the physicist and scientist appear before the Senate committee to discuss the matters which concern the welfare, security, and survival of the United States, some of them talk with a heavy accent. One or two even need an interpreter.

Lysander, Sparta's great man, was not a Spartan at all, nor was William who started Britain on her road to glory a Briton, nor was Disraeli who made Victoria Empress of India an Englishman. A man is no prophet in his own country. Every land in this world sends its preachers to its neighbor, and receives preachers in return. The millions of immigrants who came to America were "preachers" with a gospel, seeking what the Greeks called "the good life."

It is the immigrant, who, finding freedom and opportunity in America, tells us what it is.

Once we had a "peace corps" that cost us nothing. It was composed of foreigners who wrote "home" about America and linked us to every country, city, town, hamlet, and farmhouse in the world. Who else better extolled the American way of life, who praised liberty and proved the pursuit of happiness better than the "foreigner" who described to the folks behind his new job in Detroit or his butcher shop in Milwaukee?

The McCarran-Walter Act robbed us of this. But God is good to us. America's new vitality will now come from the Negro, who, striving to be like others, will make others define what it is they are, what it is they ought to be. This is America's good fortune to have always the marginal man struggling to get "in," struggling to prove himself, struggling to enter the open society and "become" like everyone else—as quickly as possible. By his use of Christianity as a weapon in his struggle for civil rights, the American Negro may have saved Christianity, or at least redeemed it for those religious fellowships, particularly in the South, who backed away from a moral issue. But the contribution of the American Negro will be equally great in providing the American civilization with the vitality which the classical "stranger" has always provided in his struggle to become part of the corporate whole.

Thank you for your invitation. I shall cherish the honor for the rest of my life.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 12318) to provide an equitable system for the classification of certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 2772. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer;

H.R. 6218. An act to amend the act of June 29, 1960, to authorize additional extensions of time for final proof by certain entrymen under the desert land laws and to make such additional extensions available to the successors in interest of such entrymen; and

H.R. 9124. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes.

EQUITABLE SYSTEM FOR CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN POSITIONS UNDER THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the bill H.R. 12318, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair) laid before the Senate the bill (H.R. 12318) to provide an equitable system for the classification of certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 12318) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL AVIATION SYSTEM SYMPOSIUM

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a unique symposium on our national aviation system took place on Wednesday and Thursday of this week at the Federal Aviation Agency here in Washington. This was the first time such a symposium has been held. The purpose of this meeting was to present what the FAA has been doing and what it plans to do for the future in the development of our national air space system. The meeting was attended by some of our Nation's leading figures in aviation. Presidents of our largest international and domestic airlines, president of our largest aircraft manufacturers and high officials in such Government agencies as NASA and the Department of Defense.

Mr. Halaby appropriately called this the "shareholders" meeting, because everyone in attendance is an active participant in our national air space system. Mr. Halaby is to be congratulated for his foresight in getting together this distinguished group of approximately 150 leaders in aviation. I am sure they have all profited from the 2 days they spent at the FAA and the FAA has undoubtedly gained from their comments which were offered at these meetings.

I believe the remarks which Mr. Halaby made at the symposium on our current national air space system and the future of aviation in 1965 will be of interest to all Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Halaby's remarks printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS OF N. E. HALABY

It is a rare and stimulating pleasure for the FAA to host the leadership of the aviation community for the next 2 days. The 200 people in this room have great responsibility and great authority for maintaining and advancing aviation in the world of the sixties and seventies.

This shareholders meeting, which I hope will become an annual event with the FAA reporting on the problems and progress of the previous fiscal year and the prospects for the forthcoming fiscal year, was suggested by my recent reading of several of your annual reports. It seemed to me that in a very real sense all of you and those whom you represent and employ are truly shareholders in the American airspace. Each of you holds stock in the national aviation system. Therefore, I feel, we will find it helpful to meet together over both problems and prospects.

This is the 6th year of the jet age; it is also the 6th year of the Federal Aviation Agency and the 26th year of the Civil Aeronautics Act. In this relatively short period we have come a long way in our pursuit of aviation improvements. Usually industry, labor, and Government have been together. Only infrequently has there been diversity and controversy—fortunately.

Our purposes today and tomorrow are these: First, to review very briefly the lessons of the past 6 years with particular reference to last year. Second, to look ahead to next year and, using that as a backdrop, to attempt to preview as far as 1975.

Today we will talk about the recent past and the present. Tomorrow the future. Thursday night we would like to feel that you will go back to your offices and homes feeling that for the first time all of the diverse and competing, yet mutually related factors in the national aviation system have been discussed. In other words, that you have met and you have been consulted over your airspace.

We also hope that, as the principal users of the Government services which the FAA provides, you will have a better understanding of what the Agency is and isn't, and what its programs can and cannot do for you and your members and customers.

Finally, we feel that this is a unique opportunity for you to pause for 48 hours and take a 360° look at aviation's horizon. If you are an airline dispatcher, you see one segment of this broad, many-dimensioned airspace. If you are a pilot, another, a mechanic, still another. If you are a manager, you look at it more broadly perhaps, but not the same as the military pilot or commander. If you are a private pilot and your whole fleet is one airplane and your entire route system is from grass strip into town, you have quite a different view from that of the airline or military pilot.

We in the FAA are required by law to look at the whole, to see the broad public interest, and in doing so not only to regulate but to promote aviation. This is not easy. But I have tried, in my own way, to seek and maintain a proper but dynamic balance of interests.

For these two days, I hope we can confer not just as regulators and regulated but as searchers for answers to mutual problems. My conclusion, after almost 4 years, is that if we look at aviation from the point of view of the traveler and the neighbor of the airplane, we come closer to that elusive standard we pursue, the "public interest."

Of course the many diverse and competing views which propel this system, and sometimes bedevil it, are held by the most

individualistic and dedicated hard-driving group of men and women in any industry in the world. This driving spirit of competition exists not only between companies but between individuals. And this, of course, accounts for the rapid growth of the aviation industry as well as the controversies among its leaders.

I have accounted for the varied interests and views of the public we serve. But we in FAA also serve, and are served by, our board of directors—the Congress of the United States, 535 strong.

We see the general public, the taxpayers, as well as the aviation community which you represent, as our shareholders. And, we feel that we are the executive management—the hired hands of the airspace, if you will. On the other hand, the Government segment of the aviation community must not only share responsibility with you but there is certain authority which we must at times exercise against you. In other words, in its wisdom the Congress has decreed that the marketplace does not provide the sole regulation. The people, through the Congress, state that they want Government as well as competition to control aviation. As Government we must wield authority and responsibility and we do, and we will continue to do so to the best of our abilities. But in doing so, we not only desire to consort with you, but have learned that we can enjoy it without relinquishing any of the authority vested in us by the people of the United States.

Let us now look at the system and describe the environment in which we fly.

You see on this chart the three general categories of flying. The military operate some 25,000 aircraft from mach 3 down to zero speed and from 85,000 feet down to the surface of the water. There were 18.8 million military flight operations last year—IFR, VFR, night and day, domestic and international.

The second category is air carrier aviation with approximately 2,100 airliners carrying 50 billion passenger miles and conducting about 7.7 million operations per year.

The third category is general aviation, involving some 85,000 aircraft flying some 46.9 million operations.

Within this national aviation system there are some 350,000 or 400,000 pilots—roughly 15–20,000 air carrier pilots, 300,000 general aviation pilots and perhaps 50–60,000 military pilots. Not all of these pilots are active and fortunately not all of them are active at any one time. They fly a variety of missions, all the way from very high speed test runs at mach 3 to the student acrobatic flights in very congested areas of Florida and Texas.

There are some 8,000 airports in the United States, only 600 of them receive air carrier service and about 70 are jetports. There are numerous military bases and thousands of small airstrips.

Let me describe the plant—the environment which contains all of this activity.

The FAA operates 168,000 thousand miles of airways with 19,000 traffic controllers supported by about 15,000 systems maintenance people. They operate the national airspace system. We believe it has a capacity of handling about 4,000 aircraft at any one time. Last year our towers, 278 of them, handled nearly 33 million operations. We estimate about 36,500,000 this year and 38 million in fiscal 1966.

As shareholders and as taxpayers I think you would be interested in the nature of your investment. It is about $1,150 million and the unit costs are spread in the following way. The 21 air route traffic control centers cost $105 million. The 191 radars in our system cost $335 million. The 278 towers cost $90 million. And, the 330 flight service stations cost $110 million.

In terms of the use of the airspace, the military use about 30 percent of the airspace services we provide and the civil account for about 70 percent.

As you know, the facilities provided have greatly increased so that, since 1958, the primary air navigation facilities for navigation and communications have increased by almost 3,100 units or 67 percent. Just since I came into office we have added 57 towers, 37 long-range radars, 76 new approach light systems, 73 new instrument landing systems, and 111 more VOR and VORTAC navigation aids.

The number of airports which have been added new in the past 5 years is 176 and 134 more are now under construction. The number improved is 888. So, we have a plant worth approximately a billion and a quarter.

Now, each of you knows about his own organization and I think a word about the one of which I am currently chief executive officer is appropriate at this point. Not that we wish to make a budget pitch to you because we do not.

However, I would like to point out what this organization has been and what it is.

When I took over in the spring of 1961, the Agency was highly centralized, operating 545 field installations from 8 line bureaus here in Washington. It was deployed in approximately 13 different buildings within this city and such operating decisions as authorizing an obstruction at the Los Angeles Airport, made their way here for decision. The thing that disturbed me most was that the key staff had projected an increase from approximately 44,000 employees to 57,000 employees by 1965. I recognized that the population had trebled in the CAA/FAA since 1954 but I could not believe that this Agency should be expanded to 57,000 people. The spending in 1961 too was projected at nearly a billion dollars or $902 million for 1965.

I immediately moved to reduce the projections by decentralizing the operation—in other words, reducing overhead—and by demanding a high rate of increase in employee productivity each year, reasoning that as our new employees gained in experience we could expect more work from them.

As a result, the rate of growth has been completely arrested and we are now, for the first time, leveled off at about 45,800 positions. In the decentralization we also reduced the Washington staff from 3,700 to the present 3,200 and made employment reductions in research and development and other areas.

To my great pleasure and pride, I can tell you that we have some very, very fine people in FAA. We have tried hard to put our most competent people in the positions of greatest responsibility, and we have here today, the first team. About 19 of these key men were brought in by me, a fourth by General Quesada and 17 are career men. I have delegated—as many of you have done to division managers—very important responsibility and authority to the regional directors in New York, Atlanta, Fort Worth, Los Angeles, Honolulu, Anchorage, Kansas City and London.

We also have two major field centers. One is the aeronautical center at Oklahoma City where we have our supply depot, training academy and medical research institute. We have 4,500 people there. Our research and development center is located in Atlantic City and we have about 1,000 employees there.

FAA employees are productive people. They are experienced people. One reason is that the turnover is the lowest in Government, for any major agency, as low as 3½ percent among our controllers. The increase of productivity per year among controllers is now almost 5 percent. For systems maintenance technicians, it exceeds 5 percent. This is a record which I would challenge any corporation to match in similar categories of operations.

I would like to touch on appropriations very briefly. This past year, for the first time in the history of the FAA, the Agency requested less money than in previous years. Despite this, as you know, we got a whacking cut of $30 million for our efforts to present the tightest budget yet.

Well, we have covered considerable ground here and I would just like to mention one rather sour note. I doubt you would like any more than I presiding over an organization whose annual expenses are three quarters of a billion dollars and whose annual revenues are only about $150 million derived from the 5 percent airline ticket tax and the 2 cents tax per gallon of aviation gasoline. Any outfit that collects only 20 percent of its costs is bound to be in trouble. Fortunately, the profit and loss statements for a Government agency is not this rigorous, and, of course, we must attribute a large share of this cost to national security for facilitating military operations, I would say roughly one-third and a large share of public protection in general.

It costs us $450 million to operate the national airspace system, and we take in only $150 million from the aircraft using the system. We have recovered one-third of our costs in tax revenue. Thus, if we are recovering only $150 million out of an annual operation and maintenance cost of $450 million, we have $300 million uncovered. I think it is fair to attribute approximately $200 million of this to national security and public protection, just as we build our defenses and as we build dams, dredge rivers for flood control and other public protective purposes. That still leaves $100 million that easily can be attributed to the users and month after month, budget after budget, I must explain to the Budget Director and a number of very thoughtful and dedicated men in the Congress why the aviation industry should be so favored.

Just to compound my felony, I am told that to this FAA cost should be added the $90 million of CAB costs and $25 million of NASA costs to bring the total "subsidy" to the national aviation system to about a billion dollars, only $150 million of which is recovered directly in fuel taxes. And even through corporate income taxes on aviation are very substantial they are no different from those paid by other industries with no such substantial subsidy.

Now gentlemen, I think we have a problem, and the sooner we face it and solve it rather than fight it year after year, I think the better off we will all be, and I think the healthier we'll all feel, as well.

In winding up this introduction, I should tell you that I think we have come a long way but we've got some very serious additional problems facing us. First is the flight safety record. It's good, but not good enough. Second is the problem of noise and public anxiety. Then, airport accessibility. As urbanization of population expands around the airport, it's less and less desirable to go by air, from one metropolitan area to another metropolitan area, unless the flight time saving is very substantial. Next, I think we have very serious problems coming up in aircraft development: the short-haul transport, the metropolitan plane, probably VSTOL, as well as the supersonic transport. Finally, I think you men who have been dependent upon MATS contracts have a very serious shifting of gears to do as the C–141 fleet builds up and perhaps added to that, the CX–HLS, capable of carrying 600 seats.

I guess all of our problems could be summed up in this fashion. Minimize fears

and fares, and maximize public service with economy.

In the last 4 years, I feel this industry has had an impressive era of growth. There has been good cooperation between industry, labor, and Government. The number of man-years lost, by the way, due to strikes, is unbelievably low. In fact, last year I believe it was less than 10 days.

Most dramatic, of course, was the air carrier economic recovery, zooming from the worst deficit in its history to the highest profit levels.

Also for these 4 years we have had the best consecutive string of annual safety records in the history of civil aviation. The carriers and general aviation flew more miles last year than at any time in history and they were about the safest miles. The U.S. commercial safety record is at least three times as good as the ICAO world average record.

All of you contributed to this great record for which we can take some encouragement but not any complacent satisfaction.

AVIATION IN 1975

During the past 6 months, we in the FAA have been involved in what I consider to be one of our most important projects—articulating the policies and goals which will guide the Agency through 1975. In these aviation goals, we are trying to achieve a balance between the Nation's needs and the Nation's capability for meeting those needs. We are also developing a long-range planning process to help insure that we achieve our goals.

This means that we shall have a document which sets out in comprehensive form the policies which guide the FAA in the accomplishment of its missions and its relationships with you, its shareholders of the airspace. Not only will such a policy statement serve as a guide in decisionmaking and help insure consistency within the Agency, but it will provide those with whom the FAA deals a better understanding of the philosophy behind our actions and our regulations.

Such an understanding is particularly significant for a regulatory agency such as the FAA, which must achieve compliance with its regulations by primary reliance upon a force of enlightened self-interest and a sense of public responsibility, and by secondary reliance upon an enforcement program which is fair, fast, consistent, and effective.

It is equally important that you, the shareholders, be aware of the goals the Agency is seeking to achieve. These goals will determine the programs we undertake and, in turn, will determine both the kind of service and the level of service which we offer the public and the aviation community.

We are proud of the fact that the United States is the world leader in aviation—that aircraft of U.S. manufacture set the standards of safety, reliability and economy throughout the world; that American-made avionics equipment is unsurpassed; that we have a domestic and international air transportation system second to none in the world; that our system of air traffic control and navigation is unequalled; and most important of all that the air traveler on U.S. air carriers is the safest air traveler in the world.

Our position of leadership is the product of dedication and hard work on the part of people like you. We, in the FAA, intend to do everything we can to guarantee that the United States remains the world leader.

Our policies and our goals must recognize this responsibility. In setting our goals, it has been necessary to identify the most important problems we will be facing in the future. Undoubtedly, the most serious problem confronting the world for the remainder of this century, aside from maintaining world peace, is the population explosion. The present world population is 3.2 billion. In ten years it will be over 4 billion, and by the year 2000 there will be 7 billion. The United States will feel the press of population growth, but to a somewhat lesser extent than the rest of the world.

The two other most serious problems confronting the United States in the years ahead are automation and the existence of the industrial-military complex.

Automation will increase productivity immeasurably, making many things possible which had heretofore been beyond the realm of man's capability and even his imagination, and remove the drudgery and the time-consuming human effort required to perform many necessary tasks. At the same time, automation poses a serious threat to our society unless we are able to make the necessary changes in our social, economic and political institutions to cope with the fact of man's changing role in his society. As a Nation, we must demonstrate the wisdom and the imagination necessary to utilize the benefits of automation without becoming engulfed in a sea of unemployment.

The requirements of national security have led to the development of a system which draws to it the best of the Nation's research talent as well as the best of its managerial capabilities. The demands of wars and cold wars, the tremendous quantities of money involved in military programs, the magnitude of our efforts in space all have combined to produce a military-industrial complex whose growth and direction have been determined not by market forces but by demands of national defense and national prestige. This has lead to an increasing dependence of the civilian sector of our economy on the technological fall-out of military and space programs. In many cases, the result has been a far different allocation of resources than would otherwise have taken place with much more rapid rates of growth and development in those sectors of the civilian economy which have been able to utilize directly or indirectly the benefits of our vast defense expenditures.

In the coming years there will be a strong temptation to use more and more governmental actions to insure the rapid introduction of technological advances. Clearly, there is an important role for Government in research and development and, of course, we must find ways to make the benefits of technology available rapidly. However, we must be very stringent in our demands that there be ample justification for any departure from the normal market mechanism. We must be sure that governmental activity is confined to those areas where there is not an adequate private substitute.

These problems—the population explosion, automation and the existence of the industrial-military complex—will be with us for the indefinite future. Certainly the first two can be expected to become progressively more serious. A failure to cope with any one of the three adequately may well prove disastrous.

Aviation is closely related to each of these problems. Each of the three will increase the demands which are already being made on the aviation industry but at the same time, the proper use of aviation technology can contribute significantly to our ability to meet the challenges ahead.

For many problems, air transportation offers a sound hope for building a social, economic and political system that can begin to both keep pace with population growth and support the demands of economic growth and development. Aviation also offers new ways of meeting traditional problems which will exist on a much larger scale with considerably less total investment than would be required by traditional means.

The rapidly advancing technology of aviation holds out great promise of bringing to the unparalleled speed and flexibility of aviation a remarkable element of operating economy; $100 fares from New York to Paris and 5 cents per-ton-mile cargo rates will come in relatively few years. There is no doubt of that.

What is far more important in terms of the problems of the United States and of the world, however, is the fact that aviation technology is just now on the threshold of developments which will provide capabilities greatly in excess of these. Innovations in aerodynamics, improved propulsion systems and fuel properties, and the development of new metals and other materials will produce performance characteristics and operating economies which will allow aviation solutions to entire ranges or problems where aviation has never been a factor before.

The implications of advanced aviation technology are vitally important to the less-developed countries of the world. Air transportation can, in effect, solve problems of mountain ranges, impenetrable jungles, deserts, and unbridgeable river complexes. We have already seen examples of this in Latin America, Asia, and the Near East.

But the less-developed countries are by no means the only ones that stand to benefit from the coming revolution in aviation technology. In the United States, for example, it may well be that the only possible solution to the urban transportation problem will be an aviation solution. There will be great strides in normal intercity operations and in city-center to city-center air transport.

Automation will provide greater reliability at lower cost in many aspects of aviation. Advanced navigation equipment, all-weather landing systems, and better aircraft themselves are just a few illustrations of the benefits we can expect.

Automation will also mean more free time for larger numbers of people. The availability of safe, low-cost air transportation will broaden the choices available to the population in general and allow them to make more profitable and more enjoyable use of their leisure. Aviation will also make a wider range of products available in markets throughout the world at greatly reduced prices, improving the choices available to the individual in his role as a consumer. Just as the emerging nations will need expanded markets for their products, the developed countries will have to find markets for their greater productive capacity generated by automation.

If we are to solve the problems of the future and use our knowledge to improve the lot of mankind, we cannot approach them with what Kingman Brewster, the president of Yale, has characterized as "the needle-point mentality of a bond house lawyer." We must approach them boldly—with imagination—with enthusiasm—and with a deep and sincere feeling for the human values involved.

In more specific terms, we must consider the general economic environment in the United States and the population problem in terms of size, distribution, and the important sociological factors. Looking at the United States, we see a population of 226 million by 1975. The steady trend toward urbanization will continue and by 1975 over 75 percent of our people will live in urban areas. There will be 30 metropolitan areas with a population of 1 million or more. Many of these large metropolitan areas will gradually join to form megalopoli.

The gross national product will increase from $600 billion to well over $900 billion by 1975. Increased productivity will mean higher family incomes and a generally rising standard of living. Per capita disposable income is expected to increase by at least 30

percent and shorter workweeks and extended vacations will mean more leisure time for large segments of the population.

In the light of this, we must consider what the needs of air transportation will be in the decade ahead and what should be the role of the aviation's community in meeting these needs.

It is immediately obvious that an increased number of vehicles, diversified in type and in deployment, will be needed to solve our air transportation problem. The Nation must look first to its aviation industry to see that new technology is used in supplying vehicles matched to our changing requirements. The FAA must have a thorough understanding of the Nation's air transport problems in light of our total transportation system. In those cases where private industry alone is unwilling or unable to use the technology to produce the needed vehicles, the Government must be prepared to act—but only to the extent necessary to see that the Nation's requirements are met.

In speaking of vehicles, I refer to the entire spectrum, from SST's to V/STOL's and, I include both general aviation and the air carriers.

In our developing complex of urban communities, new air vehicles will not serve to provide effective air transportation without an appropriate system of airports. The FAA is developing a national plan for a system of airports to meet these future needs. The problem of access to these airports from the communities they service will depend on better solutions to urban ground transportation problems. It is an established fact that the technology of air transportation is far more advanced than the technology of other modes. While all of us in aviation should be proud of our progress, we can not afford to sit back and watch the effectiveness of our air transportation system being strangled by inadequate airport access.

We anticipate at least a 40-percent increase in flight activity by 1975. To support this increase in traffic with its new vehicles and its system of airports, we must have a National Airspace System to move the vehicles safely and efficiently.

As of today we have introduced only a small amount of automation into a system that remains basically manual. Now we are at the threshold of a major program to automate our air route traffic control centers. Before 1975, we expect to see automation not only of the entire en route system but also of all significant terminal areas. This will include automatic processing and distribution of flight plans, automatic radar and radar beacon tracking, the automatic association of these tracks with flight plans, and automatic coordination of flight information by the controllers within a facility and between facilities.

The aviation weather subsystem will be developed to a point where it can truly meet the needs of all aviation users and will be fully automated. Terminal area operations will benefit significantly from complete all-weather landing, and airport capacity will be increased through automated sequencing and control of each aircraft.

Through these applications, we can expect significant improvement in safety along with greater dependability in air transportation.

The future of our air transportation depends upon the combined efforts of all the aviation shareholders. I would like to discuss some aviation goals which can be achieved only by the support and impetus of the entire aviation community.

It is in the national interest to see the products of our entire aviation industry sold to the other nations of the world. But we are not interested in just selling hardware. Our responsibility as a world leader, our national prestige, and indeed our national security require us to promote the use of our concepts, techniques and procedures of managing an airspace and an airport system. While there has been some progress toward this goal in the past, I do not feel that the United States is as far along this path as our changing world requires.

In my opinion, our most important domestic goal is the establishment of a truly effective air transportation system. In terms that the traveling public can understand, this means the connection of any two population centers within the United States by a door-to-door travel time of not more than 8 hours. Obviously, such a system will require the dedicated efforts not only of the entire aviation community but also of those who are developing an integrated ground transportation system.

Finally, there is an overriding goal which must be uppermost in the minds of everyone. None of the accomplishments I have already discussed will be possible if they are not accompanied by improvements in air safety and, here, primary reliance must be on the aviation community itself. The greatest strides in aviation safety will always be the result of voluntary actions on the part of manufacturers, carriers, pilots and mechanics and airport operators. The Government's role must be one of guiding, assisting and monitoring. Only in the last analysis should it take direct enforcement actions. Only through an acceptance of this responsibility by all members of the aviation community will we be able to achieve and maintain the level of safety which the public has every right to expect from aviation.

It is important that we all understand where aviation is going in the future. But understanding alone is not enough. No one segment of the aviation community, neither in the Government nor in the private sector, has the resources, the capability or the authority to achieve these goals unaided. It is only through the combined and concerted efforts of all shareholders that our goals for air transportation will be realized in the decade ahead.

RECESS UNTIL 5 O'CLOCK THIS AFTERNOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 5 o'clock this afternoon.

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

(At 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess until 5 o'clock p.m. today.)

At 5 o'clock p.m., the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. AIKEN in the chair).

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR EDMONDSON, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with regret that we bid goodbye to Senator J. HOWARD EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, who joined our ranks less than a year ago. Senator EDMONDSON served as Oklahoma's youngest chief executive before coming to the Senate and was notably well prepared to fill the place left by his predecessor, the late Senator Robert Kerr. He has served admirably and with distinction.

Those who have served on the Agriculture and Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committees with Senator EDMONDSON can attest to his abilities and his insights. He has been one of the hardest working young Senators and has earned a special place in the hearts of his colleagues.

I wish him well. We know that his service to the people of Oklahoma and the United States is not over, but that he will continue to give of his great capacity with the same sincerity and dedication that has marked his career in public service since its inception in 1953.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

At 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m. the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m. the Senate reconvened and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MCINTYRE in the Chair).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the consideration of a number of nominations which have been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

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

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Eugene C. Patterson, of Georgia, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James F. Delaney, of Pennsylvania, to be a U.S. Marshal for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

BOARD OF PAROLE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charlotte Paul Groshell, of Washington, to be a member of the Board of Parole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jon O. Newman, of Connecticut, to be a U.S. Attorney for the District of Connecticut for the term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION IN BRAZIL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before the Senate adjourns sine die, I wish to make a few brief remarks on Brazil. I make them in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I make them also because at the beginning of the present regime in Brazil I expressed on the floor of the Senate some skeptical views as to whether or not the new administration in Brazil would follow constitutional processes. I said at the time that I hoped it would. I was critical of the fact that it exercised a power which, of course, would not be tolerated in the United States, namely, denying continuation in office of people freely elected to that office, even though the party in power might not be sympathetic with the views of those officeholders.

However, it is always a mistake for us to insist that exactly the same procedures of the democratic process must exist everywhere else in the world in order to have us view with approval the accomplishments of a given administration. I have watched the Brazilian situation very carefully, and I am satisfied that the Brazilian administration at the present time is characterized to a remarkable degree by democratic process in keeping with the constitutional powers granted to any administration in Brazil. It is also making an attempt to check the inflationary spiral in that country. The leaders of that Government, I am sure, would be the first to say that they still have a long way to go.

One of the first steps taken by the new Brazilian Government to cope with the deteriorating economic situation, which it inherited, was to reestablish negotiations with the major creditor governments of the country to obtain help in alleviating severe balance of payments difficulties. As a consequence of arrangements worked out with the creditors, Brazil obtained substantial foreign debt relief in 1964 and 1965 of approximately $300 million.

Of course, the United States and its taxpayers are foremost among the creditors to whom payment was postponed.

The growing Federal budget deficit was quickly identified as one of the prime causes of rapidly increasing inflation and the new Government has taken concrete measures to cut back sharply Federal expenditures and to increase revenues. As a consequence of these measures, in addition to eliminating costly import subsidies on wheat and petroleum, the government estimates that it will be able to reduce the 1964 budget deficit to approximately Cr$750 billion, compared to a deficit of roughly Cr$1.3 trillion which would have arisen under the budget inherited from the previous administration had the new Government not moved rapidly. The authorities are fully aware of the continued need to make further reductions in spending both during the current and coming years. In real terms, the budget deficits presently forecast for 1964 and 1965 are expected to be less than in 1963. Furthermore, the entire format of the budget is being recast along the lines employed in many other countries; this is expected to permit a clearer definition in future of the uses of available resources and in overall economic planning.

One of the primary goals of the Government is to attract greater foreign private investment and to that end legislation to amend the highly restrictive profits remittance law, which had resulted in a sharp decline in foreign investment since 1962, was submitted to the Congress. It was signed into law by the President on August 31, thereby removing one of the principal deterrents to foreign private investment. The new law has been generally welcomed by investors abroad.

During the past few years, Brazil has handicapped its exports by highly unrealistic, overvalued foreign exchange rates. On September 2, it was announced that the exchange rate would be permitted to fluctuate freely, which resulted in an immediate de facto devaluation which will have a significant effect in stimulating exports and increasing foreign exchange earnings.

During the brief period since the establishment of the Government, strenuous efforts have been directed toward the preparation of a comprehensive economic action program for 1964–66, to achieve the triple goals of stabilization, development and reform. A preliminary program has now been completed which envisages the acceleration of economic growth, social welfare, agrarian reform, correction of chronic budget deficits, creation of new jobs, gradual containment of inflation, encouragement of foreign investment and numerous other highly constructive measures, which represent real progress in the efforts of the authorities to come to grips with their extremely difficult economic and financial problems.

I cannot begin to express the extent of my high commendation for this program of domestic reform in Brazil.

As I have said before, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I at the Conference at Bogotá and later at the Punta del Este Conference, sought to point out to the delegates that the Alliance for Progress had no hope for success unless the Latin American countries had a cooperative program, rather than depending on a program of unilateral aid from the United States to Latin America.

At the recent Conference of the Organization of American States in Washington, D.C., I was greatly encouraged by the position taken by the Foreign Minister of Brazil, and the information I obtained from the Brazilian delegation, as to the great strides forward they are making in the whole field of economic reform in Brazil. I think it augurs very well for the future of Brazil.

In order to meet the existing housing shortage, a housing bill has been submitted to, and approved by, Congress. In essence, the bill establishes a National Housing Bank and provides for a mechanism to make available resources for low-cost housing construction.

I think they are well on their way to implementing the principles of a building and loan association approach, which, under the Alliance for Progress program, is going along with great, successful strides in such countries as Chile, Venezuela, Colombia, and Peru. We see great hopes for its development also in Bolivia. Now we have this additional evidence of the strides that are being made for the improvement of housing conditions in Brazil by making available to low-income people an opportunity to own the roofs over their heads through the program of a National Housing Bank to which I have just referred.

Brazil's independent and constructive posture in the field of international relations has recently been clearly manifested in international forums and was referred to by the President of Brazil in a foreign policy speech which he delivered to the graduating students of Brazil's foreign service school. He referred to the many common interests and ties between the United States and Brazil and to Brazil's commitment to the Western democratic system. He also spoke of free enterprise and the orderly encouragement of private capital, its tradition of inter-American solidarity, his confidence that our two nations "can join their economic and commercial interests on a plane of honorable policy and friendly reciprocity." His fundamental observation that interdependence is essential to the preservation of independence applies equally today to the United States or to any country which seeks to achieve for its citizens a free and prosperous way of life.

I highly commend the Government of Brazil for the progress it has been making on the several fronts I have mentioned in this brief speech, but we should keep in mind the fact that we have obligations to perform, too, if we are to maintain good faith as a partner in implementing the Alliance for Progress program.

It is a matter of great disappointment to me that the Congress has not faced the importance of seeing that the coffee agreement was approved before adjournment. We must face the fact that some of our Latin American allies are dependent for economic stability in large

measure upon the exportation of one or two commodities. Those are so-called raw material commodities. They are not manufactured goods.

It pains me to listen to Members of Congress seek to take political advantage of our neighbors to the south of us by opposing a coffee agreement which we solemnly entered into, which we urged others to enter into, for the purpose of stabilizing the price of coffee.

Unless one or two or three commodity products of our Latin American allies can be stabilized, so far as export prices are concerned, we are only wasting our money in foreign aid to Latin America. We can pour millions of dollars into Latin America through the Alliance for Progress program, and by a few cents' change in the price structure of some commodity on which the economy of a country is largely dependent, as in the case of Brazil, whose economy is in large measure dependent upon the export price of coffee, we shall have wasted the taxpayers' money made available under the Alliance for Progress program.

Through the coffee agreement, we were seeking to stabilize the price of coffee, to at least build a floor under which the price of coffee could not go. Such stabilization is necessary for the economic stability of a country such as Brazil, and some 14 other Latin American countries whose economies are dependent in no small part upon coffee prices.

It pains me to hear politicians in our country wring their hands over a possible increase of a few cents a pound in the price of coffee and make their plea to the housewives of America. That may be good vote-getting technique, but let me say, quite frankly, that the housewives of America have some responsibility of citizen statesmanship in these troublous times.

Although it does not follow that the coffee agreement would result in a substantial increase in the price of coffee in this country, I am perfectly willing to say on the floor that I would not be greatly concerned if it resulted in a slight increase in the cost of coffee of 2 or 3 or 4 cents a pound. That is not going to break the housewives of America. Most of those wives pay more than that increase for lipstick. Important as that is, they buy a good many items on which they might save. That is true—and I submit it is true—if the stabilization of so-called raw material production would, in the long run, mean hundreds of millions of dollars to the economy of the United States.

Certainly, I prefer it to the continual advance of money we are sending to Brazil under foreign aid, even as we reschedule old debt she cannot repay.

Do not forget that this country exports a great deal to Latin America. Do not forget that we export finished products, manufactured goods. Do not forget that the prices of American goods shipped into Latin America during the past 10 years have increased manifold over the increase in the price of any natural raw material product Latin America ships into the United States.

When we attend international conferences in Latin America, that fact is made very clear to us, and right into our teeth. It is pointed out that we are in no position to be complaining about whatever increase in price a stabilization program such as represented by the coffee agreement might result in, in connection with their raw materials. Do not forget that we are the beneficiaries of the increased prices of finished products that the United States ships into Latin America. We cannot have it both ways and maintain friendly relations with Latin America.

It has been very interesting to hear some concern expressed today as to whether or not some Latin American countries will turn, to a greater degree, to trade with France. Those comments have been made in connection with General de Gaulle's visit to Latin America. It can be put down for a certainty that that is where they are going to turn if we continue to exploit their raw materials by insisting that they come into this country at prices so low that the results will be to cause depressions and unemployment and low income for their people.

For some years on the floor of the Senate the senior Senator from Oregon has supported what is a very unpopular cause, but we will come to it. It is only a matter of time. Eventually, if we are to maintain trade relations with Latin America, we shall have to develop a common market, or else we shall lose Latin America, and Latin America will turn toward Europe.

I hope that in the next session of Congress we shall come to grips with the type of economic problem that is raised by such proposals as the coffee agreement. That is not the only agreement we ought to be working out to stabilize prices. We shall not be able to go into international conferences through the Organization of American States and expect to receive the good will of Latin American countries, as we seek to solve mutual problems, if we continue to supply the evidence that they are accumulating of a policy that is, in fact, economic discrimination against Latin America.

I hope we shall take advantage of the present favorable climate which exists between the United States and Latin American countries, created in no small measure by two past great Presidents of the United States. Franklin D. Roosevelt inaugurated his good-neighbor policy. Many of the points that I made this afternoon were embodied in the good-neighbor policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He recognized that we must work out a broad understanding with our Latin American friends in connection with the raw material goods that we buy from Latin America at low prices when we expect them to buy our manufactured goods at high prices. We shall not be able to work that game much longer and have economic allies to the south of us.

The late beloved Jack Kennedy envisioned and promulgated the Alliance for Progress program. That program is based not only on cooperation, and not only on a program of self-help, which Senator HICKENLOOPER and I proposed to our Latin American allies at the Bogotá Conference, when we pointed out to them in that Conference that there could be congressional support for the development of a mutual program of economic reciprocity provided they would be cooperating partners engaged in self help, and expressed it further at Punta del Este. President Kennedy, in promulgating his Alliance for Progress program, also made it clear that a principle of mutuality and reciprocity was involved in the matter of developing trade relations between the United States and Latin America.

I know the powerful lobbies that exist whenever an attempt is made to seek to arrive at a trade agreement with Latin America that will make it possible for those countries to develop a system of economic self-reliance, or to develop a system of economic security. The United States will have to be willing to pay more for the raw materials that we import from Latin America.

I note that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has just entered the Chamber. I should like to close my comments on the economic problems with regard to Latin America by pointing out that his program, which he and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] have been pressing on the Senate for the past 2 years, and of which I have been in support, is designed to strengthen the economy of Latin America. We must encourage the Latin Americans and welcome, by way of cooperative effort, American investment in their economic resources—the development of the technology, and technical know-how, so that they can manufacture a substantial amount of the goods they must export in trade, so they can develop some of their own raw materials into manufactured goods. That will not result in the loss of jobs in the United States.

As the Senator from New York and the Senator from Minnesota pointed out time and time again, it will create a healthy economic climate in Latin America. A healthy economic climate there will create a demand for goods, because in that way there will be built up purchasing power, and that purchasing power will create a market for our own goods far in excess of anything that most people have imagined thus far.

That is another reason why Senators have heard the senior Senator from Oregon urge favorable consideration of a Common Market approach to the economic relations between the United States and Latin America.

Before Congress adjourns, I wished to speak these words of commendation to the present administration in Brazil, so far as its economic effort is concerned, and to wish it well, and to express the hope that my own country, come January, will be more cooperative than it has been to date in respect to a coffee agreement.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have listened with great interest to the Senator from Oregon. I have heard him before on this subject. It is interesting and exciting to me that the Senator, who has a very interesting and sympathetic relationship to the great Senators who have served in this Chamber, and who has a real sense of identification with those who fought against predatory interests, to the point that it is almost a Populist tradition which the Senator carries in his character, especially coming from where he does, and a person like myself, who has had big business experience, who has a certain sense of the industrial processes, the banking processes, and the credit processes, and knows how they work, and who sees how the fundamental thrust of business in the public interest as the hope of mankind can best be realized through the stock corporation, and multiple ownership, which it makes possible. We have come almost unconsciously to that kind of consensus. This is to me one of the exciting aspects of my service in the Senate. I wanted the Senator from Oregon to know how good I felt about it.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate very much the position the Senator has taken. It has been unanswerable. We cannot fly in in the face of facts. The Senator from New York has presented to this body time and time again economic facts that confront us with regard to our problems in Latin America that we cannot run away from. Some of our colleagues have tried to run away from them, because they are taking a provincial attitude.

If we are to beat communism in Latin America—and the battle is nip and tuck—we must build up institutions of economic freedom. Those institutions are related to individuals. Without individuals, it is worthless. We must do what we can, through the type of program the Senator from New York and the Senator from Minnesota have been emphasizing, to help Latin America set up what I am perfectly willing to call a system of private enterprise in Latin America. I keep referring to it as a system of economic freedom. That is what private enterprise is.

Unless people first can be economically free, they can never be politically free. So long as we permit a situation in Latin America that maintains millions of people in economic serfdom, we have victimized them with the danger of communism. That is why I am protesting on this little segment today. I am protesting the failure on our part to end this session with the coffee agreement an accomplished fact. I am protesting our failure to implement to a greater degree than we have this feature of the Alliance for Progress program.

My colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Relations know that they could have had an enthusiastic ally if they had cut out the millions of dollars of waste in military aid in the foreign aid bill and placed those millions of dollars in economic aid, for investment in specific projects that would have helped the masses of people living in the economic environment of those projects. I was willing at one point in the foreign aid discussions in the Committee on Foreign Relations to agree to have every dollar that was cut from military aid added to economic aid. Much of the military aid that is being given is worthless, so far as bringing freedom to the people of Latin America is concerned. The sad part is that so much of our military aid reduces the amount of freedom because it builds up a powerful military oligarchy that has no interest in democratic processes or in economic freedom.

So long as I serve in this body, I shall continue to try to carry out what I know were the objectives of President Kennedy in regard to the Alliance for Progress program, because that program came out of our subcommittee when Jack Kennedy of Massachusetts was a member of the committee. The recommendations from the experts with whom we entered into contracts to do that research are the recommendations that John Kennedy adopted when he went into the White House. That is where the whole program came from. I shall continue to keep faith with that program.

THE MALLORY RULE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "The Mallory Rule: Myth and Reality," written by Alan Barth, and published in the Washington Post of September 22, 1964, and also the excellent testimony on this subject by Mr. Sidney Zagri, which was submitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

THE MALLORY RULE: MYTH AND REALITY

(By Alan Barth)

The Mallory rule is up for flagellation again—this time in the political arena. Observing that "the Nation's Capital is being consumed by crime," and ascribing this situation to "obsessive concern for the rights of the criminal defendant," Senator BARRY GOLDWATER defined the Mallory rule a week ago as holding "that any statement made by a defendant to police officers is inadmissible if arraignment is delayed."

It would be hard to compress more misconception and misinformation into any assertion of comparable length but District Police Chief Robert Murray promptly showed that it could be done. The Mallory rule, he said, commenting on the Senator's speech, has had "a great deal to do" with the rise in the crime rate here.

The Mallory rule does not forbid the use of statements made to police officers prior to arrest; it does not forbid the use of so-called "threshold" statements made to police officers immediately after arrest; it does not forbid the use of statements made to police officers after arraignment. It excludes from Federal courts only confessions obtained by the police during an unlawful detention of a defendant, or statements derived from such confessions.

As for Chief Murray's contention, the Mallory rule may conceivably affect prosecution of defendants but it cannot reasonably be said to affect the crime rate. U.S. Attorney David Acheson pointed out that crime has increased in the Maryland and Virginia suburbs, where the Mallory rule is not operative, at about the same rate as in the District.

The history and purpose of the Mallory rule deserve to be recalled as an aid to understanding it. After the famous Wickersham Commission report on "Lawlessness in Law Enforcement" was issued in 1931—it revealed that brutal third-degree methods were used to elicit statements from suspects held in police stations all over the land—virtually every State in the Union, Arizona included, enacted laws requiring that arrested persons should be brought promptly before a judicial officer who would determine whether they should be detained. Congress enacted just such a law to govern Federal officers.

In 1943, the Supreme Court, in the McNabb case, upset the conviction of three Tennessee moonshiners convicted of killing a Federal revenue officer—because the conviction was based on a confession obtained through violation of this law. The Court noted that the law was intended to check "resort to those reprehensible practices known as the 'third degree.'"

Following the McNabb decision, the Supreme Court appointed an advisory committee of distinguished lawyers which deliberated on the problems involved in arrests and confessions and drafted the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. These were promulgated by the Supreme Court in 1946 and were expressly approved by Congress in 1948 when it reenacted title 18 of the United States Code into law.

Among these was rule 5(a) providing that "an officer making an arrest * * * shall take the arrested person without unnecessary delay before the nearest available commissioner or before any other nearby officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States."

In 1957, the Supreme Court applied rule 5(a) in the case of Andrew Mallory, convicted of rape on the basis of a confession obtained after prolonged detention in a police station—and without ever being told of his right to counsel or to a preliminary examination before a magistrate or his right to remain silent. The Court unanimously decided that the confession was inadmissible because it resulted from police lawlessness—from flagrant defiance of an act of Congress.

It seems plain from this that the rule requiring the police to take an arrested person promptly before a judge or a commissioner is a rule framed by Congress, while the Mallory rule or the McNabb rule (they are the same thing) is simply a judicial device for enforcing the rule which Congress enacted into law.

Moreover, taken together they protect some pretty basic constitutional rights. They protect the right to be free from arbitrary arrest; they protect the right to the assistance of counsel; they protect the right to refrain from self-incrimination; they protect the right to be released on bail pending trial; they protect the right of habeas corpus. And they provide protection against the evil they were designed to correct—the evil of third degree tactics by overzealous policemen.

STATEMENT OF SIDNEY ZAGRI, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL, INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS

The CHAIRMAN. Good morning, Mr. Zagri.

Mr. ZAGRI. Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate District Committee, although I am appearing specifically on title I and title III, of H.R. 7525, as well as on H.R. 5726, I would not like to have this opportunity escape me to say that the testimony by the preceding witness, Mr. Bennett, Director of the Bureau of Prisons, his comments on the meat-ax approach of this bill, its drastic approach in

finding solutions to crime, illustrates the approach of the bill in title I and title III as well.

And we are here specifically in opposition to H.R. 7525, particularly title I and title III, as well as H.R. 5726, which has been offered by U.S. Attorney Acheson and Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach as a compromise solution.

I note in today's paper that the committee is thinking in terms of a compromise solution on the Mallory rule. I trust it has not reached that because I am going to direct much of my testimony here this morning to point out that this so-called compromise——

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has reached no determination on this bill. They have not met in executive session and there will be no determination until they have met in executive session.

The indication was where there were possible avenues of working this out.

Mr. ZAGRI. Because let me say that there can be no compromise with the techniques of the police state or with the essentials of personal liberty. There can be no compromise with "secret investigative" arrests, whether they be by Castro's secret police, the Soviet Committee for State Security, or by the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia.

There can be no compromise with fundamental constitutional guarantees. H.R. 7525 openly flouts the Constitution; whereas, H.R. 5726 hems and haws, advances and retreats between constitutional safeguards and arbitrary police action. What it gives with one hand, it takes away with another.

H.R. 5726: I consider H.R. 5726 the more dangerous of the two bills because it is the more plausible. It appears to afford constitutional safeguards without assuring them. It is an attempt to reconcile "the exigencies of criminal prosecution with the imperatives of constitutional liberty." In reality, it ends in whittling away dangerously at vital constitutional safeguards.

Its principal proponents—such as Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach—start out with the major premise that the Mallory rule is a good one—but not for the District of Columbia.

In defense of the Mallory rule, he states:

"The district court made clear its intention to prevent law enforcement officers from delaying hearings for the purpose of eliciting confessions. This is as it should be."

He then states:

"The problem which gives rise to the legislative proposal before the committee not with the Mallory rule but with its application in the District of Columbia."

He makes the rather remarkable proposal that Federal rule 5(a), requiring preliminary hearing without unnecessary delay, which is effective in all of the courts of the 10 judicial districts of the Federal court system, and with all the States having similar enactments, be repealed in its application in the District of Columbia.

Rule 5(a) is aimed at preserving constitutional rights and, in particular, procedural due process of law. It provides for the treatment of accused persons on an equal basis—the innocent as well as the guilty. It offers protection to the impoverished, uneducated, or youthful suspect. The hardened, well-heeled criminal does not need a city magistrate to advise him of his rights.

He knows those rights. He has highly paid attorneys to advise him in advance.

On what basis can he justify that the lowly, the illiterate, the impoverished of the District of Columbia be detained by the police up to 6 hours without probable cause to believe that the accused has committed a crime, and afford the right of prompt arraignment in all other jurisdictions?

Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach seeks to justify a double standard of constitutional safeguards on the basis that—

"Only in the District of Columbia do the Federal courts have broad jurisdiction over crimes of violence which characteristically lack eyewitnesses and independent evidence."

By contrast, he points out—

"Most Federal criminal cases in other jurisdictions involve frauds, mail thefts, narcotic violations and the like, where there is substantial evidence apart from a confession; i.e., controlled property, financial records, tax returns, et cetera."

He then concludes that—

"It is reasonable to consider the problems in the District of Columbia as being rather unique with respect to the Mallory rule and deserving of congressional consideration in legislation limited in its application to the District of Columbia."

While it may be true that such a distinction may exist between the District of Columbia and other Federal jurisdictions, it is not true with reference to the State jurisdictions where the Mallory rule has been applied. As recently as last week, in *People* v. *Donovan*, 326 W 2A1, the court of appeals in the State of New York, where crimes of violence are as great as in the District of Columbia, applied the Mallory rule.

And I quote from that citation:

"Quite apart from the due process clause of the 14th amendment. New York's constitutional statutory provisions, pertaining to the privilege of self-incrimination and the right to counsel, not to mention the State's guarantee of due process, require its exclusion."

In this case the court excluded a confession solely on the grounds that it was taken during a period of unnecessary delay prior to arraignment. And I think that it is especially significant at this time that a State like New York, which includes, of course, New York City where crimes of violence are certainly as many in number or probably much higher in number, and almost as great in frequency, as they are in the District of Columbia, that the New York Court of Appeals applied the Mallory rule.

The Supreme Court has enforced the Mallory-McNabb rule in the States under the 14th amendment.

The rule in the Mallory case is in full force and effect in the city of Buffalo, N.Y. This is in accordance with section 165 of New York State Code of Criminal Procedures, which provides:

"The defendant must in all cases be taken before the magistrate without unnecessary delay and he may be given bail at any time of the day or night."

An examination of crime statistics of cities with half a million to 1 million persons establishes Washington, D.C., as No. 1 in two major crime categories of violence, and Buffalo, N.Y., is recorded as 16th in these same two crime categories. A check with Lieutenant Phelps of the Buffalo police force indicates that:

"We do not arrest a man unless we are ready and prepared to go to court."

The Mallory rule did not impede effective police practices in Buffalo. Operating under the New York State Code, the police are required to use brains rather than brawn.

In Great Britain the suspect cannot be questioned, with the exception of clearing up ambiguities, once he is placed under arrest. Yet we find according to the criminal statistics of England and Wales in 1962, an unusually high percentage of crime solutions, particularly in acts of violence without the aid of the confession. Although crime is on the upgrade in England, felonies increasing from 283,220 in 1938 to 896,424 in 1962, we find that in 1962, there were 37,958 offenses charging acts of violence with 32,027 cases cleared during the same year.

It is clear from these figures that adherence to a strict code of police behavior is not a handicap to police efficiency. On the other hand, slack and unimaginative police work cannot occur where recourse to extra legal action is not available in the solution of crime.

It should be pointed out that the Mallory rule does not prohibit questioning of a suspect. It simply requires arraignment without unnecessary delay.

The crucial period during which mental or physical coercion may be applied is between the time of detention and arraignment. The investigation into lawless enforcement of law conducted by the Wickersham Commission showed that out of 106 cases reported between 1920 and 1930 in appellate courts where use of the third degree was charged, there were only 7 cases where the prisoner declared that the third degree was used after he had been brought before a city magistrate.

Coercion itself is always hard to prove because the questioning takes place in secret. It is true that H.R. 5726 provides that—

"Such questioning and the warning and advice required by subsections (a) and (b) of this section were, whenever reasonably possible, witnessed by a responsible person who is not a law enforcement officer or transcribed verbatim or recorded by a wire, tape, or other sound recording or conducted subject to other comparable means of verification."

This provision simply provides for verification of the accuracy of the warnings and advice with reference to self-incrimination, also to notify a relative or friend and consult with counsel. This does not provide for verification of the actual questioning, and it is well established that mere questioning, in and of itself, can be coercive under certain circumstances.

Section 3 of H.R. 5726 establishes a 6-hour period for detention between the time of arrest and completion of the confession, statement, or admission. Could not this result in establishing the norm for investigative arrests?

Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach conceded this as a possibility in his questioning by Senator DOMINICK in his appearance before this committee yesterday. This establishes an arbitrary standard in which questioning which, in fact, was coercive could take place and confessions so acquired would be admissible. Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach seeks to justify the 6-hour rule on the basis that recent decisions of the District Court of Appeals have reversed convictions based upon confessions given 2 or 3 hours after arrest. He states:

"Thus 'without unnecessary delay' has come to mean 'without any delay.'"

On cross-examination, Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach, concedes that while confessions were obtained within 2 or 3 hours or less after arrest, arraignment in some instances did not take place until the following day. The Mallory rule simply requires the court to find that under a particular set of circumstances, delay was unnecessary. It may be that in each of the instances cited by Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach, the court had good reason to find that the delay was unnecessary. It does not follow that because a confession was obtained within a short time after arrest, that the surrounding circumstances did not indicate the existence of unnecessary delay.

The 6-hour detention period repeals the present rule banning investigative arrest in the District of Columbia, which was enacted by the Commissioners as a result of the Horsky report, which found that there had been great abuse of police authority in arresting individuals on grounds of suspicion. There is no law called suspicion.

Under the fourth amendment, the person may not be arrested unless there is probable cause before the arrest may be made. This probable cause may not be ascertained by an unnecessary delay through the media of the secret investigative arrest. The fact that there is a 6-hour limitation on the investigative arrest does not make it less a violation of a fourth amendment right.

Despite all the constitutional window dressing of section 3, the fact remains that the suspect is informed of his rights against self-incrimination, right to counsel, right to remain mute—not by a magistrate, not by a commissioner, but by the police. This bill substitutes the zealousness of police action for time-honored checks on the police through judicial machinery.

The legislative policy behind the requirement that an officer making an arrest take the arrested person without unnecessary delay before the nearest available commissioner is spelled out by the U.S. Supreme Court in *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U.S. 332, 343, 344, p. 1582):

"The purpose of this impressively pervasive requirement of criminal procedure is plain. * * * The awful instruments of the criminal law cannot be entrusted to a single functionary. The complicated process of criminal justice is therefore divided into different parts, responsibility for which is separately vested in the various participants upon whom the criminal law relies for its vindication."

I wish to point out that the Katzenbach proposal does not divide this function. He vested all in the police authorities.

"Legislation such as this, requiring that the police must with reasonable promptness show legal cause for detaining arrested persons, constitutes an important safeguard—not only in assuring protection for the innocent but also in securing conviction of the guilty by methods that commend themselves to a progressive and self-confident society. For this procedural requirement checks resort to those reprehensible practices known as the third degree which, though universally rejected as indefensible, still find their way (354 U.S. 453) into use. It aims to avoid all the evil implications of secret intorrogation of persons accused of crime."

I must agree with the Washington Post editorial:

"It is a sound principle of law that arrested persons should be taken before a judicial officer without unnecessary delay, that they should be advised of their rights by a judicial officer and that they should be subject to detention only upon the authorization of a judicial officer. The only effective way we can think of to make the police observe this principle of law is to forbid the use of any evidence, including confessions, obtained in violation of it."

I must agree with Senator MORSE's evaluation of this bill:

"The Acheson bill is a most unacceptable compromise. When one concludes the reading of the Acheson bill he discovers he has nothing but a meaningless hodgepodge left."

I must agree with the overwhelming majority of the 900-odd lawyers of the District bar who voted against all three bills (including the Acheson bill) aimed at a revision of the Mallory rule and permitting easy interrogation of suspects by policemen.

H.R. 7525, title I: Repeals the McNabb-Mallory rule and nullifies section 5(a) of the Federal rules. While the Mallory rule is an exclusionary rule of evidence, its repeal will interfere with certain basic constitutional safeguards. It opens the door for prolonged detention for an unlimited period of time. Imprisonment incommunicado interferes with the right of habeas corpus, which is guaranteed by article I, section 9, of the Constitution itself. If the prisoner's family or friends or lawyers knew where he was, they could at once obtain habeas corpus and compel the immediate production of the prisoner before a magistrate.

No expediency would supersede the rule of immediacy—no court would permit custody without committal to be continued an instant because of the desirability of interrogation or the inadvisability of warning confederates. The suspension of habeas corpus by policemen should be condemned.

Unlawful detention takes away the right to bail guaranteed by the eighth amendment of the Constitution to insure personal freedom. Even after a lawful arrest only a magistrate can grant a person bail. Those who keep him from the magistrate are denying him the right to bail.

Unlawful and secret detention deprives the accused to have the assistance of counsel for his defense; which is guaranteed by the sixth amendment. The Supreme Court through Justice Sutherland and Justice Black has declared that a person requires the guiding hand of counsel in every step in the proceeding against him.

The constitutional right to counsel commences from the moment of the arrest of the prisoner to assist him in securing his discharge if the evidence is insufficient, to advise him about his statement during preliminary examination before the magistrate, to arrange his bail, and to protect him from abuses during confinement.

Finally, unlawful detention tends to impair the right of the accused under the fifth amendment not to be "compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." This does not preclude proper questioning, but it is obvious that the line between proper and improper questions may easily be passed. Nothing but the conscience of the police officer can protect a prisoner from milder or drastic forms of the third degree so long as he is in their uncontrolled custody removed from systematic prison regulations and isolated from the outside world.

Title III: Title III seeks to accomplish indirectly what title I would do directly. It is, to quote the minority report of the House District Committee, "a legislative sheep in wolf's clothing."

Although it is extensively designed to detain a material witness, it does not provide that the material witness be in connection with a pending case. The Federal rules already provide for the detention of material witnesses under those circumstances. Actually under this title, any investigative arrest or any confession obtained could be used for the purpose of obtaining an arrest of a person detained.

The proponents of title I will do more than to "qualify and amend" the Supreme Court's decision in *Mallory* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 449); it will, in fact, overrule many court decisions and a long well-established judiciary policy of protecting persons against unlawful arrest and secret prolonged interrogation.

It has been argued that the Mallory rule hampers effective law enforcement in that it is often difficult to show "probable cause" unless and until a confession has been secured. I have already pointed out that efficient police work does not depend upon obtaining confessions by unlawful detention, in fact the contrary is true.

Reliance upon extra-legal methods for obtaining evidence results in sloppy police work; it results in disrespect for law because of the use of unlawful means by law enforcement officers.

Earlier in our discussion, I referred to Buffalo as an example of the best behaved city in America where the Mallory rule was enforced.

I suggest that there is a more basic reason for the crime rates in the two cities; this is, Buffalo and Washington.

Let us compare the situation of a man, able bodied, unemployed, and penniless with a family to support in Washington and in Buffalo. I do not suggest the gentleman has two families to support. I ask you to envisage him in the same family situation in Washington or in Buffalo. In Washington, he could not be given relief, desperately though he, his wife, and his children may need it. In Buffalo he would be entitled to relief. This relief would be supplied, in part, by Federal matching funds under the aid-to-dependent-children law, as amended in 1961. If he were a single able-bodied man in Buffalo he would get relief from the city general assistance fund. In Washington, he would get no relief.

The exclusion of a man from relief because he is able bodied, when he has a family to support and cannot find work, is inhuman. It arouses in the man desperation, bitterness, and enormous envy. This is a tough society in which to be poor. The bitterness of the dispossessed is reflected in the crime statistics of this city and in the type of crime committed.

Washington is the highest city in the Nation in incidence of aggravated assault and second to highest in the incidence of robbery. Out of 16 cities, Buffalo is 15th in the incidence of both aggravated assault and robbery.

What is a penniless father of a family to do in Washington when his children cry for food or for more warmth on a winter's night? For many of us of low skills there is no work and no prospect of work. He must either beg or he must steal. Until we, too, have been faced with that choice I do not think we should feel sure of what we would do.

In Buffalo, the same man has an additional choice. He can apply for relief. It is better than begging or stealing.

I criticized the Murray thesis for simplicity. Am I opening myself to the same criticism here? My argument is a simple one. Many crimes in Washington are committed, on impulses, by desperately poor men denied help by the society which has rejected them as wage earners.

I am not suggesting that this is the only or even the major cause of crime in this city. What I do suggest is that it is one of the major causes. I believe there is a positive correlation between the humane welfare regulations of the city of Buffalo and the low crime rate there.

Scrupulous police work and a human approach to welfare problems spells Buffalo, America's best behaved big city.

A police force encouraged openly by its chief to demand extra-legal rights in "fighting" crime and an inhuman welfare program directed by Members of the Congress who oppose advance in the area of civil rights spells Washington, D.C., where one's chances of being assaulted and robbed are higher than anywhere else in the Nation.

May I urge upon members of this committee to call upon their colleagues on the full Senate Appropriations Committee this week to replace the aid-to-dependent-children program in the new District of Columbia budget. Let us give it a try for 1 year. Let us see what demoralizing results will flow from helping a poor unemployed and able-bodied man to feed his wife and little ones. Let us see what effect this innovation might have upon the crime rate.

CONCLUSION

It should be noted that the Ford Foundation has made a grant of $215,000 to the American Law Institute for the purpose of conducting an objective study of the rule

in the Mallory case and related problems raised by that case.

I completely agree with Senator WAYNE MORSE that the Congress should put off making any decision in this matter until the American Law Institute has completed its study.

In the meantime, let us not be stampeded into any drastic departure eliminating basic constitutional safeguards. Let us remember that the basic separation of functions does not permit the police to pass judgment on the validity of their own arrests. Let us face up to the problem of the increasing crime rate in the District by improving the efficiency of the police, increasing the size of the force, raising the minimum educational standards and training program.

For example, the Buffalo Police Department requires high school graduates; the District police have many school dropouts on the force.

And, finally, let us remember the problem of crime in the District is far too complex to find solutions through any single panacea. Remember that the concentration of crime here is in the central city which economy is a disaster area. The average unemployment rate in this area, calculated from 1960 census figures, is 10.4 percent of the male work force.

And this figure does not really tell the full story because we find that when the average national unemployment is around 6 percent, that the Negro unemployment in the country borders nearly 20 percent.

They are the first to be laid off and the last to be returned to work.

Let us remember the warning of Judge Lehman, New York Court of Appeals in the Doran case.

"Suggestions that courts should not hamper police by restricting them to the use of lawful methods seem to many of our citizens in accord with commonsense. Our boasted guarantees of liberty—it would seem—are so precious that they must be kept for special occasions and not be subjected to the wear and tear of daily use. Not so may the court treat these guarantees. In a court of law no argument of expediency can ever justify a lawless invasion of a legal right."

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Zagri. I appreciate your views.

You made constant reference to Buffalo. Approximately how large a city is Buffalo?

Mr. ZAGRI. It is over 500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any knowledge as to the size of its police force? Do you know how many police they have there?

Mr. ZAGRI. I can get that information for you.

(The information referred to follows:)

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOUSEMEN & HELPERS OF AMERICA,

Detroit, Mich., December 16, 1963.

In re H.R. 7525, H.R. 5726.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,

Chairman, U.S. Senate, Committee on the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: When I testified before the Senate District Committee on November 6, 1963, on the subject of the Mallory rule, I was asked to supply figures for the populations and police strengths of Buffalo and the District of Columbia.

The figures are appended below.

	District of Columbia	*Buffalo*
Population (1960)	763,956	532,759
Present police strength	2,920	1,346

This means there is a policeman for each 261 persons in the District of Columbia and 1 for each 395 persons in Buffalo. Yet it is the District of Columbia police who call for additional police powers.

If I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Cordially yours,

SIDNEY ZAGRI,
Legislative Counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it would be helpful to furnish it for the record because it apparently is a city of somewhat comparable size.

It is a little smaller, but it is not surrounded by as large a metropolitan area as we have, but comparisons of that kind, I think, are very helpful.

The Senator from New Hampshire?

Senator MCINTYRE. I just want to compliment Mr. Zagri for a very fine statement and to assure him that the views that he has expressed here will be given every consideration by this committee.

Mr. ZAGRI. Thank you.

Senator MCINTYRE. In view of the time situation here, I do not think I will ask any questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Zagri. We certainly appreciate your coming here this morning.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is the best article, the best analysis in language understandable by laymen, that I have yet read on the Mallory rule. I have placed it in the RECORD because I want it to be easily available to people who are raising questions about the Mallory rule.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a speech I made last Monday at the National Convention of City Attorneys, held in Portland, Oreg., in the course of which I discussed the Mallory rule and answered some of the arguments that are being made by the Republican candidate for President in connection with his so-called crime program.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MUNICIPAL LAW OFFICERS, PORTLAND, OREG., SEPTEMBER 28, 1964

There are few men in contemporary America who have contributed more to the application of legal principles than has your general counsel and my long-time friend, Charles Rhyne. Over the decades he has, probably more than any other representative of the legal profession, stood for the practice, and not just the theory, of the rule of law in human affairs.

It is unfortunately easy to forget that our devotion to a system of government of laws rather than government by men is sometimes characterized by lipservice and not by practice. The U.S. Senate has just concluded a long wrangle over just such an issue.

The substantive question was that of the reapportionment decisions of the Federal courts. I need not describe to you the controversy that these decisions have aroused, not only in the some 30 States where the apportionment of legislatures is under challenge in the Federal courts, but everywhere in the country.

In State after State, legislatures have for decades violated their own constitutions by failing to keep their legislative apportionment in line with their own constitutions. This was true in Oregon from the turn of the century until 1952, when the people of this State finally took matters into their own hands and reapportioned the legislature directly, by their own hand, through the use of the initiative.

But in States where the initiative is not available to the general public the disproportionate voice of rural and small town districts was causing the State government to lose contact with a growing bulk of its people. In Oklahoma, for example, which is one of the States now holding elections to its legislature under court order, its own State supreme court found 20 years ago that the legislature was in violation of the districting provisions of the Oklahoma constitution. But it did not believe there was any judicial remedy. So the rule of law became an exercise in lipservice. The rule of law in the composition of these State legislatures disappeared. In State after State, as districting requirements were ignored by session after session of the legislatures, we had a government of men and not of laws.

The real contribution of the Supreme Court in these cases was not so much the finding that the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment requires representation according to population, but the finding that there was indeed a judicial remedy for malapportionment.

Under guidelines laid down by the Supreme Court, the Federal district courts have been directing the responsible State agencies to formulate redistricting plans, and where no plans have been forthcoming, the courts have formulated their own plans. They have begun ordering special elections to carry out these new apportionments. Despite all the political howling heard across the land in recent months, these elections are proceeding with remarkable public acceptance and equanimity. It is not the public weal that is disrupted, so much as it is the political organizations that were based on an illegal control of the legislatures that are disrupted.

No matter what the Federal courts do in this matter, it will always be possible for the American people to exempt the State legislatures from the 14th amendment, if that is their desire. The people may reach the conclusion that area rather than population representation is desirable at the State level, and they may change their Federal Constitution to so provide. But I am certain that whatever are the constitutional requirements for apportionment, never again will State legislatures be allowed to flout those requirements for lack of a judicial remedy.

The rule of law, and not of men, has been extended to State legislatures. The right of people to be protected equally by the laws and constitutions of their States has been made a reality, and not a theory only. A majority of the U.S. Senate felt it had to throw a sop to the political machines by passing its own judgment on how the cases should be handled.

It did so despite the lack of any legal right whatever to advise the courts on the handling of certain cases. There was no rule of law in the Senate last Thursday when it extended its extra-legal, gratuitous opinion to the courts on how equity should be defined in reapportionment cases.

The Congress does have the constitutional power to enforce the 14th amendment. I hope that some day the Congress will remove the blot of this illegal resolution by adopting legislation that will set forth a statutory procedure for reapportionment in line with the 14th amendment.

Insofar as the apportionment issue alone is concerned, I believe that the court orders are the best thing that has happened to our States in a long time. I need not tell municipal officials that many of your problems have been brought to Washington for attention and solution because it has been impossible to have them adequately considered and solved at the State level. If there has been any so-called invasion of States rights by the Federal Government, it has not been so much an invasion as it has been the filling of a vacuum.

The needs of the American people are going to be met, and if they are not met at the State or local level, they will be met at the Federal level. These domestic problems are increasingly those that relate to urbanization and suburbanization.

From my 10 years of service on the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, I have achieved some familiarity with those problems. The District of Columbia is typical of many large cities in that it is losing population to outlying areas, yet those outlying "bedroom" counties are in two different States, Maryland and Virginia. Metropolitan Washington therefore consists of two State jurisdictions, one Federal jurisdiction, and a great variety of subdivisions within those jurisdictions.

It is probably inevitable that the municipal problems of the District come in for political treatment at campaign time. Currently we are hearing about crime in the Nation's Capital, for which the Johnson administration and the U.S. Supreme Court are made to sound personally responsible. But for many years past, any time a street crime occurs in the District that involves a tourist, or an employee of a Member of Congress, the news has been treated as national news rather than as local news.

I do not dispute this practice, but I do not think it has really been developed far enough. The crime that is under discussion in this year's election campaign is not the organized rackets that have existed for decades in city after city in this country, but almost entirely street crime. And it is a rising rate of street crime that is plaguing virtually all urban communities of the country.

You are hearing it said that crime in the District of Columbia is in large part due to the existence of a provision in the Federal criminal code that requires an arrested person to be taken before a committing magistrate without unnecessary delay. The Supreme Court has interpreted this rule in cases where it has thrown out convictions resulting from confessions obtained during arrests where the individual was held more than 8 hours without being committed. These interpretations have come to be known as the Mallory rule.

The Mallory rule today is only a court interpretation of a Federal statute. It applies to all cases of Federal criminal prosecution. Not only the District of Columbia police, but the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Treasury Department agents, and all other Federal law enforcement officers are bound by it.

Yet despite all the charges and allegations that the Mallory rule is promoting crime in Washington, D.C., there is not one single hint of evidence that crime in Washington is any greater or increasing any faster than in areas where there is no Mallory rule. It has already been brought to the attention of the American people for the first time, though not by the people who raised the issue in the first place, that the rate of crime per 1,000 inhabitants is higher in Phoenix, Ariz., where there is no Mallory rule than in the District of Columbia, where there is.

I think that is progress. I think there is some chance of bringing out the facts about the conditions of life in a community that result in lawless acts and assaults against person and property not to take possession of a small fortune, but for pennies and nickles, or for "kicks."

In fact, we are beginning to appreciate that increasing crime is not peculiar even to economic deprivation and lack of opportunity alone, although that is one of its important sources. We are seeing crime that takes the form of thrill seeking and vandalism increases even in well-to-do neighborhoods.

There are those who believe that as in international relations, the way to encourage respect for authority is to have to use overpowering force.

One manifestation of that theory has been the age-old practice of arrest for investigation. Surprisingly enough, arrest for investigation was practiced in the District of Columbia for many years after the Mallory rule. It was possible for it to continue because persons were able to invoke the Mallory rule only if they were brought to trial and a confession obtained during their detention were used as evidence against them.

The result was that the Mallory rule did nothing to protect the thousands of persons who continued to be arrested in the District of Columbia, held for as many hours as the police chose to hold them, and then released. In nearly all these instances, the persons detained were not of the economic or social background where a lawsuit was likely to be instigated against the local police.

Today, there is no longer in effect in Washington the practice of arrest for investigation, a condition that continues, however, in virtually every other police jurisdiction in the country. It was abolished in Washington by administrative order of the District Commissioners. But again, the return to the rule of law has not set loose more crime in the city than exists in comparable cities elsewhere.

We have been hearing these legal rules derided as giving criminals a sporting chance to evade the law. But who knows who the criminals are until the full process of the law has been run?

The Anglo-American system of jurisprudence itself gives the accused person far more than a sporting chance. It demands that he be regarded as innocent until proved guilty. That is not a legal doctrine invented by the Warren court, nor the Johnson administration, nor WAYNE MORSE, nor Americans for Democratic Action.

These attempts to blame rising crime rates upon legal procedures long established as basic to due process of law is an easy "out" for those who find it embarrassing and disturbing to consider any other possible causes for those crime rates. Social conditions and attitudes, lack of opportunity due to racial discrimination or lack of education, poor motivation, a glorification of violence in all our entertainment media, a national pride in the most monstrous and destructive war machine ever assembled—all these factors also contribute to the ease with which many American youths find it simpler and more convenient to snatch a pocketbook from an old lady than to earn $20 on a job.

The use of force or stealth to gain what you want from others is not a practice nor an attitude that can be cultivated at the international level of activity and then easily and readily repudiated as a standard of behavior on the individual level. Nor can respect for the law be advanced by methods that flout and disregard the law.

We excuse the first by saying that there is no rule of law among nations that can be enforced today over all nations equally. But we cannot excuse the second at all.

We do have a national crime problem that relates to rising street crime as distinct from organized crime. But we will never solve it or curb it by illegal methods.

Whatever the outcome of the current political campaign in which this issue is being used, I very much hope that the discussion of the issue itself will continue. I hope that more Americans will familiarize themselves with such matters as the Mallory rule, and with relative crime statistics in various cities and parts of the country. I hope there will be a long-term study of the mental and emotional attitudes that lead young men and women of such a variety of social and economic backgrounds to accept violence as a means to an end, and sometimes as an end in itself.

We live in a country that is changing as fast as any society has changed in the history of the world. We really understand very little about it. Neighborhoods form and disappear almost overnight; a community pattern of 10 years ago is gone today; a family thinks little of moving every 2 or 3 years and from one section of the country to another. A racial system over 200 years old is breaking up. The speed and fluidity of our society and the new aspirations it is creating among our people are developing new problems and standards of their own. Until we understand more of what they are, we are going to find it impossible to beat down crime rates with the use of force and illegal police methods.

I submit that this is not a sociological theory; it is a fact of history. We experienced the greatest social dislocation of our history in the South after the Civil War. The immediate response was to try to cure it with the massive application of force in the form of military armies of occupation.

Their only legacy is one of having made a bad situation worse. The force they applied was not so much in enforcement of the laws and Constitution as in violation of them.

Municipalities have a more immediate interest in all the ramifications of crime rates than any other level of government. But one contribution the Federal Government could make is the one that has been applied successfully to many other social problems—the White House conference. We need a nationwide study of crime rates that will pinpoint not only the types of crimes being committed, but more important, will pinpoint their motivation. Not until we know the "why" of crimes of this kind, will we know how to deal with them.

That is what I hope will come out of this campaign. I am satisfied that derision for the basic principles of the rule of law is not the answer. The American people will also recognize, in time, that it is not the answer. But we could use a White House conference to help us find the answer.

That is a real contribution the Federal level of government can make to our municipalities, along with its example of devotion to preservation of constitutionalism through such institutions as the Mallory rule.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I pointed out in the speech that there is a higher rate of crime in Phoenix, Ariz., than in Washington, D.C. Phoenix, Ariz., does not have a Mallory rule. The Republican candidate is seeking to mislead the American people into believing that the Mallory rule has something to do with the crime rate. He cannot supply any authority in the field of criminal law that will support him.

The District of Columbia has a police chief who should have been fired years ago. He has tried to spread that falsehood to the people of this area.

Baltimore does not have a Mallory rule. The cities of Virginia do not have a Mallory rule. But their crime rate is comparable with and in some instances higher than that of Washington, D.C.

There are many serious reasons why a high crime rate exists in Washington, D.C., but the presence of the Mallory rule has nothing to do with them. As this magnificent article by Mr. Barth points out, the Mallory rule applies to a

small number of cases in which a confession has been extracted from a person arrested who has never had the opportunity and guarantee of being arraigned until he has been subjected, first, to shocking third-degree, police state tactics.

The Senate is about to adjourn sine die. This is the fourth or fifth time that the Senate will have adjourned sine die without Congress adopting a "court-busting" bill that seeks to repeal the Mallory rule. I shall offer no apologies to the Senate or the country for the part I have played those four or five times in doing what I could to block such a "court-busting" bill. I shall be back at the same fort next January.

I shall continue to do everything I can to continue to guarantee to the American people that, so far as Federal officers are concerned, when the hand of a Federal arresting officer is put on a person's shoulder, that officer shall take him forthwith to a committing magistrate. That is what the Mallory rule requires. If the officer has probable cause for arresting a person, he does not have to worry about his being committed. But if he does not have probable cause for arresting, he has no right to take the person into a police jail and abuse him, interrogate him, and third-degree him for as many hours as it may take to get certain types of people to break down and confess things they did or did not do and violate the precious constitutional guarantee of the presumption of innocence. That presumption of innocence is as much a procedural right of the guilty as it is of the innocent, because that presumption places the burden upon the State to prove guilt, not the burden upon the arrested to prove innocence.

So I am highly pleased that, once more, Congress is about to adjourn sine die with the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Mallory case still protected. I renew my prediction, as I close my comment on the Mallory rule, by saying that it is my view that in due course of time a set of facts will be so presented to the Supreme Court of the United States that no other decision can emanate from that body, because I believe that arresting a person and not arraigning him forthwith is unconstitutional and constitutes a violation of due process. That question has not been directly passed upon yet by the Supreme Court. In my judgment, eventually that issue will be raised. In my opinion, if it is raised, only one decision can emanate, because a person is entitled, as a freeman or a freewoman, when arrested, to have a judicial officer, not a policeman, determine whether he or she is to be interned. One is entitled to arraignment without delay.

It is interesting to note how prosecuting officers are slowly but surely coming to recognize the soundness of the position of the senior Senator from Oregon. I was gratified at the number of city attorneys from all over the country, North and South, East and West, who attended the meeting in Portland, and who came to me following my lecture the other noon and said, "It is very difficult for us to come to this point of view because of the practicalities and the kind of people involved we deal with. But we cannot deny the major premise that arrested persons are entitled to the kind of procedural protections afforded them under the Mallory rule."

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HART. It is my good fortune to be in the Chamber when the Senator from Oregon reminds us of the role he has always played in the effort to "hold the fort" against those who would set aside the Mallory rule.

I am sure the Senator has been struck, as I have been struck, by an almost consistent and predictable pattern, that those who react vigorously against the evils of the police state and caution that we do not have enough policemen—uniformed and plainclothes men—to secure us against efforts to bring about a police state, are in the front ranks of those who argue that the Mallory rule is wrong.

I believe it is a good a rule of thumb that the distinction between a free society and a police state is precisely the right which the Mallory rule insists shall be accorded to all persons.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Michigan is so right. There is no question about it. The proponents of abolishing the Mallory rule forget one of the major causes of the American Revolution. Our forefathers fought against the police state methods of the British Crown, the kangaroo court system of the British Crown, the arbitrary power given to an arresting officer under the British Crown. How easy it is for them to forget that.

Yet, when we are fighting to preserve the Mallory rule, we are fighting to preserve one of the great guarantees over which our constitutional forefathers fought a revolution in order to maintain and preserve it for us.

Mr. HART. I am grateful that the Senator from Oregon has placed another lecture on this subject in the RECORD. I plead guilty to having stolen sections from his earlier lectures for my own use. I know that in the months which remain I shall probably be stealing some sections from this latest lecture with good effect.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Michigan never steals anything from me. If I ever make a comment which he believes is useful to him, I am the one who is complimented and honored by his use of it.

LAW DEANS CRITICIZE SENATOR GOLDWATER'S STAND ON SUPREME COURT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Washington Post for September 17, entitled "Law Deans Rap BARRY on Court."

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

LAW DEANS RAP BARRY ON COURT

Five law school deans have termed Senator BARRY GOLDWATER'S criticism of the Supreme Court "ill-informed and dangerous," the Democratic National Committee said yesterday.

The five deans, in a statement made public by the committee, said the charges by the Republican presidential candidate "being either careless or uninformed, irresponsibly obscure the real issue."

Such attacks, the statement said, "do serious disservice to law and order in a time when both depend largely upon voluntary respect for judicial decisions. Those attacks seem to us ill-informed and dangerous * * *.

"We are deeply disturbed not only by the particular attacks but about the manner in which Senator GOLDWATER apparently seeks to make a political issue of the very independence of the Supreme Court. The Court is defenseless since it must, quite properly, stay outside the arena of political controversy. It is therefore an inviting target for irresponsible criticism, but a most inappropriate one."

The Democratic National Committee said the law school deans making the statement were Jefferson B. Fordham, University of Pennsylvania; Richard C. Maxwell, University of California at Los Angeles; Vernon X. Miller, Catholic University; Eugene V. Rostow, Yale University, and Henry Brandis, Jr., dean emeritus of the University of North Carolina School of Law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the great justices in the Washington area in recent years, and now retired, is Judge Henry W. Edgerton. He has been a source of inspiration to me. His opinions over the years have been brilliant and scholarly.

Recently, he sent a letter to the Washington Post, the opening sentence of which I read:

I have retired from regular active service as a circuit judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit and am interested in apportionment only as a citizen.

Judge Edgerton proceeds to give a concise account of his views on the recent apportionment issue which plagued the Senate for several weeks. He has set forth in his letter the major arguments that I sought to present in my legal arguments on the floor of the Senate in opposition not only to the Dirksen amendment, but also to the substitutes for the Dirksen amendment. As Senators know, there was not a substitute offered that did not seek to invade the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and the lower Federal courts. I thought one of the most amusing arguments in support of the substitute was that the last substitute could not be considered as an attack on the Supreme Court because it really constituted only instructions to the lower Federal courts.

Of course, the lower Federal courts are part and parcel of the Federal judicial system, at the head of which happens to be the Chief Justice of the United States. So when we seek to weaken the lower Federal courts we automatically also strike a blow at the Supreme Court itself.

So although some of my friends are unhappy about the fact that I opposed their substitutes, although they were delighted to have me with them in opposition to the Dirksen amendment itself, I am glad to have such sound judicial support—in verification of my position in this historical debate—as Judge Henry W. Edgerton, in which he sets forth in his letter the arguments which I highly endorse.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

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

APPORTIONMENT TANGLE

I have retired from regular active service as a circuit judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and am interested in apportionment only as a citizen.

The Constitution says "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." And "The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States," etc. In cases "arising under" the clause of the Constitution that forbids a State to deny to any person the equal protection of the laws, the Supreme Court has decided that both houses of a State legislature must be apportioned on a population basis so that each person's vote shall have equal weight with every other person's.

The House of Representatives has passed a bill that would nullify these Supreme Court decisions by (1) forbidding the Supreme Court to review cases concerning apportionment of State legislatures and (2) forbidding U.S. district courts to decide such cases in the first place. If this bill were to become law and were observed, it would remove such cases from the "judicial power of the United States." Because these are cases "arising under this Constitution," Congress has no power to do so. For the same reason, Congress has no power to require delay in such cases, as a different bill now pending in the Senate proposes to do.

The Constitution says "The Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make." And Congress may "ordain and establish" inferior courts. But these constitutional provisions no more authorize Congress to prevent the judicial power of the United States from enforcing the right to equal protection of the laws than the same provisions authorize Congress to prevent the judicial power from enforcing the right to freedom of speech, or trial by jury, or any other constitutional right.

Congress cannot nullify constitutional rights by the simple device of forbidding U.S. courts to decide cases in which these rights are involved. Congress may redistribute among U.S. courts the judicial power to enforce constitutional rights, but Congress cannot eliminate or reduce that power. The Constitution, like other documents must be read as a whole.

The constitutional grant to U.S. courts of the judicial power to decide all cases "arising under this Constitution" is not subject to any implicit proviso to the effect: provided Congress is willing. The constitutional grant to Congress of the legislative power to determine what questions may be decided by what courts is subject to an implicit proviso to the effect: provided, that the judicial power conferred by the Constitution upon U.S. courts may not be abridged."

HENRY W. EDGERTON.

WASHINGTON.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me before he leaves that subject?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Not to comment on the prudence or tactics employed to defeat the efforts to instruct mildly or directly the structures of the Federal judiciary or just the district courts, but parenthetically, I believe that the tactics used prove that we were not imprudent in the course we took. So long as we are going to end this session with comments on what we have not done in the Senate, would not the Senator agree that we could take pride—and I believe proper pride—in being conscious that the emotional reaction to the so-called prayer cases has not caused Congress to panic to the point that some had led us to believe would happen.

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted at everything we have done to prevent the passage of any "court-busting" bill. I am only sorry that we did not lay the Dirksen amendment on the table. I shall never be convinced that we could not have done so if my good, liberal friends had only rallied in support of the motion, because I believe that it could have been passed—it might have taken another day or two—but it would have been worth it. It would have made pleasant reading for the legal research student in some law school writing a term paper on the reapportionment issue in this session of Congress when he went through the record on the substitute proposal.

THE WASHINGTON, D.C., POLICE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial recently published in Roll Call, entitled "The Washington Police—A Matter of Personal Privilege."

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

THE WASHINGTON POLICE—A MATTER OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

(By Sidney Yudian)

This newspaper has won testimonials throughout the Nation for calling attention to Washington's growing crime wave long before it became fashionable.

After discussing the matter with Police Chief Murray and others, we editorialized for changes in existing laws which, according to the police, hampered their efforts to combat crime in the District.

It seemed to us that criminals were afforded too great an advantage over the police under restricting regulations. Senator WAYNE MORSE and many outstanding lawyers disagreed with us. We contend that, in theory, their advocacy of more protection for the accused was fine, but that in practice it led to a perpetuation of crime.

It is amazing how personal experience can produce the facts to change one's convictions where millions of words have failed.

From personal experience with the Metropolitan Police Department, I am now convinced that more—not less—protection is needed for the District citizen against mishandling by some of the police.

I have always respected the police in my hometown (Connecticut) and in the various places I have lived and worked as a newspaperman. I am not a criminal or a lawbreaker, and the respect has been mutual.

After 15 years in the District I have good reason to believe that elements of the Metropolitan Police engage in punitive activity, harassment, and degradation as well as downright illegal practices.

In the 15 years I have been here as an assistant to a Congressman and editor-publisher of the congressional newspaper, I have never appeared at police headquarters for anything more than paying parking tickets. I have never had a moving violation or anything more serious than parking in an alley.

Because my auto has been rifled so many times, I developed the habit of parking on a corner in front of my apartment window. There I can keep an eye on it throughout the night, since, under police protection I have lost four brand new tires, two hubcaps, all of my sister's summer clothing, several suits, myriad shirts, two radio aerials, and various other articles I cannot recall. Another good reason for parking close to my apartment, is the fear of treading the streets at night. Since I work late several nights during the week, the chances of being mugged, stabbed, or robbed are minimized by reducing the space I have to cover before entering the safety of my home.

Since my articles on District crime (actually written to aid the police) I have been attracting parking tickets whenever there was the slightest excuse. Over the years, I would guess I have received between 50 and 75 tickets for parking. Many have been paid, some have been "fixed," at least $300 has been added to the District coffers for little or no reason.

Hints had been dropped that the police were "out to get me."

This week, my experiences with the Metropolitan Police confirmed that rumor. For the first time in my life I am in fear of the police. Suppose I should have an accident, or happen to be on the scene of a crime? What protection would I have against the authority of an officer or officers breathing the fire of vendetta?

Last Tuesday afternoon I left my office for a business luncheon. I walked to my apartment to pick up my car. It was parked in front of my apartment, legally within the white line denoting 40 feet from the corner. There was a car parked in back of it. I decided to leave it and take a taxi.

That evening, after working in the office, I walked home for dinner. I saw a motorcycle policeman sitting in the space behind my car. Watching from my apartment window, I saw a Metropolitan Police tow truck arrive on the scene. The officer directed him to my car. The tow truck pushed my car back, far over the white line. I saw the officer go to the front of my car and examine the fender. Then, just before the car was towed away, he placed a ticket on the car.

With the pressures of deadline and the Labor Day weekend, I did not get to the police headquarters until the following week. There I was told that I had six parking tickets outstanding, and the most current one made it seven.

District regulations forbid the impounding of a car for traffic violation unless the auto is, at the time of impounding, parked illegally. Mine was not, but the officer made sure it was. Besides, I was given a ticket for it.

After paying $10 per ticket, I asked where my car was located. After more than an

hour of going from one office to another, one officer said it was downstairs in the lot. It was not there. Back at headquarters, after another hour, someone told me it had been towed to the city car dump at Blue Plains, Md.

Arriving there, we noticed what looked like acres of discarded autos, minus wheels, fenders, hoods and tops. Only one auto in decent repair was in the assortment—mine.

The attendant told me it had arrived on Thursday—apparently towed miles away while I was negotiating for its release.

Examining the front fender, which had been thoroughly repaired and repainted that week, I found a deep gash where the tow truck had banged into it. On the windshield someone had painted a series of large numbers, impossible to rub off.

To tell this story is why I have used this space for a point of personal privilege. I am a citizen endowed with a good reputation and a responsible job. If this can happen to me, what must persons with less recourse be subjected to if for some reason the Metropolitan Police are "out to get him?"

I sincerely hope the Congress will strongly reconsider removing any regulations guaranteeing protection for District citizens. I join Senator MORSE in asking for an accounting from the Metropolitan Police in regards to their treatment of all citizens.

While this article is concerned with the Traffic Division of the Metropolitan Police solely, I believe that those charged with its supervision cannot thoroughly be absolved.

EARLY RETIREMENT FOR AMERICAN WORKERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a former legislative assistant of mine, Mr. Merton C. Bernstein, now a member of the faculty of Yale University Law School, and in my judgment one of the brilliant young legal scholars of this country, has recently written a book on the subject of union pensions and welfare funds. It is one of the most scholarly and sound analyses of this whole field of pension retirement and welfare funds which has been written to date.

In the New Republic of recent date, an article was written by Mr. Merton C. Bernstein, which reflects creditably upon his scholarship, entitled, "The Push for Early Retirement."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD, together with another one written by him, published in The Nation for June 15, 1964, entitled, "The Pension Mirage."

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

[From the New Republic, Aug. 22, 1964]

THE PUSH FOR EARLY RETIREMENT

(By Merton C. Bernstein)

The UAW this summer will ask the auto companies for optional "early retirement" with full benefits at age 60, and compulsory retirement at age 65 instead of the present 68. Other unions are following the leader. Demands to lower the social security retirement age to 60 are growing more insistent. Optional earlier retirement often in practice is forced on older workers by younger workers; since retirement at age 62, with reduced benefits, became available under social security, many men between 62 and 65 have found such pressure irresistible.

This drive to push out the elderly to protect jobs for the young (really those in their middle years) comes from the rank and file. Yet it is questionable that for every forced retirement a job will open up for younger workers. Some employers are willing to defer an employee's separation until he reaches retirement; when he leaves, the job is blanked. One utility company reports that it filled only one out of eight jobs vacated by retirees: it introduced new devices to coincide with retirements.

The supply of workers in their prime working years—between 30 and 45—will grow proportionally smaller over the next several years, because of the lower birth rates of the depression years. Therefore these people should be in greater demand by employers.

The cost of benefits for early retirees is high. The same money could be better spent to promote more adequate retirement protection and greater job security. The cost for private pension plans would vary considerably, depending upon the age distribution of the employees. For one group analyzed by me, normal retirement age of 65 would be about 25 percent more expensive than age 68. According to one union estimate, reducing retirement age to 60 from 65 would increase plan costs 50 percent. For some plans the differential would be even greater. And a reduction of retirement age to 60 under social security might require a payroll tax increase of 1 full percent of covered payroll, in addition to the present 9¼ percent which is equally shared by employer and employee, i.e., a boost of better than 10 percent.

Exiling the elderly from their work while they still are able and willing to do their jobs inflicts a great psychological wound as well as hurting them financially. This may explain why a high proportion of older workers declare that they want to keep working past 65, but that most of those out of work after 65 tell interviewers that they are not well enough to work. Not only is status destroyed, but the whole pattern of social life is disrupted with loss of a job, because the work place also provides a man's closest companions and many of his leisure activities.

Exile from the job also results in financial demotion; economic want becomes more severe as the years go by. We have yet to realize the need in which most retirees live. Just consider that the average retiree's social security benefit is $80 for men and $120 for couples—which means that perhaps half of the 13 million retirees and their survivors over 65 draw less. Nor do private pensions help many of them. Moreover, private plan benefits generally are quite modest. Even the relatively opulent steelworker and autoworker plans provide (with social security benefits) less than half the retiree's former earnings. Who wants to try to live on less than half his current income? Little wonder that about two out of three elderly persons live below the poverty level—as compared with one one out of five in the population at large.

The earlier we retire people the sooner they will fall below the poverty level because their fixed benefits are eroded by inflation, their earning power is diminished by age, and the benefits themselves must be smaller than they would be if retirement age was higher. This is obviously so because most plans pay in proportion to length of service, therefore any amount of money available for retirement income will provide smaller benefits for each year, if these must be paid out for more years. Moreover, under private plans, where earnings on pension fund principal often generate a large portion of the benefit, the earlier the benefit is drawn the shorter is its period of earning. Not only will most of the unemployed aged live miserably, many will be financial burdens to their children or their communities. Pretty clearly, their consumer purchasing power will be weak at a time when the economy needs all the effective consumers it can get.

Older jobseekers, who according to the Department of Labor already account for a disproportionately high amount of chronic unemployment among displaced men, will be given yet another handicap. Employing them will be yet more expensive if they must be retired earlier, because of the increased pension costs. Moreover, retraining them will be even less worth while because the costs, often high, will be amortized over a shorter period of work.

Better use can be made of whatever amounts are won for retirement programs in collective bargaining and from Congress.

Underlying the proposal for earlier retirement is the notion that it is better to unemploy an older worker with a regular source of income (social security and perhaps pension as well) rather than a younger worker with larger family responsibilities and without the substitute income source. This overestimates the income available to the older jobless person. In more and more States, he does not receive unemployment compensation benefits if getting a private pension benefit. Also younger workers usually will have unemployment compensation benefits, which usually will exceed the combined social security and private pension benefits of a comparable retiree, though unemployment compensation runs out after a specified number of weeks, usually 26.

The younger unemployed person is more employable than the older. He is more retrainable because of generally superior education and often superior learning power. For those now in their fifties and sixties a full high school education was a rarity; for younger workers it was a commonplace. The costs of training younger workers represent a better investment because they can be at their new work for longer.

WHILE THE GETTING IS GOOD

In contrast, where employment opportunities are shrinking and earlier retirement permits younger workers to stay on their present but tenuous jobs longer, many may last only long enough to reach the age at which reemployment and retraining opportunities are less promising—a category which today sets in at age 45 or even lower. In other words, what I suggest is that younger employees should get out of unpromising job situations while the getting is good.

Rather than unemploy the (not-so) elderly workers, our efforts should be upon retraining the young, possibly even before they become unemployed, in the many new skills for which there is a demand. Retraining subsistence allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act are limited to the State's average unemployment compensation benefits, which are pretty low especially when compared to the regular wages of those with good jobs—the kind of worker being talked about here. Special retraining allowances attractive enough to prevent loss of earnings would be necessary to persuade younger workers to leave well-paying jobs to undertake training for new skills. Of course, some such employees might be on layoff. Even with many of them, training allowances would have to be far more substantial than they are today for them to decide to train for a different job and, in effect, concede that their chances of recall to the old were gone; understandably, workers do this very reluctantly.

There are supposed to be several hundred thousand highly skilled jobs going begging; it is difficult to train the unskilled and semiskilled for many of these tasks, but many highly skilled employees would fit the bill. If we were to enable and induce promising

younger people, both unemployed and employed, to train for those jobs, we would achieve more production of goods and services which are in demand (that's why the jobs are open); greater status and financial security for older employees; and well-paying jobs which are relatively secure for younger workers.

Such an arrangement assumes that some of the quite prodigious amounts required for earlier retirement (both under private plans and social security) would be devoted to higher retraining benefits and, in some cases, more expensive and longer training for the younger transferring workers. That should leave a substantial surplus for making improvements in the benefits and protection afforded to those who retire at the older ages. There, the first order of business is to boost social security benefits above their prevailing below-subsistence levels, especially for widows—many quite aged—for whom the average benefit is less than $60 a month.

Our private pension system also stands in need of basic improvement, indeed some profound redesigning. Obviously widows—especially older ones—are in urgent need of a supplement to their social security benefit—only a bare handful of plans provide one. Most plans provide paltry death benefits for survivors of those workers who die before reaching retirement age. Benefits for such younger widows (many not eligible for any social security benefits) and children should also receive high priority.

Under the typical private pension plans most employees separated from their jobs lose the entire value of their pension credits—they might just as well have never been under a plan. This stems from the fact that eligibility depends upon retiring while still employed by the company or, if separated before that, having had service with that company of 10 or 15 years and reaching age 45 or 40; conditions not met by most who leave or are put out of their jobs. Plans should enable most separated employees to take with them at least some of the value represented by their earned credits—the more the better—so that when they reach retirement their resources will be more adequate to provide a standard of living of decency. (Such arrangements, known as "vesting," could be facilitated by a national private pension clearinghouse, a proposal to which I devote a substantial part of my book.)

[From the Nation, June 15, 1964]

THE PENSION MIRAGE

(By Merton C. Bernstein)

In the war that has been declared on poverty, scant attention is being paid to the economy's veterans—the retirees and those about to be mustered out of the ranks of the employed. We had better look to their problems soon because, behind the crisis of unemployment, another crisis is building. Whenever automation displaces workers, whenever a plant lays off hordes of workers or a whole company shuts down, the workers not only lose their jobs, but a high proportion of them also see their expected retirement savings wiped out. This happens because private pension plans are out of phase with changing patterns of employment.

For example, when Studebaker, after 40 years of operation, closed its last plant in the United States, the sudden unemployment of its several thousand workers made headlines across the country. Unreported was the second tragedy: the disappearance of the expected retirement savings of more than five out of six employees still on the payroll. Simply stated, the Studebaker pension fund, limited to this one company, had insufficient money to meet the valid claims built up over decades of service. Luckily, there was enough in the account for those already retired and for another 1,100 who were beyond 60 and immediately eligible for retirement. Of the remaining 5,700 employees, the bulk—3,900—were older than 40 and had worked more than 10 years for Studebaker. This group was entitled under the terms of the plan to the "vesting" of their credits; that is, a legally binding promise to pay a man, at 65, benefits in accordance with his term of service. Vesting is intended to protect those who, having earned substantial credits in a retirement plan, may leave the company or be dismissed before reaching retirement age. Unfortunately, at Studebaker, as is common, the obligation was limited to the resources of the fund, which ran dry meeting the claims of retirees. Hence the other long-service employees lost both job and expected pension savings; and, of course, so did the other 1,800 workers who were not yet 40.

This is story is being repeated across the Nation when plants close or lay off their workers because of rapidly changing technology, defense emphasis, export markets and consumer patterns. Sometimes pension credits mean nothing because the cupboard is bare—as with the Packard shutdown in Detroit a few years ago. More often, displaced workers lose pension credits because their plans do not contain vesting provisions or because the qualifying conditions are too stringent.

We have yet to awaken to the full dimensions of the financial pickle of the elderly—who are becoming more numerous and constitute an ever larger portion of the population. At present, more than 17 million Americans have reached 65, the arbitrary age at which our social security system and most private pension plans permit retirement with full benefits. Ever since World War I, the working life of the average American has been getting shorter, while the average lifespan has been lengthening. Pension plans have established a retirement age for many enterprises, and often it is compulsory. So fewer and fewer of the aged will have jobs; yet they will be living longer than people have in the past.

On what will they live? The mainstay of most retirees and their widows is social security, as the old-age and survivors' insurance program has come to be known. Despite a series of major improvements that began in 1950, social security benefits, if not supplemented, maintain people in a style to which none of us wishes to become accustomed. Retired workers receive from OASI an average of about $76 a month ($80 for men and $60 for women); couples average $125 (a husband and wife over 65 receive 1.5 times the husband's primary benefit). Alas, widows average but $58 a month—or a not so grand total of $696 a year.

Because social security benefits in the 1940's were so inadequate—far below even today's modest scale—unions began to bargain hard for employer-financed pension plans as part of the wage- and working-condition package. Starting in World War II, and more markedly since the onset of the Korean conflict, the plans have multiplied. They were facilitated for employers by favorable tax treatment and the phenomenal increases in value and earnings of the stock in which more and more of the pension funds became invested. So today, it is estimated—unfortunately no one really knows—that something more than 43,000 plans with assets greater than $66 billion "cover" perhaps 23 million working people. (Of course, that's a good deal less than the 43 million nonfarm employees who work full time, and the figure rises to 80 million if seasonal workers are included.)

But being covered carries no assurance of receiving a pension. Approximately 85 percent of the employees covered are in single-employer plans which condition pension eligibility upon retirement at 65 after long service with the company, alternatively, vesting is available to employees separated from a job if they are over age 40 or 45, and if they have worked continuously for that one company for 10 or 15 years. The catch is that the ups and downs of the economy keep people moving in and out of jobs by the millions. Nor is the seniority enjoyed by many older workers a sure defense against displacement; the category of work to which their seniority attaches may be wiped out.

Rapid shifts in defense production are probably the most dramatic job destroyers. A congressional decision to discontinue a plane or missile can cost tens of thousands of jobs in a matter of months. Scrapping the Skybolt missile caused one company to lay off 1,700 workers within days; 2,000 to 3,000 were dropped thereafter. One subcontractor alone separated 3,200 employees. In the aggregate, these changes are enormous. From a postwar high of 928,000 in 1957, aircraft employment dropped to 640,000 in 1960.

Technological change—of which, I suggest, we've seen only the beginning—eats up jobs by the hundreds of thousands. A short time back, some evangelists of automation declared that jobs would be made, not lost, as it advanced. Even if that should prove to be true, new devices displace workers, and not only from factory jobs but from service and white-collar positions.

Competition from overseas, shifts in domestic tastes, shifts in the population profile (more babies, more oldsters, fewer people in their middle years), changes in demand for goods and services all mean a shifting pattern of consumption; that in turn means a high job turnover—and many lost pension credits. Technological developments often make it advantageous for a company to shut down an old plant and build a new one nearer markets or sources of supply. Such shifts are facilitated when new techniques free the employer from dependence on a skilled labor supply.

Some companies, usually under union pressure, consent to partial benefits for separated employees, but the law has yet to compel such payments. Without exception, the courts turn down employee pleas to preserve pension credits earned before a merger, mass layoff, or other organization switch. The judges usually do not look beyond the precise terms of the plans themselves, which rarely provide for plant or unit shutdowns, mergers, and the like. Courts overlook the fact that employer contributions to pension plans have come to be regarded and dealt with by both companies and unions—and, indeed, by Congress in several major pieces of legislation—as a form of compensation. In effect, the employees are denied part of their pay.

In one such shutdown which went into litigation, some 10,000 jobs were lost and with them all pension credits; even employees who would have reached retirement age during the span of the current collective-bargaining agreement (some with 20 and more years of service) lost all the potential value of pension credits. In another plant shutdown case, employees within a few weeks of age 65 were fired, and thereby lost all their retirement benefits. On occasion, an employer who shuts down recaptures the use of the funds that had been set aside for pensions.

Obviously, most existing pension plans do not fit rapidly changing employment patterns; the courts are unimaginative and wooden, and the Treasury Department has been doing too little too late. Other remedies are required.

The prescriptions usually offered for improvement are vesting—for long-term, older employees—and multiemployer plans. The

trouble is that large groups of employees, caught in mass layoffs, do not have sufficient service (10, 15 or even 20 years) and the requisite age (typically 40, 45 or even 50 and 55) to meet vesting conditions. Moreover, vesting as now practiced, means high administrative cost and low benefits subject to erosion by inflation. And while multiemployer plans are some improvement, because an employee who spends his working life in one industry can carry his credits from one employer to another, they are no help at all when the industry is declining, as the plight of the mineworkers so pathetically attests.

Private employment-based pension plans were called into being to supplement a sadly inadequate social security retirement program. Since 1950, OASI has only just kept pace with inflation. Hence, private-plan supplements are still needed and will continue to be. Hence, also, they clearly require some basic redesigning. What we need, in essence, is a pension system which allows an employee to obtain at least some of the value implicit in every year of pension credits he earns, and to carry it with him to any future job. Although there have been timid calls for "portable pensions," all such proposals are based upon the kind of vesting described, with shortcomings even beyond those sketched.

What I urge is a national clearinghouse to facilitate the transfer of pension credits as employees move from job to job throughout their career. The clearinghouse could be operated as an all-public or an all-private affair, or under one of several public-private arrangements. It should offer a master group plan for small companies, which find it burdensome and costly to cover their employees—and rarely do so. This will become a matter of growing importance as the service trades, in which small firms are common, account for an ever larger portion of the work force.

The details of a national scheme are complex, the problems many—but they are all manageable. To get started, we need awareness of the problem and sufficient concern to seek solutions. We have lacked both.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure that the Labor and Welfare Committee of the Senate will be confronted next year with several issues, particularly in connection with the job losses caused by automation, which will bring us face to face with problems of welfare funds, pensions and retirement funds. I am sure that we shall all be grateful to Mr. Bernstein because he has already done much of the research work for us.

I believe that all we need to do will be to take the mass of material found in Mr. Bernstein's book and use it as the basis to implement whatever proposed legislation we wish to enact.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1147. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes;

S. 1593. An act to amend section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 concerning the interstate planning and coordination of the Great River Road;

S. 2460. An act to amend the act of July 13, 1959, so as to extend the period of time within which certain construction may be undertaken by the State of Missouri on lands conveyed to such State by the United States;

S. 2649. An act to designate as the Graham Burke Pumping Plant the pumping plant being constructed in the State of Arkansas as part of the White River backwater unit of the lower Mississippi River flood control project;

S. 2654. An act to change the name of the canal known as the Bay Head-Manasquan Canal and as the Manasquan River-Barnegat Bay Canal, to Point Pleasant Canal;

S. 2968. An act to amend subsection 120(f) of title 23, United States Code; and

S. 3143. An act to designate as Clair Engle Lake the reservoir created by the Trinity Dam, Central Valley project, California.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H.R. 9393. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide full retroactivity for disability determinations, to extend the period within which ministers may elect coverage, and to validate wages erroneously reported for certain engineering aids employed by soil and water conservation districts in Oklahoma;

H.R. 10473. An act to extend the period during which Federal payments may be made for foster care in child-care institutions under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act; and

H.R. 11812. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes, p.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

At 8 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair).

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF "IMMIGRATION HEARINGS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PARTS 1, 2, AND 3"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution, which I send to the desk. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 358) was read, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 358. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 5,000 additional copies of "Immigration Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, parts 1, 2, and 3."

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, five thousand additional copies of part 1, "Immigration Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives"; and five thousand additional copies, each, of parts 2 and 3 to be printed concurrently with the publications entitled "Immigration Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives", Eighty-eighth Congress, second session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (H. Con. Res. 538) was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "STUDY OF POPULATION AND IMMIGRATION PROBLEMS; POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution, which I send to the desk. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 364) was read, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 364. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of an additional 1,000 copies of the document entitled "Study of Population and Immigration Problems; Population of the United States."

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed one thousand additional copies of the documents entitled "Study of Population and Immigration Problems; Population of the United States", with illustrations and maps, special series 1 through 16, inclusive, for the use of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 364) was considered and agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 11, 12, 31, 39, 45, 51, and 63 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 38, 40, 43, and 60 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to address my remarks briefly to that portion of the conference report which relates to the financing of the permanent food stamp program that follows the enactment of the permanent authorization law at this session.

I regret that in the conference meeting between the Senate and the House conferees in connection with the supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 12633, the Senate conferees were unable to prevail upon the provision inserted under this head in the appropriations bill, which reads as follows:

Provided, That hereafter appropriations under this head shall be made in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 88–525.

That amendment was in accord with the authorization law passed by the Congress at the present session, when it enacted a permanent food stamp program.

As one member of the Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations, I wish to make it abundantly clear that, so far as I am concerned, any future requests in a budget estimate to use section 32 funds for financing the food stamp program will be vigorously opposed.

The statement of the managers of the bill in the House of Representatives in connection with the conference report reads as follows:

While Senate language prohibiting the use of section 32 for this purpose has been eliminated, the conferees concur with the intent of such language.

Mr. President, I interpret that language to mean that the House agrees with us that under the provisions of the authorizing legislation, section 32 funds should not be used for this purpose, which is a welfare purpose, but that, instead, general revenue funds should be so used.

I believe that this agreement of the conferees in connection with the supplemental appropriations bill should be directive enough to the Department and to budget-making officials outside the Department of Agriculture to preclude any recurrence of unwarranted and unauthorized proposals to transfer section 32 funds for other purposes not directly related to its original intent.

If there is to be any clear record available for Members of Congress, or anyone else, as to the expenses in connection with any governmental program, it is my view that the financing thereof should be by direct appropriation, out of the general revenues of the Treasury, rather than by attempts to camouflage the cost of programs through transfer from permanent appropriation funds, such as section 32.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the pertinent provisions of section 16 of Public Law 88–525, the authorizing legislation.

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

SEC. 16. (a) To carry out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; not in excess of $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and not in excess of $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year. Such portion of any such appropriation as may be required to pay for the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotments shall be transferred to and made a part of the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act.

(d) Amounts expended under the authority of this Act shall not be considered amounts expended for the purpose of carrying out the agricultural price support program and appropriations for the purposes of this Act shall be considered, for the purpose of budget presentations, to relate to the functions of the Government concerned with welfare.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, section 16(a) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 authorizes that the financing be by regular appropriations, and specifies the limitations through fiscal 1967.

Second, section 16(d) makes it very clear that the costs of the food stamp program are not considered price-support programs operations, and appropriations made for the purposes of carrying out the Food Stamp Act are to be considered for the purpose of budget presentations to relate to the functions concerned with welfare and not with agricultural support programs.

The action by the conference committee provides $60 million for expenses of the new program for the fiscal year 1965, and for the continuation of the pilot program during the current fiscal year.

Mr. President, the wording of the authorizing statute could not be clearer, and I believe that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the members of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations will be extremely insistent from this time forward that the food stamp program shall be regarded as a welfare program and shall be financed as directed by the authorization act out of general revenue rather than out of section 32 funds. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 12633, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 11, 12, 31, 39, 45, 51, and 63 to the bill (H.R. 12633) entitled "An Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"For an additional amount for 'defense educational activities,' $60,750,000, of which $10,300,000 shall be for capital contributions to student loan funds and loans for non-Federal capital contributions (not to exceed $300,000) to student loan funds, $10,000,000 shall be for grants to States for equipment and minor remodeling of facilities for the purposes included in section 301 of Public Law 85–864, as amended, and for supervisory and other services, and $3,000,000 shall be for grants to States for testing, guidance, and counseling: *Provided*, That, in lieu of amounts heretofore specified, allotments for grants to States under sections 302(a) and 305 for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling shall be made on the basis of $70,400,000, allotments for loans to private nonprofit schools shall be made on the basis of $9,600,000, and allotments under section 302(b) for supervisory and other services shall be made on the basis of $6,000,000: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment of S. 3060, Eighty-eighth Congress, or similar legislation, amending the National Defense Education Act of 1958: *Provided further*, That none of the funds available for "Payments to school districts" shall be paid to the District of Columbia or any agency thereof as a result of Federal impact on the schools of the District of Columbia during fiscal year 1965."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For an additional amount for "Community Health Practice and Research", $5,000,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriations for the Economic Opportunity Program, Office of Economic Opportunity: *Provided*, That the appropriation under this head in the Department of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1965 (Public Law 88–605) shall be available to carry out section 306 of the Public Health Service Act."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"*Provided, further*, That not to exceed $2,000,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to "Grants to States for public assistance" to carry out existing projects authorized by section 1115 of the Social Security Act, as amended."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and concur therein with

an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

"APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses

"For necessary expenses of the Federal representative and his alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $800,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall become effective upon enactment into law of authorizing legislation."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 40, 43, and 60.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the status of the conference report at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has agreed to the only amendment that was in question. The bill will be transmitted to the House for the House to act on the last amendment of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF ANNUAL REPORT OF JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it has been customary in all other years for the annual report of the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership to be published as a Senate document. I see no necessity for having it published in the RECORD, but I ask unanimous consent that there be printed as a Senate document the annual report of the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership.

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

SENATOR GOLDWATER'S VIEWS—REMARKS BY CICERO

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the September 19, 1964, issue of America magazine there appears a letter to the editors written by Miss Taylor Caldwell, of Buffalo, N.Y. Her letter deals with remarks made by Cicero in defense of Rome. I believe the letter to be timely and appropriate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EDITOR: A considerable time ago—long before he was even considered as the Republican nominee—I wrote BARRY GOLDWATER and quoted a saying of Marcus Tullius Cicero's, in connection with Cicero's defense of Rome against the evil and violent patrician, Lucius Sergius Catilina. The quotation is from the Vatican archives, which I read and translated for use: "I must remind you, lords, Senators, that extreme patriotism in the defense of freedom is no crime. And let me respectfully remind you that pusillanimity in the pursuit of justice is no virtue in a Roman."

Whether that quotation of Cicero's remained in BARRY'S mind, I do not know. It is still true today, when America is in exactly the same position as Rome was when Cicero was consul—an office similar to that of the President of the United States. BARRY meant just what Cicero meant, and under the same circumstances, and the liberals know it only too well.

Rome had declined, as Aristotle had said, centuries before the event, from a republic into a democracy, and, as Aristotle said, "democracies degenerate into despotisms." Catilina's speech to the murky underworld of Rome—composed of criminals, unemployed freemen, songsters, dancers, "intellectuals," the disaffected and the traitors—could be used by any "liberal" politician today, word for word. And Cicero's orations against Catilina could be used by BARRY today, in toto, and would be just as valid.

We have several Catilinas in American public life today. Fortunately, we have a Cicero in BARRY GOLDWATER.

Miss TAYLOR CALDWELL.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall refer to one paragraph of the letter, because it is so timely. It indicates that in any age or generation, the mind of man contrives the same thing. Here is Cicero's statement; it is from the Vatican Archives:

> I must remind you, lords, Senators, that extreme patriotism in the defense of freedom is no crime. And let me respectfully remind you that pusillanimity in the pursuit of justice is no virtue in a Roman.

That sounds almost word for word like BARRY GOLDWATER and it was uttered a long time ago in the dignity of the Roman Senate.

THE BIG ROCK CANDY MOUNTAINS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for a long time I have been searching for a definition of "the great society." I started with the New Deal, and then the Fair Deal, and then the New Frontier, and then the great society; and I wondered how one would adequately define it. I discovered a definition. It is a song. Perhaps I shall sing it tomorrow for the edification of the Senate. The title is "The Big Rock Candy Mountains."

I will read the introduction and then the chorus:

THE BIG ROCK CANDY MOUNTAINS

Introduction

On a summer's day in the month of May,
A burly little bum come a-hiking,
Travelling down that lonesome road
A-looking for his liking.
He was headed for a land that was far away,
Beside the crystal fountain—
"I'll see you all this coming fall
In the Big Rock Candy Mountain."

1.

In the Big Rock Candy Mountains
You never change your socks,
And little streams of alcohol
Come a-trickling down the rocks.
The boxcars are all empty
And the railroad bulls are blind,
There's a lake of stew and whiskey, too,
You can paddle all around 'em in a big canoe
In the Big Rock Candy Mountains.

CHORUS

O—the buzzing of the bees
In the cigarette trees
Round the soda-water fountain,
Where the lemonade springs
And the bluebird sings
In the Big Rock Candy Mountains.

2.

In the Big Rock Candy Mountains,
There's a land that's fair and bright,
Where the handouts grow on bushes
And you sleep out every night,
Where the boxcars are all empty
And the sun shines every day,
O I'm bound to go, where there ain't no snow,
Where the rain don't fall and the wind don't blow
In the Big Rock Candy Mountains.

3.

In the Big Rock Candy Mountains
The jails are made of tin
And you can bust right out again
As soon as they put you in;
The farmer's trees are full of fruit,
The barns are full of hay,
I'm going to stay where you sleep all day,
Where they boiled in oil the inventor of toil
In the Big Rock Candy Mountains.

Mr. President, I think that must be the great society.

THE MINORITY LEADER'S REPORT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is also customary at this season of the year to place in the RECORD an account of the activities of Congress for the past 2 years; and I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in the RECORD and to be printed as a Senate document, the minority leader's report, together with some attached data.

There being no objection, the report and attachments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and to be printed as a Senate document, as follows:

THE MINORITY LEADER'S REPORT

The 2d session of the 88th Congress is now history. Like all institutions serving the people, it will be appraised in various ways.

One favorite inquiry is to ask, "Who got what?" and then proceed to list what was or was not done for labor, business, agriculture, relief, the aged, and other social and economic groups.

Still another assessment—as I have pointed out before—is the volume approach; namely, days in session, pages filled in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the number of bills enacted, the number of recorded votes, the number of bills on which no action was taken, the number of nominations submitted and approved, and other items. All this I leave to the statistical bonepickers.

The principal achievements of the session are conceded to be the tax reduction bill and the civil rights bill. Other measures are included with this report.

I make especial mention of two measures.

The first is the Antipoverty Act, officially styled the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This proposal burst upon the Congress and the country with a flourish of trumpets and

the great battle cry "War on Poverty." The slogan is mainly political. The report of the Committee on Labor and Education of the House of Representatives on this measure indicates that we already have 43 individual programs dealing with the cause, prevention, and cure of poverty. This new program duplicates much of what is already being done and its purpose and scope are anything but new.

The act provides for a Job Corps, a work training program, a work study program, urban and rural community act programs, special programs to combat poverty in rural areas, employment and investment incentive programs, pilot programs, and small business loans. To this one should add the authority of the Director to enlist an unlimited number of "volunteers for America." It is quite a package. By means of camps and centers, study classes and incidental work, community projects and land development, loans and grants, a half million persons will actually be added to the Federal payroll without full payroll status. All this is to cost about $1 billion the first year.

It is but the first installment. Unless this program departs from the historic pattern, it will be here a long time and grow and grow and grow. If there were the slightest chance that the durable results to be expected from this program justified such an outlay, it might be accepted as at least a fair gamble.

But the justifications which were submitted were weak and conjectural. The cost per enrollee in the Job Corps, for example, is admittedly sky high—$5,000 per year (a year in Harvard costs only $3,800). And the type of training will fall far short of the needs and requirements of an expanding industrial economy.

The second measure which merits some comment is the so-called Appalachia project, named for an area of 11 States from Pennsylvania to Alabama which cluster about or near the Appalachian Range and embrace 355 counties. The overall cost on a 5-year basis would also be a billion dollars to be jointly financed by the Federal and State Governments. More than $8 out of every $10 provided by the program would go to highways. The balance would be scattered among schools, hospitals, health facilities, the restoration of mining areas, etc. To be sure, the very construction of such facilities would provide temporary jobs. But a durable, lasting job is one which must be geared to the production and servicing of goods and commodities.

Coal and timber are the basic resources of this area. What is going to be done to retrieve markets for the dwindling coal mines? Where is the program for developing markets for the timber industry? What hope is there for an impoverished area unless its development is strongly geared to the production of goods and services and not merely to the building of city halls, sewage disposal plants, and highways?

The House of Representatives failed to act on this measure during the 88th Congress.

The area redevelopment program is subject to much of the same criticism. So many of its frills have already been exposed. It has now been provided with another $355 million for the fiscal year 1965. If anyone wishes to examine a classical account of the incredible and fantastic operations of ARA, an article should be read which appears on page 197 of the September issue of Reader's Digest under the title, "When the Bubble Burst in Crockett, Texas." By permission, the article is appended at the end of this statement. It requires no amplification from me.

These are some of the things which the Republican minority has sought to bring to light in connection with these and other measures. With a public debt of $314 billion, a deficit between income and outgo of $8.3 billion, an increase of 13 percent in the Federal debt since World War II, an increase of 448 percent in the State and local debt in that same period, an increase of Federal aid to the States from $885 million to $7 billion since 1946, how long can this squandermania continue before we are in deep trouble?

Already signs of fiscal desperation, inflation, and difficulty are appearing elsewhere as in the case of Italy. Other countries are moving in that direction. Can we hope to avoid this contagion if our fiscal house is not in order? One can only look to the lamps of the past and take note that we did not escape it before.

At this point I must take a departure from the pattern of these annual reports. It concerns not the performance of Congress, but the future of Congress as an institution. It, in plain English, amounts to a constitutional crisis and should be understood by every American.

This 88th Congress comes to an end as we observe the 187th anniversary of the formulation of the Federal Constitution. That document created Congress. It made it article I, ahead of the other branches. From time to time, we should refresh ourselves on the first section under that article. It is clear and all inclusive. It recites that, "The legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." That is the whole of it.

Speaking of the powers given to Congress by the Constitution, President Monroe was led to observe that, "The whole system of the National Government may be said to rest essentially on the powers granted to this branch."

But today, it is beset with reformers who believe it is too slow, too clumsy, and too inefficient. It is beset with reorganizers who would like to change its structure, its rules, its committees. It is beset by pressure groups without number who know full well that only through the Congress can they secure the laws and the authority which are to their liking and which serves their own particular economic and social purposes.

As an institution, the Congress has been castigated from within and from without. It has been lampooned and cartooned. It has been reviled and calumniated.

In other days this attitude toward Congress was not to be taken too seriously because it was sporadic and diffused. But today, it is quite another thing. The effort to demean and denigrate the Congress appears to be organized. It embraces Congressmen, Senators, professors, some of the press, pressure groups, some columnists, and a few commentators. Not the least of the forces at work to downgrade the Congress resides in the executive branch of Government itself. This is no new phenomenon. It takes the form of flouting the will of Congress, of withholding information, of ignoring the intent of the legislative branch. Some years ago, I listened to the late distinguished Senator from Georgia, Walter George, as he addressed the Senate and uttered the conviction that one of the great and disturbing weaknesses in our Government today was to get those who are charged with executing the laws enacted by the Congress to carry out its expressed will and intent. Whenever the Congress and the people become both complacent and reconciled to such a state of affairs, then indeed will the most important branch of the Government become demeaned and downgraded in its own eyes and in the eyes of the people.

Now there is a new threat. We are confronted with still another invasion of the legislative power. It comes from the third branch of our Government—the judiciary.

Justice Felix Frankfurter while on the Supreme Court had occasion to comment on the trend during his judicial service. Justice Learned Hand once referred to the tendency of the Supreme Court to become "a third legislative chamber" and Prof. Edward Corwin, of Princeton, remarked upon "the aggression of the Court." Now the aggression has become a full reality.

The action of the Supreme Court in the so-called apportionment cases is an affront to both the legislative process and the Constitution itself. The Court's interpretation of the 14th amendment in these decisions is such that the powers of the States to deal with the composition of their own legislatures is jeopardized and the power of the Congress to deal with the problem through the amendatory process to the Constitution is cavalierly dismissed as an arbitrary and capricious effort to tyrannize the High Court. In recent weeks, there has been a veritable rash of articles, editorials, and comments on this matter and especially from the cloistered deans and professors of our law schools. What this melange adds up to is complete confusion of the issue.

First, it is essential to grasp what the Court has done.

When our great Constitution was being written the primary concern of the Founding Fathers was the protection of the rights and interests of all the people—not just those of the majority, but of the minority, not just the great, but the small, not just the rich, but the poor, not just those in the densely populated urban centers, but those in the sparsely populated areas.

The backbone of this concern was expressed in the establishment of a Federal system of States under a tripartite National Government of carefully limited powers, with all other authority residing in the States. One of the National Government's delicate balances was the establishment of a U.S. Senate based on geographic representation, and a House of Representatives based on population. It was based on the constitutional practice of certain of the original 13 States themselves.

Last June, the Supreme Court by a 6-to-3 decision, without clear constitutional language nor precedents to guide it, upset 175 years of legislative tradition rooted firmly, as we have seen, in the very birth of the Constitution itself. In a decision by Chief Justice Warren, the Court held:

"With respect to the allocation of legislative representation, all voters, as citizens of a State, stand in the same relation regardless of where they live. Any suggested criteria for the differentiation of citizens are insufficient to justify any discrimination, as to the weight of their vote, unless relevant to the permissible purposes of legislative apportionment. Since the achieving of fair and effective representation for all citizens is concededly the basic aim of legislative apportionment, we conclude that the equal protection clause guarantees the opportunity for equal participation by all voters in the election of State legislators * * *.

"We hold that, as a basic constitutional standard, the equal protection clause requires that the seats in both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned on a population basis. Simply stated, an individual's right to vote for State legislators is unconstitutionally impaired when its weight is in a substantial fashion diluted when compared with votes of citizens living in other parts of the State."

Justices Stewart, Clark, and Harlan dissented in the sharpest tones. Said Justice Stewart in part:

"The Court's draconian pronouncement, which makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the 50 States, finds no support in the words of the Constitution, in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year political history of our Federal Union.

"With all respect, I am convinced these decisions mark a long step backward into that unhappy era when a majority of the members of this Court were thought by many to have convinced themselves and each other that the demands of the Constitution were to be measured not by what it says, but by their own notion of wise political theory.

"The rule announced today is at odds with long-established principles of constitutional adjudication under the equal-protection clause, and it stifles values of local individuality and initiative vital to the character of the Federal Union which it was the genius of our Constitution to create * * *.

"What the Court has done is to convey a particular political philosophy into a constitutional rule, binding upon each of the 50 States * * * without regard and without respect for the many individualized and differentiated characteristics of each State * * * stemming from distinct history, distinct geography, distinct distribution of population and distinct political heritage."

Justice Clark remarked in part: "I cannot agree to the arbitrary application of the one man, one vote principle for both houses of a State legislature. In my view, if one house is fairly apportioned by population * * * then the people should have some latitude in providing, on a rational basis, for representation in the other house."

In his scholarly and exhaustive dissent, Justice Harlan literally dissected the majority opinion. He summed up his dissent in these historic words:

"What is done today deepens my conviction that judicial entry into this realm is profoundly ill advised and constitutionally impermissible. As I have said before * * * I believe that the vitality of our political system, on which in the last analysis all else depends, is weakened by reliance on the judiciary for political reform; in time a complacent body politic may result.

"These decisions also cut deeply into the fabric of our federalism. What must follow from them may eventually appear to be the product of State legislatures. Nevertheless, no thinking person can fail to recognize that the aftermath of these cases, however desirable it may be thought in itself, will have been achieved at the cost of a radical alteration in the relationship between the States and the Federal Government, more particularly the Federal judiciary. Only one who has an overbearing impatience with the Federal system and its political processes will believe that that cost was not too high or was inevitable * * *.

"Finally, these decisions give support to a current mistaken view of the Constitution and the constitutional function of this Court This view, in a nutshell, is that every major social ill in this country can find its cure in some constitutional 'principle' and that this Court should 'take the lead' in promoting reform when other branches of Government fail to act. The Constitution is not a panacea for every blot upon the public welfare, nor should this Court, ordained as a judicial body, be thought of as a general haven for reform movements.

"The Constitution is an instrument of Government, fundamental to which is the premise that in a diffusion of governmental authority lies the greatest promise that this Nation will realize liberty for all its citizens.

"This Court, limited in function in accordance with that premise, does not serve its high purpose when it exceeds its authority, even to satisfy judicial impatience with the slow workings of the political process. For when, in the name of constitutional interpretation, the Court adds something to the Constitution that was deliberately excluded from it, the Court in reality substitutes its view of what should be so for the amending process."

There is the essence of the Supreme Court's decision, and of the dissenting opinions by the Justices who disagreed.

What is next? A whole ocean of uncharted waters confronts the American people as a result of the Court's action.

When the Court employs the brand of logic found in this decision the entire historic Federal-State relationship comes into question, segments of the Federal system itself appear in jeopardy, and the very foundation of municipal and county government is potentially challenged.

It is, for example, clear that approximately 44 of the 50 States must revise their legislative apportionment—historically divided on a population and a geographic basis—so that it rests solely on population. This overturn of 175 years of legislative tradition, with neither clear constitutional language nor precedents to sustain it, raises the serious question as to what next is on the docket to further invade rights unmistakably vested by the Constitution in the States. How far can the 14th or equal protection amendment be stretched? What other constitutional amendments have been adopted for one purpose, one intent, which can now be interpreted by the Court to rewrite the Constitution in a manner never intended by the original authors?

Who can say? Will the U.S. Senate—where today 26 States having only 16 percent of the population could exercise a 52 to 48 majority—be next? Or will it be the electoral college system under which one New York City precinct could nullify the electoral vote of 12 States for President of the United States?

Or will it be the governmental instruments of the 3,072 counties in the United States, the 34 independent cities, and the 24 election districts in Alaska? Or the 91,185 other types of local government which include 34,678 school districts, 17,997 municipalities, and 17,144 townships? Far fetched?

Not at all. A Michigan court has already ruled, on the basis of the Supreme Court decision, that the Kent County Board of Supervisors must be reapportioned on a population-only basis.

Clearly, the apportionment decision of the Supreme Court has far-reaching implications. To correct imbalances in representation in certain areas where the legislatures themselves had refused to act—rightly or wrongly—a whole new philosophy of judicial interpretation of the Constitution has been evolved.

We are, whether we yet fully realize it or not, in a constitutional crisis. We must look profoundly at this page in our history and decide if we want to erase it. If we don't we may find the pages have only begun to turn.

AGRICULTURE

Republicans have always believed the farmer exemplifies the free way of life. We believe that free farmers are the Nation's greatest asset for they not only provide food for our own people but for others. That the free farmer who has produced in such abundance is our greatest asset is proved by the fact that Soviet Russia has had to call upon our farmers as well as farmers of other free countries to supply their need for wheat for bread to fill the mouths of their own children.

However, the Democrat administrations have always looked upon this abundance and surplus of agricultural commodities as a sword of Damocles hanging over our heads. The only answer they have had for this problem is more and more stringent controls over the farmers' freedom, instead of pushing for more utilization research, to find new and industrial uses for agricultural commodities. The Department of Agriculture requested that no additional funds for this purpose be included in the 1965 agriculture appropriations.

Here, in the approach to this important problem, the Democrat administrations have differed extensively from the Republican viewpoint.

In the first session of this Congress, the Democrat administration offered the farmers a generous subsidy in return for accepting Federal aid. What they failed to stress was that in accepting this subsidy they were placing the chains of most severe controls on the farmers.

The extension of the Feed Grains Act as sponsored by the Democrat administration contained many changes from the original act, and retained many of the same shackles with a demand for speedy action on the ground that it was urgent. It was indeed urgent from the Democrat viewpoint, for looming up was the wheat referendum on which the farmers were to vote whether or not they would accept Federal payments which would limit their freedom of action.

But what happened? Despite heavy pressure, the farmers chose to retain their freedom even though a frantic pressure campaign was waged all over the Nation by the administration and its bureaucratic personnel. In fact, these political activities became so flagrant that a section was written into the 1964 agricultural appropriations bill, forbidding funds to be used by the Agriculture Department for influencing the vote in any referendum or to influence agriculture legislation by county agents or for engaging in any activities other than advisory and supervisory duties, other than those prescribed in administrative regulations. The end result was that the program could not command so much as a simple majority of those who voted, let alone the necessary two-thirds vote required.

With this setback in its agriculture program, the Democrat administration then set out to produce a voluntary wheat program which follows in a general way the compulsory provisions rejected overwhelmingly last year.

The bill provides 1964 price supports at $2 a bushel on grain for domestic food use and $1.55 a bushel on export wheat. Only those farmers who voluntarily limit production would receive price supports.

Coupled with the wheat program is the cotton program which was designed to meet the textile industry's complaint that domestic mills must pay more for American cotton than foreign competitors. Under the cotton legislation, cotton mills would buy cotton from the farmers at the supported price of 32.5 cents a pound. However, they would receive a subsidy of 8 cents in the form of certificates redeemable for Government surplus cotton. This, in turn, would bring their cost down to the world price of 24.5 cents a pound.

As an inducement to reduce cotton planting the legislation provides a bonus price-support payment of 3.5 cents a pound to farmers who cut their acreage about one-third. Farmers could, however, grow some cotton above their allotments for export at world prices. Although the request was for a 4-year cotton program, the duration was cut in half to 2 years.

It is interesting to note that in the 1960 Democrat platform it was stated: "All these goals demand the leadership of a Secretary of Agriculture who is conversant with the technological and economic aspects of farm problems."

And what happened? In trying to carry out this program, the Secretary of Agriculture upset the cotton program as it was intended by the 1958 law. He almost ruined the dairy program through Federal controls and national allotments and then tried to force down the throats of the farmers a

wheat program that the farmers did not want and which they voted against in no uncertain manner.

And as for the promise of commodity supports at not less than 90 percent of parity—it went down the drain as did so many of the other Democrat promises.

Truly, the American farmer is the forgotten man as far as this administration is concerned. His innate spirit of independence, his love of freedom as expressed in the wheat referendum in May 1963, have only subjected the farmer to reprisals.

Republicans introduced legislation to give the wheat farmer a voluntary program that made sense. Then President Johnson jumped in and started his highly publicized war on poverty March 6 this year by supporting and praising the administration's wheat and cotton bill.

Basic to this problem is the fact that the CCC operated farm program had in 30 years cost the taxpayers nearly $38 billion. Of this cost, this Democrat administration has been responsible for more than $11 billion of the total in the 3 years it has been in office.

If you will recall, when this administration took office it was with a promise of "full parity of income," but in the past year the farm parity level, as a matter of fact, stood at 74 percent on September 1, 1964—the lowest since 1939. This present administration promised to control inflation, yet the current prices the farmers are paying for items used in living and production are the highest in history. This administration promised lower interest, but the farmers are paying higher interest and farm debt has increased over $7 billion in the last 3 years.

It is not enough that the farmer has been regulated and harassed, but the ill-combined wheat-cotton program fails to come to grips with the real problems which are punishing American agriculture.

Congress, in 1958, passed adequate cotton legislation and during the time congressional intent was followed the program worked satisfactorily. However, in 1961, the Secretary of Agriculture increased the support level, thus increasing the export subsidy. This upset the applecart because it caused us to lose our competitive position in the world market.

Although the cottongrower was in much more trouble than the cotton manufacturer, in the public mind the cost of the cotton provisions is to be charged to agriculture.

What this cotton program did is to revive the old discredited Brannan-type plan of direct payment to farmers.

As far as the wheat program is concerned, it is substantially the same program which was rejected last year by the farmers' referendum despite the efforts of the administration to force it upon them by threatening that it was this program or none at all.

The farmers want uncomplicated and workable legislation in the direction of less, not more, control. They want to move away from restrictive Government programs and assume greater responsibility for the production and marketing of their commodities.

Senate Republicans, realizing the farmers' desires in this direction, voted almost solidly against this poorly conceived, mismatched cotton-wheat program. When the bill went over to the House side, Republicans again voted overwhelmingly against it and it was only approved by a cliffside vote of 211 to 203 after a night session followed by a very unusual recess of 2½ hours called by the Speaker.

The farm bill was further complicated by a trade-off idea on the passage of a food stamp for the needy bill which is part of the President's so-called war on poverty program. The program, which permits needy people to buy discount stamps which may be redeemed at full face value at food stores, would not, according to many Republicans, help to dispose of surplus commodities. The stamps may be used to buy almost any type of food and would, in their estimation, mushroom into a multimillion-dollar welfare program. Therefore the problem not only remains unsolved but could grow into another costly and unneeded Government bureaucratic activity.

In the final analysis, the farmers are again the forgotton stepchild, remembered only in false promises by the Democrat administration in election years.

CIVIL RIGHTS

In the history of mankind there is an inexorable moral force that carries a nation forward. Such a force had its culmination this year in the Civil Rights Act.

Every generation must march up to the unfinished tasks of the generation that has gone before. There probably will be greater unfinished tasks and every generation will have to confront them. They will also be found in the domain of freedom.

Equality of oportunity must prevail if we are to complete the covenant made with the people.

And thus it was on June 19, 1964, the Senate, after 83 days of debate, passed the most comprehensive civil rights bill in the history of the country by a rollcall vote of 73 to 27, following the longest debate on any legislation ever considered by the Senate. This vote came after a historic vote on cloture, the fifth time cloture has been invoked in the Senate, and the first time cloture was ever invoked on a civil rights measure.

This historic vote occurred 1 year to the day from the time that an Executive message and accompanying legislation dealing with civil rights was sent to the Congress for consideration; a message delayed 2 years after the Democrat administration had promised action.

As early as June 5, 1963, 2 weeks before the late President Kennedy sent his civil rights message to Congress, the Senate Republican Conference issued a statement which read as follows:

"It is the consensus of the Senate Republican Conference that:

"The Federal Government, including the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, has a solemn duty to preserve the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens of the United States in conformity with the Constitution which makes every native born and naturalized person a citizen of the United States as well as of the State in which he resides.

"Equality of rights and opportunities has not been fully achieved in the long period since the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution were adopted and this inequality and lack of opportunity and the racial tensions which they engender are out of character with the spirit of a nation pledged to freedom and justice.

"Since the days of Abraham Lincoln, the first Republican President, the God-given rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness have been cardinal principles of the Republican faith, and the equal opportunity to obtain these rights has consistently and uninterruptedly been reaffirmed in the platforms of the Republican Party.

"For the first time in more than four score years civil rights legislation of a meaningful character and purpose was placed on the Federal statute books as a result of the initiative of Republican leadership in Congress and President Eisenhower.

"Republican Members of the U.S. Senate in this the 88th Congress reaffirm and reassert the basic principles of the party with respect to civil rights and further affirm that the President, with the support of the Congress, consistent with his duties as defined in the Constitution, must protect the rights of all U.S. citizens, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

"We deem it the President's duty as provided in the Constitution to enforce the laws insuring the rights of citizens of the United States and preserving domestic tranquillity as basic objectives of constitutional government.

"In pursuance of these objectives, we as Republican Members of the Senate will support further appropriate legislation required to help solve the problems of our Nation in the field of civil rights."

The Republican Party—the party of Abraham Lincoln—has from its beginning striven to make the promise of civil rights for all a reality. We also recognize that discrimination is not a localized problem, but rather a problem to be faced by North and South alike. The Republican Party is proud of its civil rights record. During the 8 years of the Republican administration from 1953 to 1961, more progress was made than in the preceding 80 years.

As we considered this legislation, some Republicans felt there were provisions in the act that were meritorious dealing with genuine civil rights, but they felt compelled to oppose the bill on grounds of constitutionality, particularly in titles II and VII. They were genuinely concerned over Government regulatory action in the field of private enterprise. They felt this should be brought before the people in the form of a constitutional amendment and so they opposed the enactment of the bill.

Now that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has become the law of the land, overwhelmingly approved by both Houses of Congress and by members of both parties, it should be accepted in good grace and with full cooperation of all our citizens.

It will not be an easy path to tread. There will be many thorns and brambles. I have great faith in the American people. They have always risen to their greatest stature when there have been crises, and, with good faith on both sides and a determination to abide by the laws, we can go forward to even greater heights.

CIVILIAN SPACE PROGRAM

Among the most controversial and expensive programs submitted by the present administration has been the civilian space adventure known as Project Apollo—the manned lunar landing project. No one has ever given Congress a definitive estimate of the cost of this program. We have cost estimates by experts ranging from $20 billion to $40 billion.

Republican concern over the program is engendered by the belief that far too much of our national technical talent and scientific intellect is devoted to this one project while other, more needed and worthy programs are permitted to flounder for lack of competent, imaginative direction.

We have the President stating that we cannot afford and will not permit Russia to be first with a man on the moon.

Let us look at this space project more closely.

It is not a question of being second in space ventures. We have already proved our superiority in sophisticated instrumentality in this field. Our moon shot with its thousands of pictures of the moon's surface proved our superiority.

Psychologically, to put a man or men on the moon first may give us great satisfaction. But scientifically, according to the testimony before the Senate Appropriations Commmittee for fiscal year 1965, it was admitted that some of the severest criticism of this manned attempt comes from the scientific community. Some scientists contend

that far more scientific data could be obtained by instruments than through a manned vehicle.

The testimony also brought out that we are spending about one-twentieth of our national budget on space.

Mr. James E. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, said that if unmanned, fully instrumented space vehicles were used, there would be a savings of $2 billion on the cost of the manned capsule.

Space exploration must and will come. But what priority should be applied to it within the total national effort?

In 1963, in a study on space exploration by the Senate Republican Policy Committee staff, titled "A Matter of Priority," it was stated that no fruitful discussion could be held unless the emotional trappings, the verbal excesses, were removed. It was stated that a cold, careful examination was past due.

The questions were asked: Was it more important to have a man on the moon than to conquer cancer; a lunar exploration more important than conquering mental illness; lunar dust more important than the 17 million Americans we are told go to bed hungry each night; a path to the moon more important than a highway system free from the slaughter of thousands of Americans each year; or more important than seeing our children free of leukemia; or insuring an adequate water source for our great metropolitan centers; or making use of our stored natural resources?

The controversy resolves itself then to this—not whether man will ultimately reach the moon and beyond, but rather, how shall it be done, and whether other aspects of human needs should be bypassed or overlooked in the one spasmodic effort to achieve a lunar landing at once.

And what after that? Are we to reach further and further into space with manned shots so that there is no end to these astronomical costs beyond the period of 1970?

The 88th Congress has not mistaken glamor for sound, scientific inquiry. In both sessions the House and Senate have taken long, hard looks at the project, the result being a substantial trimming of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration budgets. Fiscal 1964's NASA budget was trimmed from $7.5 billion, as requested by the Administration, to $5.3 billion. The fiscal 1965 budget was further trimmed to $5,246,293,250.

It is still a question of priority. When we are spending one-twentieth of the total national budget for political and psychological reasons, it is time to stop, look, and listen as to what the end result will be.

ATOMIC ENERGY

This year the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, for the first time, reviewed the entire AEC budget, including both operating and construction funds. The hearings were extensive, lasting over a period of 6 weeks. The bill was reported by the Joint Committee without dissent and approved by a voice vote in the Senate. The House approved the bill by a vote of 340 to 3.

In general, the bill authorizes a total of $2.6 billion for operating expenses and plant and equipment for the fiscal year 1965 atomic energy program. This amount is $28 million less than that requested by AEC. The bill sets a ceiling on appropriations of approximately $60 million less than the appropriation for fiscal year 1964.

Approximately $2.3 billion is authorized for operating expenses under the AEC's 13 major programs, including a cooperative program with Canada in the development of heavy water reactors; the merchant ship reactors program; a flight test for the SNAP 10–A reactor; the physical research program; plant and capital equipment; and a commission with special authority to enter into arrangements with industry for the construction of isotope production and packaging facility.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

Under the euphonious name of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, more commonly known as the antipoverty program, the Congress gave a green light for the spending of almost a billion dollars the first year to alleviate poverty in this country. As is the case in many other Democrat programs, this first year cost will not reflect future costs. It is anticipated by some that the cost of this program may easily reach many more billions a year.

In testifying in favor of this program, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare stated the Government already has 43 programs which have "a direct application to poverty." If these 43 programs cannot take care of this problem then how can these additional costly programs—some of which duplicate existing programs—do any more? Why not make the present programs more effective was a question that was not answered. It is also interesting to note that the amount devoted in the first year to the "war on poverty" amounts to two-thirds of the cut in the Defense Department's procurement expenditures in the 1965 budget.

This law contains seven titles. There is a series of youth programs to establish a Job Corps, a work training program, and a work study program. Cost: $412.5 million. All of these are worthy causes but it remains in doubt that some of the training suggested will do much to prepare youths for jobs in this skilled market.

Then there are the community action programs on which $340 million will be spent. This presupposes that communities have not been doing their best to attract industries and jobs.

Next, there are programs for rural areas, including loans up to $2,500 to low-income families to help bring them above the poverty level. I am constrained to ask that if these people are now in such straits how are they going to be able to repay these loans? Thus there would be added another burden on their backs. And in connection with these loans there are loans of $2,500 to finance nonfarm, income-producing enterprises.

There are employment and investment incentives in the form of loans to small businesses up to $25,000 limit on more liberal terms than now possible under the Small Business Administration. It is cause for concern as to the wisdom of this since loans under the SBA are quite liberal in terms.

Then there are the work experience programs for experimental projects designed to stimulate States to introduce training programs for unemployed fathers and other unemployed persons. Here, too, unless good judgment is used these experimental programs could end up without actual usable work training given.

This whole program is headed up by an antipoverty czar under whom the administration and coordination of the program is placed. Since the program cuts across many Government agencies with already existing programs in the antipoverty field this could become quite a maze.

Then there is the policy declaration that an individual's opportunity to participate in the programs is not to be jeopardized by his or her receipt of unemployment compensation or public assistance.

The object of this law is to be commended. It is doubtful, however, that, under the circumstances, its object can be obtained. It would not be surprising to have a request before Congress next year for many additional billions to carry on this program with an ever-expanding Government bureaucracy. Already there are rumblings from various State Governors that they do not wish some of these programs in their States. Its success is to be hoped for and remains for the future to decide. And it is also hoped that the administration would make the existing programs more effective.

FOREIGN POLICY

One of the responsibilities of the party out of power in the United States is to lend its support to bipartisan foreign policy wherever mutual accord makes this possible.

The history of this Nation shows that when the party in power pursues a strong foreign policy there is strong bipartisan support for that policy.

Examples of this bipartisan policy are the Truman Greek-Turkish policy which the Republican 80th Congress supported wholeheartedly and the Eisenhower policies on Formosa, the Suez, and Lebanon which were supported by the Democrat Congresses.

However, on several occasions during the last 3 years we Republicans have been compelled to assert our mystification as to what policy we were being asked to support, whether, indeed, there was any policy at all. And since Mr. Johnson assumed the Presidency, the mystery has deepened.

The United States has drifted in its foreign relations and has suffered one setback after another. Instead of acting in the field of foreign policy under a firm program, we have been reacting to each crisis, improvising as we have gone along, the consequence of which has been a steadily deteriorating position all over the world.

I need only mention the disarray of our relations with our allies in NATO, in SEATO, and CENTO. We have raised suspicions in the minds of our NATO allies by our unilateral trade with and concessions to Soviet Russia, then have demanded their cessation of trade with Communist Cuba.

Although the President has stated that we are beloved and respected all over the world, events seem to indicate otherwise. I might cite Cambodia which kicked out the American diplomatic mission and rejected further American aid in favor of Red China; Pakistan, cooling relations with the United States and conversely warming relations with Red China; Japan, with its increasing interest in closer ties with Red China; France, and its recognition of Red China; Panama, where Castroites helped to organize anti-American rioting; Peru where Communist-led tin miners kidnaped American officials and held them for ransom in the form of concessions to that country; Zanzibar, where Communists have seized power and endangered our satellite tracking station; Libya, which announced cancellation of American rights to airbases; the Dominican Republic, where U.S. property was set afire; Martinique, where U.S. property was smeared with black paint; Cyprus, where two bombs exploded against our Embassy; Ghana, where mobs tried to seize and destroy our flag. U.S. property suffered thousands of dollars in damages in Caracas, Venezuela, and money was stolen. Windows of our buildings have been smashed in London, East Pakistan, Brussels, Bulgaria, Somalia, and in dozens of other countries.

If our foreign policy cannot cope with problems of these dimensions, what happens when greater issues develop?

We, in Congress, do not contest the right of the executive department in the conduct of foreign affairs. Our Constitution gives that awesome responsibility to the President. But the Constitution also gives to the Senate the obligation to ratify treaties as proposed by the President.

Republicans have in the past and will in the future support the foreign policy of our

Nation—but, first, we must know what that policy is.

Since Congress must be called upon to appropriate the necessary funds to carry out all important aspects of our Nation's foreign policy, it must look carefully into the grants and aid through which this policy is carried out.

When we see this administration collaborating with Socialist and neo-Communist governments to the disadvantage of our allies, when we see American pilots shot down and American property expropriated or destroyed, when we see the administration publicly announcing that it limits our participation in the face of Communist threats and aggression, when we see the weakness of our leadership in the United Nations and unilateral agreements made with Soviet Russia, when this administration fails to gain concessions from Soviet Russia in return for such things as the wheat deal and then even subsidizes the prices of that commodity and gives long-term credits for it, then the charge of a weak and vacillating foreign policy can be sustained.

Now we are not only involved in Vietnam with the loss of almost 300 American lives through combat but are getting more and more deeply involved in Laos by refusing to stand firm in the face of Communist violations of the Geneva agreements. Permitting them to continue this practice merely gives them the go-ahead to further Communist penetration in Southeast Asia. We are confronted with the lack of a firm policy and confusion of opposing statements by the State Department and various officials of the Defense Department as to whether we are in for a long, drawn-out form of guerrilla warfare or are going to be able to withdraw our forces within a year or two. All is indecision and confusion.

It is hoped that a step forward was achieved in the lessening of tension by the signing of the partial nuclear test-ban treaty last year, which was designed to end nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in space, and underwater areas.

The long negotiations which brought even this small step were instituted under the Republican administration by President Dwight D. Eisenhower and his Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. This treaty cannot wholly prevent the spread of nuclear arms to nations not now possessing them, as witness France's nuclear arms program, but it does prohibit assistance by signatories to nonsignatories. A limited test ban treaty was first proposed by President Eisenhower in 1959, when the relative nuclear strength of Soviet Russia and the United States made a limited test ban desirable. However, the relative strength of the world powers had changed between the time of the Eisenhower proposal and the signing of the test-ban treaty causing some doubts to be raised about its ratification. The Eisenhower proposal did not envision a Soviet Union veto of every proposal by the United States for the peaceful application of atomic energy for such worthy purposes as diverting hurricanes, digging shipping channels and canals, and other so-called plowshare programs. The 1963 treaty does limit uses for peaceful purposes if the resultant radioactive debris would extend beyond national borders. Because of this limitation it makes it impossible to use atomic power to dig a new canal anywhere within Central America.

This treaty, although a small step in the right direction for easing tensions, does not mean the elimination of the hateful Berlin wall, the elimination of the Communist cancer in Cuba, the free unification of Korea, the cessation of armed conflict in Vietnam and Laos, nor the threat of Red China to India, Formosa, or Southeast Asia.

The citizens of the United States since World War II have provided over $100 billion from the public purse to assist nations all over the world to develop healthy, free societies. Hearings have brought out that too many of these funds were channeled either into the pockets of some of the ruling classes or put to frivolous uses. Because of this situation, Congress has looked very thoroughly into some of the grants and loans and has pared down many requests. To make sure that the world would know that all these funds come from the taxes of the American people or from funds borrowed on their credit, I proposed an amendment to the foreign aid bill to this effect and the amendment was accepted. In addition, Congress encouraged the investment of private funds for use in newly developing nations where the know-how of American enterprise would prove helpful in developing their own economies.

The Senate also consented to an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 expressing the sense of Congress that full investment guarantees under the act by those countries receiving aid would be regarded "as a significant measure of self-help by such countries improving the climate for private investment both domestic and foreign." It is hoped by such action the expropriation of American properties will cease.

Last year, in December, the Senate agreed to the conference report which set the foreign aid authorization at $3.6 billion.

This year, for fiscal year 1965, the President proposed a $3.5 billion foreign aid budget and it was approved substantially in that amount after attempts to whittle down the funds. The American people are becoming loath to use their tax money and credit to support nations who are now amply able to support themselves, or who accept our aid and then consort with the Communists to our disadvantage.

Because of the deterioration of our position in foreign affairs, Republicans think the time is here for a reassessment of American foreign policy. We cannot be expected to support an enigma. We cannot be expected to support an unknown program.

Republicans support a policy of strength—a clearly enunciated policy—and the sooner this Nation returns to such a policy the better will be our relations in the world.

GOVERNMENT FINANCE AND TAXATION

There is one record this present Democrat administration has made which has never been equaled by any Republican administration—and that is the size of the debt limit today.

When Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon asked Congress on May 25 to raise the Federal debt ceiling again, after setting another record in 1962 when two raises were approved by this Democrat-controlled Congress, our national debt reached an alltime high. Traditionally, Congress grants only one debt ceiling increase per year. However, under this Democrat-controlled Congress, there have been three increases in the debt ceiling within a period of a little over a year. As of April 30, 1963, the public debt was $303 billion. As of April 30, 1964, it was $308 billion. The Democrats have raised the temporary debt ceiling to $324 billion.

Although this present Democrat administration increased the debt limit by $39 billion since it has been in office, it is constantly reminding the public that it is an economy-minded administration.

It is of interest to call attention to the following comparison of the expenditures by Federal agencies under the fiscal year 1960, during the Eisenhower Republican administration, with the estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1965, under the Johnson Democrat administration, as compiled by the U.S. Treasury:

A comparison of expenditures by Federal agencies under Eisenhower (1960) and Johnson (1965)

[In billions]

	Fiscal year 1960	Fiscal year 1965 (estimated)
Legislative branch	$0.126	$0.179
Judiciary	.049	.072
Executive Office of the President	.056	.028
Funds appropriated to the President	1.764	2.533
Agriculture Department	5.419	5.815
Commerce Department	.539	.833
Defense Department, Military	42.824	51.200
Defense Department, Civil Functions	.902	1.192
Health, Education, and Welfare Department	3.403	5.853
Interior Department	.690	1.148
Justice Department	.258	.343
Labor Department	.549	.667
Post Office Department	.525	.475
State Department	.247	.382
Treasury Department:		
Interest:		
On public debt	9.180	11.000
On refunds of taxes	.076	.090
Other	.875	1.246
Atomic Energy Commission	2.623	2.735
Federal Aviation Agency	.508	.829
General Services Administration	.408	.578
Housing and Home Finance Agency	.309	.149
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	.401	4.990
Veterans' Administration	5.250	5.066
Other independent agencies	.224	.085
District of Columbia	.028	.088
Total by agencies	77.233	98.500
Less: Interfund transactions	.694	.600
Total budget expenditures	76.539	[1] 97.900

[1] Total includes nonagency expenditures.

Source: Treasury Bulletin, April 1964 (U.S. Treasury Department, Office of the Secretary), p. 5.

But that does not tell the whole story of fiscal and financial gimmicks. Total Federal outlays or gross expenditures in fiscal year 1965 will probably approach $150 billion. This total includes the spending of 76 public enterprise funds which appear in the administrative (or "regular") budget only on a net basis—and 314 trust funds.

These so-called public enterprise funds include such familiar enterprises as farm supports, certain Federal housing activities, and the postal service. Federal old-age and survivors insurance, the disability insurance trust fund, highway trust fund, and others are usually completely outside the administrative budget, but are included in consolidated cash budget totals. Thus the estimated $150 billion in gross Federal expenditures for fiscal year 1965 compares with an estimated $97.9 billion in expenditures in the administrative budget alone.

And there is another gimmick being used to bolster the posture of the Johnson administration and that is to tack on to the late President Kennedy's budget year, which ended June 30, 1964, large sums which would normally show up in later months. In other words, the deficit in President Kennedy's budget was obviously increased by the amount of Preisdent Johnson's budget cuts.

It is a certainty that the Bureau of the Budget has never been through a more trying period in the preparation of a budget than in adjusting from the requirements of the late President Kennedy to fit the demands of President Johnson when he took office.

In the normal course of events we receive the large budget document and the summary at the same time. This year the detailed budget was delayed by about 2 weeks in order to make the justifications tally with the budget summary as adjusted by President Johnson. It was clear that he sought to enforce economies in some areas, particularly

military procurement, in order to permit expansion of other programs, such as the antipoverty effort, without making the total dollars in the budget appear to be out of line. Specifically $1.2 billion was cut from military procurement, which bears a striking resemblance to the first year cost of antipoverty.

Many other adjustments have been made to absorb 1965 projects with money contained in the 1964 budget, and indeed many programs were deferred to fiscal year 1966 when there will not be an election-year scrutiny on the overall budget.

Ever since he took office, President Johnson has outspent President Kennedy. In every month, since December 1963, expenditures under the Johnson administration have been larger than those of identical months under President Kennedy.

The record shows that for December 1963 there was an increase of $717 million over December 1962. For January 1964 the increase over January 1963 was $479 million. For February 1964 the increase over February 1963 was $758 million; March 1964 over March 1963 an increase of $74 million; April 1964 shot up again over April 1963 with an increase of $340 million. In May 1964 expenditures of the Johnson administration under the administrative budget were $7.511 billion compared with $7.470 billion in May 1963, an increase of $41 million. Altogether there was a total expenditure increase of $2.4 billion in 6 months—or at an annual rate of around $5 billion.

In addition, the cost of new programs which are spread over other years must be remembered.

Over 95 percent of our national debt today was created under the 30 years of Democrat control of the National Government. It is admitted that much of this debt can be attributed to the cost of wars. However, the Democrat administration boasts of its planned deficit even in peacetime.

We needed a debt limit of only $300 billion to finance World War II. When the war was over this debt was reduced to $252 billion. Now the Secretary of the Treasury foresees not the present "temporary" ceiling of $324 billion but an actual debt of $325 billion within the next 2 years. And, this at a time when the Democrat administration boasts of the highest peacetime prosperity in history.

In the past 15 years there have been 11 Federal deficits. During this period the interest on the Federal debt has doubled so that that interest alone is now costing the taxpayers of this Nation $11 billion a year or the equivalent of more than 12 cents out of every dollar of taxes paid the Federal Government.

With a Presidential pledge for "prudence and economy" we find there was a deficit of $8.3 billion in fiscal 1964. Next year, there is a planned deficit of approximately $6 billion. Next, we find a planned debt approaching $325 billion in 2 years.

And there are no plans for either a balanced budget or a debt reduction.

Turning off a few bulbs in the White House is not going to put a fraction of a dent in this huge spending program.

The state of the national finances, despite present prosperity, is deplorable.

Taxes

The late President Kennedy sent to Congress a request for a tax reduction and tax reform law. For around 8 months the House worked diligently on this most complicated piece of legislation.

Finally, the bill, with more tax reduction than tax reform, was received by the Finance Committee of the Senate in the late fall. Great pressure was placed upon this committee to get the bill before the Senate so that its passage would make it possible for tax reductions to take place by January of this year.

The Finance Committee set right to work and had a bill prepared for Senate consideration in the first month of the second session of this Congress so that one of the first major bills to be considered would be the tax bill.

Then some wonderous things began to happen. Our Democrat friends have made a great issue of being the party of the common man. However, when it came to aiding the common man, they were noticeable by the absence of their votes.

First of all, there was the matter of education. All of us know that in this age education is a must. Every effort is being made to induce our young people to stay in school—to obtain as much education as they can—in order to become skilled in the field of their choice.

Everyone knows, too, that higher education today is four or five times as expensive as it was 20 years ago. Many families, particularly those with more than one child to educate, cannot afford higher education and if the child is to receive this education he must find a job somewhere to send himself through college.

A Republican amendment was offered to the tax bill to permit those boys and girls who are working to send themselves through school to take a tax reduction on their earned income up to $1,200 a year in exemptions in the case of undergraduates and $1,500 a year for graduate students as long as they are in college.

This amendment was defeated—not by the Republicans, every one of whom voted for the amendment—but by the Democrats who voted against it. Thus the student who wants an education to such a degree that he is willing to work and earn the money while he is going to a college or university is penalized and, if his parents cannot help him out, he is taxed on his earnings without the extra financial aid he needs at the time.

Excise taxes

There is no greater truism than that a tax once placed upon the people is almost impossible to repeal. The excise taxes are a case in point.

Many of these taxes, placed upon the people during World War II and extended year after year, are still with us. Not only are they visible taxes paid when the article is bought, but they contain taxes paid by the manufacturer at the source and added to the price of the article.

Republicans made an attempt to repeal a few of these more onerous taxes. In fact, every Republican present voted for an amendment proposed by me to repeal the excise taxes on luggage and cosmetics, and, in addition, to make tax free jewelry and furs costing less than $100.

The Senate finally adopted an amendment accomplishing this purpose and also cut taxes on cabaret admissions; reduced theater admission taxes; and partially repealed the tax on musical instruments used in school bands; and also removed the taxes on lacrosse, tennis, and ping pong equipment.

However, in conference the House was adamant against repealing or reducing these taxes and, with the deadline of July 1 around the corner when all excise taxes would have expired, the Senate agreed with the House. The only amendment agreed upon was that which provides retroactively for the deduction of nonbusiness losses arising from the confiscation of property by Communist Cuba.

A study is being made now in the House on the question of excise taxes. It is hoped next year that many of these onerous so-called wartime taxes will be repealed or reduced.

HOUSING

Once again Congress approved an omnibus housing bill, continuing until October 1, 1965, not only such housing programs as urban renewal, public housing, direct loans for farm housing, the Federal mortgage insurance programs, the open space program, community facilities, and housing for the elderly, but some more controversial programs. The cost of the housing programs for 14 months is $1.2 billion.

A substitute was proposed which, in effect, would provide a simple extension of the existing programs, for it was the opinion of many sincere advocates of housing programs that it would be wiser to continue the existing programs this year. A number of studies were underway in both Houses which would give better guidelines to the housing programs in the future.

It was felt by some that many controversial and new programs needed further study. For instance, it was felt that the committee took only halfhearted action on city building code enforcement requirements whereas a thorough study should have been ordered so that effective action could be taken in 1965.

It is true that many families displaced by urban renewal programs have suffered in trying to find decent and adequate housing, but in many instances this has been due to poor planning and administration on the part of the Housing Administration and the municipalities which have shown more interest in commercial activities. Spending more money will not alleviate this problem, but more consideration to the housing needs of displaced persons would go far toward meeting these needs.

Another controversial feature is the advance acquisition of land for community facilities. This could provide windfalls for those with inside information. It could also mean that land acquired for such purposes could no longer be desirable for future public works because of rapidly changing community needs. And it was felt that the provision for financial grants for urban studies could be postponed until there was more information available as to the need for this program.

Despite the need for housing legislation, over the course of the years it has become a kind of catchall and badly needs overhauling. It is hoped that when housing legislation again is before the Congress it will be looked into thoroughly; be made to do what it was first intended to do instead of trying to rebuild badly planned cities, building new towns, financing transportation, and granting "vacation allowances" for businessmen who are displaced by an urban renewal project. All of this is a far cry from providing housing for those needy and worthy people.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

The International Development Association came back to Congress for an increased authorization of $104 million in each successive year beginning with fiscal 1965—a total of $312 million from the United States, with other countries putting up the remainder of the $750 million in capital requested by the Association.

This money is lent to soft currency countries which cannot obtain credit through regular channels.

I feel it should be noted not only by the American people but by those who do the borrowing that the American taxpayer is paying for these loans.

With this in mind I evolved the so-called Dirksen formula which reads as follows—after the word "appropriate"; "out of funds supplied by the Nation's taxpayers or out of funds borrowed on their credit." This phrase was adopted by Congress and is contained in the act.

This bill was approved by the Senate early in the session. The House, on February 26, sent the bill back to the Banking and Currency Committee by a vote of 208 to 187

after critics charged that some of these funds might be funneled into Cuba or other Communist countries.

Finally, under White House prodding, the House was prevailed upon to act once more and on May 14 approved the bill by a voice vote although some Members complained that other IDA member countries were not bearing their share of responsibility in providing funds.

The bill is now law and it is hoped that it will serve its purpose and not be another futile, costly program to the American taxpayer.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Republicans have always stood for a sound defense in the belief that a strong defense is the surest means of keeping the peace and a sure deterrent against aggression by any nation or combination of nations.

There is little doubt the cold war which followed the hot war of the 1940's has been kept in its cold state because of our retaliatory capabilities.

It was during the Eisenhower Republican administration that the program of a strong defense was built up and accelerated. The so-called missile gap issue of the 1960 campaign turned out to be just what it was—a phony with no basis in fact.

It has been forgotten, perhaps, that under the Eisenhower Republican administration the concept of the intercontinental ballistic missile was developed—that the Atlas, Titan, Minuteman, and Polaris were developed.

Many of today's advanced strategic weapons systems are realities due to the foresight and imagination of the Republican defense team. Among them is the A–11 interceptor, a plane that can fly at approximately three times the speed of sound and can climb to an altitude of more than 70,000 feet.

But what has happened to our defense posture in the last 3 years? The Secretary of Defense testified before the Joint Atomic Energy Committee in November of last year that during the Cuban crisis the United States was caught terribly short of fighter and transport planes.

He also stated that there were not enough patrol craft and escort vessels and that we were also short of Navy and Air Force planes to track Soviet ships moving into the Western Hemisphere.

We have witnessed a difference of opinion between the Defense Secretary and the Air Chief of Staff over the reliability of missiles in replacing bombing planes. There has been an air of secrecy in regard to our defense needs.

Then there has been the controversy over the TFX fighter plane for both the Air Force and the Navy in which the Defense Secretary overruled his military advisers. The conflict-of-interest charges have not been clarified.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, in appearing before a House Appropriations Military Subcommittee, warned that Russia is catching up with the United States in military strength and urged immediate steps to develop a new manned strategic aircraft for use in the 1970's to provide a flexible response to attack. He also cautioned against overreliance on what he testified was a "muscle bound" defense system dependent entirely on intercontinental missiles.

The Democrat administration's claim that in the 3 years of the Kennedy-Johnson administration development of new weapons systems had averaged well over 50 percent higher than in the 4 preceding years is not supported by the record. When compared with the two Eisenhower terms with a total of 47 new starts, the Kennedy-Johnson record shows only 7 new programs, all of which were nonstrategic systems. In his report, Secretary of Defense McNamara used the Nike X, which is a follow-on of the Nike-Zeus, as a new system. This is similar to claiming a brand new weapons system every time the model numbers are changed.

The President, on a "nonpolitical" tour to the West, announced in Sacramento, Calif., that new antisatellite and radar systems had been developed. He stated that the systems were operational. The antisatellite system would, the President stated, knock out any hostile satellite sent in our direction. The radar system now, according to the President's statement, has overcome the horizon-limit and is now capable of detecting any missile launching wherever it might occur.

The President stressed the time limit, stating the new weapons were developed "in 1962 and 1963."

Defense Secretary McNamara, on September 18, made a particularly remarkable statement as to the cost figures on these two projects. He stated that the cost for the one Army and one Air Force operational antisatellite installations was $80 million. Then Mr. McNamara went on to state that the cost for a "whole family" of over-the-horizon early warning radar outposts was $50 million.

To go into this incredible assertion further, Mr. McNamara acknowledged that the Army antisatellite program is a "derivative" of the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile system that has been under development since 1957 at a cumulative cost so far of nearly $2 billion.

The space tracking system has been in place for a number of years, one part being the Vanguard program in 1957. "Spadats," the basic satellite detection network in use today, and the control system in Colorado which it serves, both date back to the Eisenhower administration. Therefore, the claim of this Democrat administration that the development of new weapons systems averaged 50 percent more than under the Eisenhower Republican administration does not jibe with the facts.

A study was made by Senator LEN B. JORDAN in which it was brought out that the United States will not be able to verify the ability of its hardened underground missile systems to survive close-in, high-yield nuclear explosions.

The study also revealed that Secretary McNamara stated that the Soviet Union has conducted tests with much bigger bombs than those tested in the United States and that "their technology is further advanced than ours in this very high-yield field." We do not know what the Russians did or did not learn from their high megaton tests and we know practically nothing about possible impairment of our system from the detonation of a large yield weapon.

According to U.S. Air Force records, the rates of successful firings of three major missiles are: Atlas, 68.8 percent; Titan, 72.2 percent; and Minuteman, 68.8 percent. Gen. Thomas S. Power, Commander of the Strategic Air Command, was quoted as saying that, "We have not tested any of the operational warheads in our inventory" and "unless you test the very thing that is in your arsenal, you are never certain."

All these are matters of concern to the Republican minority. If our defenses are being maintained adequately, then the Nation should know. There should be no paper curtain of secrecy and evasion. If we need further weapons of any kind to maintain our defense superiority, then every American, whether Republican or Democrat, stands ready to back up any program.

It is no time to subordinate our national security to political purposes. Our peace and security are not playthings in the hands of political experts. A candid statement of facts within the realm of security would do much to alleviate the uncertainty which now prevails as to our defense readiness in a world which sees brush fire wars all over the globe—wars which could accelerate into large conflagrations.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

The welfare of all our citizens has never been the prerogative of any political party. The difference lies in the approach to the problem.

When the original social security act was reported out of the House Ways and Means Committee in 1935, during a Democratic administration, it is significant that the minority report concluded with these views: "The minority membership (Republican) of the Ways and Means Committee has at no time offered any political or partisan opposition to the progress of this measure, but on the contrary, have labored faithfully in an effort to produce a measure which would be constitutional and that would insure to the general welfare of all the people."

In its approach to the general welfare of our elder citizens, the Republican Party has endeavored not only to increase the benefits and coverage, but to place social security on a sound actuarial basis. The aim has been to preserve the trust fund and to insure that the funds are more than sufficient to meet future obligations. This is still our guiding principle.

At the time the act was adopted, social security benefits, it was agreed, would not constitute a pension but would provide a floor on which private savings could be built.

As time has gone on, the various Congresses and administrations, both Republican and Democrat, have not only increased these benefits but have brought under the system many more millions of our citizens.

Then came the question of the ills of old age. Proposals to extend hospital insurance benefits to all persons covered by social security began to be made as far back as 1942. Periodically such bills have been introduced, specifically in 1942, 1945, 1950, 1952, 1954, 1957, 1959, 1961, and 1963.

Answering these needs, but still keeping medical care in the hands of the States which are nearer to the needs of the people, there was enacted into law on September 13, 1960, amendments to the act. The so-called Kerr-Mills program provided, among other things, grants to States for medical care for the aged individuals of low income—those who needed it the most. In all except 12 States, some type of coverage is provided.

It is a true medical care program for it provides that those States which participate may include not only hospital expenses but physicians' services, skilled nursing, and private duty nursing services; dental, laboratory, and X-ray services; prescribed drugs, eyeglasses, dentures, and prosthetic devices; diagnostic, screening, and preventive services, among other things. There are no dollar limits on matching funds by the Federal Government.

It is no secret that the Democrat administration has not pushed or publicized this program. Instead it has consistently pushed its socialized medicine plan, misnamed medicare. In reality this medicare program is a limited hospitalization plan with a deductible provision which would result in expense to the patients. It provides no medical expenses outside of routine medical care in the hospital itself. Physicians and surgeons bills must be paid for by the individual.

Despite these drawbacks, when the improved social security amendments came over to the Senate from the House, the so-called medicare program was added to it.

To take care of the additional cost of such a program, it was necessary to increase the social security payments by both employee and employer and also for those self-employed. Not only was the rate increased to 4.2 percent of earning but the ceiling

was raised from $4,800 yearly earnings to $5,400 in the House bill or to 5.20 percent by 1971 on $5,600 yearly earnings in the Senate bill. This constituted a maximum of $252.20 yearly on each individual. The rate on self-employed increased to 6.3 percent on the maximum of $5,600.

It was anticipated that the total cost of the program would be about $2 billion the first year.

Then the bill went back to the House. Realizing it did not have the votes to pass this so-called medicare program, the House sent the bill to conference.

The conferences finally could come to no agreement, therefore no action was taken on either increased social security payments or the so-called medicare program in the 88th Congress.

Thus those under the social security program were denied increased benefits due to President Johnson's insistence on including so-called medicare in the bill.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

After a tortuous journey of 4 years, the urban mass transportation bill was approved by Congress despite the objections of the majority of Republicans who felt that this was a problem more ably solved by the urban centers themselves. In the opinion of many, this was one more intrusion of the Federal Government into local affairs and the spending of unneeded funds in this time of huge Federal deficits.

Evidence that the Congress was reluctant to pass the bill is the history of this legislation. The first mass transit bill was passed in the Senate in 1960. No action was taken by the House. Again, in 1961, the Senate approved mass transit legislation as part of the housing bill. That legislation authorized mass transit only on a temporary basis and was concurred in by the House. Studies of experimental projects were made with Federal loans and demonstration grants throughout the Nation.

In 1962, a comprehensive mass transit bill was reported to the Senate; but Congress took no action on that bill, merely extending the temporary program for another year.

In April 1963, the Senate approved mass transportation legislation. It was not until the latter part of June 1964 that the House passed a slightly different version of the bill which was accepted by the Senate.

Now we have a mass transportation law despite the fact that last year the New York City Planning Commission proposed a municipal $547 million mass transportation program while a year earlier San Francisco approved a similar $792 million bond issue, and Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and other large urban centers have either approved multimillion-dollar bond issues or drafted their own plans for mass transit.

Although this new law authorized Federal grants in the sum of $375 million for mass transit over the next 3 years at the rate of $75 million for fiscal 1965, $150 million for fiscal 1966, and $150 million for fiscal 1967 for the purpose of helping to pay for building transportation systems and to buy equipment for such systems, only $60 million was appropriated for 1965, and nothing was appropriated for 1966 or 1967.

These Federal grants could cover up to two-thirds of that part of the cost of improved systems which is not financed by fares charged to passengers. Local communities would have to provide the remainder of the funds.

It is true that our urban communities have great need for improved mass transit systems but it is true also that our major metropolitan centers are the wealthiest in the country.

The money provided in this bill is only a starter. It may open the door to an ultimate expenditure by the Federal Government of $10 billion or more.

Economy in Government seems to be a forgotten word.

WILDERNESS

Legislation was enacted on September 3, 1964, to establish a wilderness preservation system which embraces 54 areas totaling 9.1 million acres. In the future, commercial development or exploitation of mineral resources will be forbidden on these acres. Another 34 primitive areas, totaling 5.5 million acres remain under Forest Service jurisdiction. Thereafter Congress can decide over a 10-year period whether these areas should be included in the wilderness preservation system.

The mining and mineral leasing laws were extended to these areas through December 31, 1983. As of January 1, 1984, minerals in the system would be withdrawn from development under the mining laws except for valid existing rights.

Land and water conservation

The Congress approved a measure establishing a Land and Water Conservation Fund to be used for improvement or acquisition of outdoor recreation facilities. The funds would come from Federal taxes on motorboat fuel, Federal fees at certain recreation areas, and proceeds from the sale of Federal surplus real property. It is estimated that $140 million a year would go into the fund for the next 10 years.

WHEN THE BUBBLE BURST IN CROCKETT, TEX.: THE ILLUMINATING STORY OF A SMALL TOWN THAT BELIEVED THE PROMISES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—AND WOKE UP BOTH SADDER AND WISER

(By Charles Stevenson)

Crockett is a town of some 5,350 people in Houston County, Tex. What happened there recently shows not only what can come about when Washington pours hundreds of millions of dollars into hastily contrived business ventures; it also illustrates how official secrecy is used to cloak official mistakes. The Crockett story is one of the most remarkable in the brief history of the Federal Government's Area Redevelopment Administration.

ARA was set up in 1961 to help depressed areas create new industries and jobs. Since then it has ballooned into a free-wheeling arm of government, ladling out lavish gifts and loans, and establishing a new order of politically entangled businesses. Frequently these Government-subsidized establishments make things very tough indeed for competing businesses which operate under our traditional free enterprise system. All this is done under ARA's broad authority, granted by Congress in an incredibly rubbery statute, to boost employment and prosperity. Here's how the program worked in Crockett.

WONDROUS INVENTIONS

Late in 1962, ARA introduced to the leading citizens of the town the president of a firm called Audio Electronics, Inc. His name was J. Paul Dawson, and he—with ARA's sponsorship—proposed to build a plant to manufacture, among other things, a wondrous new tape-playing, picture-projecting invention. Not only would the new industry create jobs and aid the town's limping economy; also, the people were to be allowed to buy stock in Audio Electronics.

On the morning of March 1, 1963, some 35 persons assembled at Crockett's County telephone building to hear the official announcement that ARA had approved Dawson's proposal. Among those present were members of the county's Democratic executive committee, local officials, and Benton Musselwhite, a lawyer from nearby Lufkin, who, as a member of ARA's National Advisory Committee, was lending his prestige to the project.

Presently, out of a loudspeaker-telephone hookup from Washington boomed the voice of RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, senior U.S. Senator from Texas, who had been one of the sponsors of the legislation establishing ARA. After complimenting Musselwhite for his efforts and congratulating the Democratic committee members for their participation, he said, "It is highly pleasing to me to be authorized from the White House to announce to my friends in Houston County that you are going to gain a fine new industry—one that will provide new jobs for 180 people, add new strength to your area."

The Senator outlined the terms: ARA had approved a loan of $382,649 to Audio Electronics to build its factory—a loan that would run for 25 years at 4 percent (a better deal than businessmen can get commercially). The firm itself would put in $147,173 in equity." And, finally, the people of Crockett would raise a public purse of $58,869 to pay for the plant site and provide the required show of local interest.

Inspired by the Government ballyhoo and Senator YARBOROUGH's loudspeakered assurances that the deal would "help spark a whole industrial revolution," the residents of Crockett eagerly set to work. Quickly they raised their share of the Audio Electronics kitty—some $60,000 in cash. Drawings of Audio's proposed factory of aluminum and tinted glass were exhibited at both Crockett banks. A banker and officials of the local development organization inserted in the weekly Courier an announcement that "Audio Electronics, Inc., is offering 1,300,000 shares of stock to Houston Countians at 50 cents per share." A separate column urged prospective investors to "hurry up," because there was a 5-day time linit.

DISAPPEARING SHOVELS

The construction contract for the plant was awarded, and Houston County Development Foundation Day was proclaimed for the ground-breaking on May 25, 1963. A crowd of 3,500 assembled. Senator YARBOROUGH and Audio officials flew in. Everyone seemed impressed with two large signboards on the factory site, a 40-acre tract bought with part of Crockett's public contribution. One sign, which carried the signature of the President of the United States, proclaimed: "We're creating more jobs for America." On the other was a painting of a vast, shiny factory.

Dignitaries took turns breaking the earth with six gold-plated shovels—four of which somehow disappeared after the ceremony. Then everyone adjourned to the city park for a free barbecue and speeches. Dawson feelingly gave credit to Senator YARBOROUGH as "the individual who more than any other man made the day possible." And, in his address, Senator YARBOROUGH said, "You have brought in a new industry, a new plant, new vision, new payrolls, new jobs, and opportunities for youth. Under the wise and beneficent provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act you are building for the present and the future."

Construction work was scheduled to begin 2 days after the groundbreaking. The day came—and nothing happened. At least 300 people who had been exhorted over the radio to come out for jobs milled around the site in disbelief. Next day, many returned. Still nothing happened. Days became weeks.

On June 28, State ARA Coordinator Ray Morrison got together with worried members of the county development organization at a meeting to which reporters were not invited. Afterward everybody was told that the project "is still in sound position" and that there was only a "temporary delay."

But nothing ever did happen. Although more than a year has elapsed since the ground-breaking, the costly site provided by the people of Crockett is still bare of any ARA building. Up to now, nobody in Texas has been able to get a full explanation of the mysterious collapse of the much-heralded project.

STOCK FRAUD

The facts are that, even as the ground-breaking ceremony was taking place, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission was conducting a stock-fraud investigation involving Visutronics Corp. of America and the arrangements whereby Audio Electronics was to manufacture Visutronics inventions. Two months later, the SEC asked a U.S. District Court to restrain Visutronics and "all acting in concert" from fraudulently representing that its inventions and patents were worth $1,500,000 to $2 million—and also from representing that the Audio products would be sold to the Armed Forces.

Subsequently, Federal Judge Roger D. Foley issued an injunction to halt the whole scheme. Yet for months after this court order, and long after collapse of the whole bubble, ARA continued to list the Audio Electronics loan as one of its approved projects and to claim that it was bringing 180 jobs to Crockett. The project was dropped from the ARA directory only after I personally asked why it was still listed.

The most mysterious facet of the whole affair is how and why ARA permitted the full prestige of the U.S. Government—including the White House and a U.S. Senator—to be placed behind a man like J. Paul Dawson. The simplest investigation would have revealed that he had a long record of legal difficulties. Moreover, throughout the time that he was negotiating with ARA for the Audio loan, there was pending against him in the U.S. District Court of Montana a $21,000 suit for stock fraud under the Securities and Exchange Act. (Last May, a judgment was entered against Dawson and a salesman-colleague for the full amount plus interest—in favor of a group of Montana and Idaho physicians and dentists whose funds had been accepted for help in manufacture of an electronic painkilling device.)

At the time of the ARA announcement and the festivities in Crockett, Audio Electronics shared quarters with another company in a small, one-story building on an outlying side street of Houston. It could scarcely meet its day-to-day cash requirements. A principal asset was believed to be its licenses for the Visutronics inventions. Yet if ARA had checked, the agency would have learned that the Visutronics president, billed as a scientific genius, had never gone beyond grade school and had been involved in bogus security deals in California. Moreover, it turned out that Audio did not have the necessary legal right to manufacture the Visutronics inventions.

VANISHED DREAM

Not only has Crockett's dream of a fine Audio factory vanished like the morning mist, but a number of citizens have been hurt financially. Because people believed that their Senator's "White House announcement" of the ARA loan to Audio guaranteed the firm's soundness, several Texans invested in it and lost all. One man dropped $40,000. A retired Air Force officer plowed in $7,000. On the day that the Houston Post carried a report that Audio "has received" a $382,649 loan from ARA, Dawson was able to persuade a trusting employee, a former Salvation Army captain, to turn over his life savings of $4,000 to "provide needed capital." He even induced a woman to lend $2,000 borrowed from a relative. "We assumed that our Government had investigated and everything was all right," the incensed woman says. "Wouldn't you?"

Which raises the obvious questions: Didn't ARA conduct any investigation at all? How was it possible for this agency to announce that Audio Electronics would post $147,173 as its "equity" to justify the big Government loan?

When I asked ARA for the answers, Donald W. Stull, special assistant for public affairs, wrote me: "Our attorneys advise us that title 18, United States Code, makes it a crime to disclose confidential information on an applicant's financial status." How about information that isn't confidential? "Our legal department advises us that it would be mechanically impossible to separate the confidential material from these reports, and that this would have to be done in order for us to stay within the law and protect the privacy of the applicant's business," replied ARA Deputy Administrator Harold W. Williams.

Indeed, the only explanation that I could get from Williams for the collapse of the Crockett project was that "the president of the applicant firm requested withdrawal of the application" for his loan because "he had been unable to obtain patent rights for products he intended to manufacture"—a withdrawal which in truth was suggested by certain Federal officials after I had begun to ask them questions.

Apparently the official ARA philosophy is that we taxpayers, who supply the money for this phase of the administration's war against poverty, will be happier if we are not exposed to the full truth.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I also ask unanimous consent that the major laws digest be placed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a later date and that the customary number be printed as a separate Senate document.

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

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, since we are on the eve of adjournment, I wish to say a particular word about my friend from Montana. There may be gentler people in the world, there may be humbler people, and there may be abler people, but if there are I have never seen in one man such an acme of these qualities as in the majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD.

In the years that he has sat in the seat of the majority leader and I have sat in my seat I have developed a deep and abiding affection for him. I know the burdens that he has carried, and I presume on occasion the minority leader has added to those burdens, not wittingly, but only in pursuit of duty as he saw it.

I salute him for the excellent service he has rendered in the 88th Congress. I hope time will deal gently with him and give him health and strength and shower him with all of life's richest blessings.

Then, Mr. President, I commit the supreme political heresy—and perhaps it ought not to be done—but I hope, if it is the desire and the design of destiny that he pursue his responsibilities in this body, that he will be back.

On occasions people have sought to entice me to come to the State of Montana to campaign. Mr. President, I am a rather rough character, and I have gone almost everywhere to campaign, and I suppose, in the manner of these new technological developments, I will be aboard one of the orbit schooners, if there is a constituency on the moon, to see whether we can get a Republican up there.

There may be other places in the universe that may some day be represented in the U.S. Senate. If there are, and if it is given to me as an assignment to go there and campaign for a Republican, I shall do it. But there are times when the heart speaks, and nothing else counts. So I wish him well, and I leave it there, because he has been a great leader.

There are all kinds of leaders. There is the imperious, arrogant kind who drives things through. Then there is another type, the humble type, like the Leader who walked along the shores of the blue waters of the Sea of Galilee a long time ago. That kind of leader leads through the sheer force of character and gentility. That is the kind of leader he has been. MIKE, I wish you well.

Mr. President, tomorrow, when we adjourn sine die, I may have many more things to say that may be pertinent, as we take leave of each other, because I am so hopeful that perhaps in the 89th Congress I can gain a few recruits.

I should not say this. I should not say that a Member is or is not on the floor, but I should like, as a great mark of respect, refer to our newest Member, from California, PIERRE SALINGER. I shall have my ear cocked on election night, because that will be a great contest in the State of my friend from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. I thought up what I believe to be a suitable sentiment.

I can only hope that on that night, as the votes are counted, George Murphy will be elected to the Senate, the band will strike up in Sacramento or Los Angeles or San Francisco, and that PIERRE will be there, and that the band will play, "Carry Me Back to Old Virginny."

There will be a contest in the great State of Indiana. I love our friend from Indiana, who is a Member of this body, but I would be a little entranced if on election night I should hear the sweet cadences of a Hoosier quartet sing "Back Home Again in Indiana."

There is a distinguished Member of this body from the State of Michigan. I love him like a brother. He is my chairman. But, I suppose whatever agreeable evil sometimes creeps into this feeble mind of mine might find some joy when our friend PHIL HART will be singing "That Is Why I Wish Again That I Was in Michigan, Down on the Farm."

Then there is our distinguished friend who sits in the rear row. I love him too. He is BILL PROXMIRE. His father and mother saw the light earlier. They are Republicans. They live in Illinois, I believe, and they vote for me. Would it not be wonderful, as we try to recruit on our side, if suddenly a great swelling chorus should move into a crescendo and sing on election night "On, Wisconsin."

Would that not be wonderful? "And stay right there."

I do not want to make an adjournment speech tonight. I really wished to pay tribute to my great friend from Montana, and also to express the hope that perhaps a kind destiny and some kind of genie will look with favor upon our friend. I hope that on the 3d day of January, when we reassemble here, we shall look around and see, in addition to all the old faces, a few new faces.

I say to you, Mr. President (Mr. WALTERS in the chair), that you will be the one voluntary retiree from this body, so far as I know. I paid testimony to you the other day because I have known you a long time. You have been a gracious citizen. You have been gracious to a part of my family and my grandchildren. You know them. They are in the land of "Estes the Bestest." So I come down there frequently, and you have been very kind. You deserve every choice blessing that a good destiny can shower upon you. You are a good person. All Tennessee knows it. I have heard about you many times in the years that I have gone down to the Volunteer State. I have always thought of that man from Arimathea, who claimed the body of the Great Redeemer. I have looked for a description of him, and all I found was "He was a good man, and just."

Mr. President, you have been a good man for Tennessee, for your friends, and for your country. Mrs. Walters has been good for them, too. So, as you leave this body and resume your business in that great State, everyone here will wish you well.

I shall probably conclude these remarks tomorrow.

So with that we can go on with the business of the Senate, if there be any business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the distinguished minority leader for the kind words he spoke about me. However, in all honesty I should point out that the record of this Congress is not the property of either the minority leader or of myself but is, in effect, the result of the joint efforts by all Senators on both sides of the aisle.

Unlike my distinguished friend, I look forward with pleasure to watching the return of Senators SALINGER, HART, HARTKE, PROXMIRE, and perhaps a few new Democrats. But only time will tell in that respect.

I do want the distinguished minority leader, my warm friend, my close friend, to know how much I appreciate what he has said.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN—EDITORIAL IN THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the spectacle of normally Republican newspapers and magazines announcing their support for Lyndon Johnson has become commonplace. Yet, nothing could have prepared us for the September 19 editorial of the Saturday Evening Post, a venerable magazine which throughout its long and colorful history has never before supported a Democrat. Its editorial, entitled "Why Lyndon Johnson Must Be Elected," must surely rank as one of the most incisive and pungent political statements of the year.

The distinguished elder statesman of journalism, Walter Lippmann, has amplified upon two aspects of the Post editorial, and the campaign in general, in two valuable articles. In one, he wrote of the contradiction in the Goldwater belief that a smaller, less powerful Government can sweep crime and violence from the streets, and all our obstinate foes from land and sea. In the other, he wrote about the Senator's foreign policy: "His idea of diplomacy is to deliver an ultimatum."

The editorial and the articles are well worth the time of anyone still in doubt about where his vote should go. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WHY LYNDON JOHNSON MUST BE ELECTED

A healthy, vigorous two-party system is absolutely indispensable to the survival of American democracy. Its proper functioning requires each of the major parties to put forth a man who is unmistakably and unquestionably qualified to be trusted with the incalculably grave and terrible powers of the Presidency.

In the presidential election of 1964, the two-party system has been seriously endangered. One of the great parties, the Democratic, has fulfilled its duty by putting forth a man, Lyndon B. Johnson, who has many flaws and leaves much to be desired, but who is unquestionably as well qualified to be President as any tried and tested leader the Democrat Party now affords.

The other great party, the Republican, has shirked and betrayed its duty by putting forth a man, BARRY GOLDWATER, who is manifestly unqualified to be President and whose unsuitability for this awesome responsibility becomes clearer with every passing day and with every feckless word he utters.

The two-party system has thus been endangered because this misfeasance on the part of the Republican Party has left the enlightened, the rational, the prudent, the responsible American voter no acceptable other choice in this election. He is not even given the option of an echo. He is given only the option of a question mark, of a man who is seemingly congenitally unable to say what he means or even know what he says, to say anything clearly or to hold the same conviction 2 days in a row. BARRY GOLDWATER'S tongue is like quicksilver; his mind is like quicksand.

The Post therefore urges the election of Lyndon B. Johnson as President.

It urges, even more strongly, the defeat of BARRY GOLDWATER.

We are confident that Johnson will make a good President because he already is a good President. In the 10 brief months he has held the highest office, he has shown an ability unmatched in this century to bring all the diverse and warring factions of Congress behind the enactment of positive, progressive, and needful legislative programs. In his greatest test as Commander in Chief—the attack on our Navy in the Gulf of Tonkin—he has acted with both the forcefulness and restraint which is required in the man who alone controls the ultimate weapon and bears all the fearful responsibility which that entails.

We are equally confident that GOLDWATER would not make a good President. He has not even made a good Senator. He has been in the Senate 11 years and not one piece of memorable legislation attaches to his name. He has been in its councils through the most momentous and revolutionary decade in the history of this Republic as we have strained every seam and fabric of our traditional habits and thinking to keep abreast of an age when all the supposed boundaries of man's environment are being broken, gravity defied, space penetrated, the moon reached, the riddle of the human cell being unraveled. Merely to understand, much less to master, this surge and change, heavy with unguessed new treasures of technology to increase man's wealth, has required and will require Government entry into areas never before imagined. But BARRY GOLDWATER has managed to live through this whole tremendous epoch with his face turned squarely to the past, his eyes closed, and his mind preoccupied with one—and only one—idea; somehow to shrink the Government back into the familiar and comfortably small proportions of his Arizona youth. BARRY GOLDWATER has left no mark in the Senate because, as he has truthfully declared, he sought to erase marks rather than to make them: "I have little interest in streamlining Government or in making it more efficient, for I mean to reduce its size. I do not undertake to promote welfare, for I propose to extend freedom. My aim is not to pass laws, but to repeal them. It is not to inaugurate new programs, but to cancel old ones. * * *" He is like the Cincinnati kettlemaker who, when first hearing of Kentucky Ironmaker William Kelly's use of air to make steel, exclaimed, "I want my iron made in the old way or not at all." His mind is surely not in phase with today's world.

GOLDWATER changes his "convictions" almost as often as his shirt. One day he is for abolishing social security, the next day for strengthening it, one day for giving field commanders control over nuclear weapons, the next day for restricting control to the NATO supreme commander. Many of his statements are inherently contradictory nonsense—e.g., to cut all Government expenditures, while expanding defense (which already takes more than half of every tax dollar spent)—like advertising a car that is bigger on the inside but smaller on the outside. Some of his statements, if they have any meaning at all, are rather frightening in the subconscious thoughts which seem to lie behind them, particularly those concerning his strange love affair with German prowess: "With all due respect to American military leaders, Germany would have won both world wars if she had not been badly led." "I think it was the Germans who originated the modern concept of peace through strength." This last remark prompted Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of Foreign Affairs, to ask the New York Times to clarify whether it was Hitler's or the Kaiser's "peace through strength" that GOLDWATER had in mind. However, it is always possible that he really had nothing in mind, as when he told reporters who briefly boarded his cruising *Sundance*, "I've thought for some time that talks with the Red Chinese might be profitable." He later radioed ashore that what he really meant was that the United States should be ready to threaten the Chinese, telling them that "if they didn't stop, then you would blow up a bridge or some other sort of force." He finally cleared everything up by adding, "I'm not really recommending this, but it might not be an impossible idea."

GOLDWATER is a grotesque burlesque of the conservative he pretends to be. He is a wild man, a stray, an unprincipled and ruthless

political jujitsu artist like Joe McCarthy, whose last-ditch defender he remained even when three-fourths of the Senate had voted to condemn their Red-hunting colleague. He still defends McCarthy, well knowing that he imputed treason to General Marshall and to President Eisenhower. He will not condemn the John Birch Society, though knowing that its leader, Robert Welch, has called Eisenhower a Communist agent. Yet, in order to get Eisenhower's vacuous blessing, GOLDWATER was capable of a tongue-in-cheek erasure of his infamous "extremism" slogan, a statement that was not written in haste but with extreme care, and gone over time and again by GOLDWATER before he uttered it. These words can, and should, forever symbolize the total fraudulence of his claim to be a true conservative: "Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice, and * * * moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue." That statement deserves to be the "rum, romanism, and rebellion" of this election, and BARRY GOLDWATER deserves to be defeated for it alone, no matter how much he tries to clown it away. He knew what he meant by it, and so does every John Birch fanatic and Ku Klux vigilante.

For the good of the Republican Party, which his candidacy disgraces, we hope that GOLDWATER is crushingly defeated. It was clear, from poll after poll, that the rank and file of Republican voters overwhelmingly preferred other leaders to GOLDWATER. It was equally clear that the fanatical GOLDWATER bias of a majority of convention delegates revealed the capture of the Republican Party by a new breed of so-called leaders whose selection had been steamrollered by extremist, well-heeled types. The men who have most deserved to lead the Republican Party, by virtue of their long, distinguished, and responsible service in it, and to the country, have been made to feel unwelcome, hissed and hated in it, as they were repudiated by it. A crushing defeat for GOLDWATER will drive the fanatic saboteurs of the Republican Party back into the woodwork whence they came. It will provide the opportunity for the party's true leaders to build anew from the wreckage that these heedless, reckless, ill-mannered and arrogant men are sure to leave. Then the two-party system can be restored, and the voter will again have a choice, not a calamity.

THE HALLMARK OF GOLDWATERISM

(By Walter Lippmann)

Senator GOLDWATER has been telling the country that the President has become much too powerful and that this very powerful President has been much too weak to win the cold war and stamp out crimes of violence in our city streets. The Senator has based his campaign on the thesis that the powers of the Presidency must be reduced and that then a smaller and weaker President can and should do away with the most troublesome problems at home and abroad.

This central contradiction is the hallmark of Goldwaterism. The Senator finds it easy to believe that a smaller, shrunken, much less costly government can overawe the Communist nations jointly and severally, can command the Western alliance, and can put Latin America in order. In BARRY GOLDWATER's mind a cheaper government could act more strongly, a weaker government could see that the cities are successfully policed.

How, one must ask, can we run the world and yet pay less? The fact, to be sure, is that to do what Senator GOLDWATER wants to have done demands a much more powerful government than we have today. Why does he think it doesn't? The plain truth, I submit, is that he is a dreamer, that when BARRY GOLDWATER talks about public affairs, he lives in a world of fantasy. He dreams that all things are possible. For it is only in the world of dreams that weaker Presidents can do gigantic things, that great results can be achieved at little cost.

This unworldliness is a part of his personal attractiveness. In his world everything becomes possible when you have said that it should happen. There is no clash between the theories and the facts. The hard realities do not really exist. It was this boy who has never grown up fully who said the other day that when he was President he would install his ham radio set in the White House and would then be able to talk to a number of heads of state.

This unworldly divorce from reality is not always charming. Many dreams can be quite cruel, and when Senator GOLDWATER talks about the poor he can be very cruel. He has been making much of our common worries about the increase of crime and, exploiting this worry for political purposes, he has been claiming that he, BARRY GOLDWATER, can stop the crime which Lyndon Johnson is, so says GOLDWATER, promoting.

How is President Johnson promoting crime? By backing the Civil Rights Act and by sponsoring social security and welfare measures. These, according to Senator GOLDWATER's Minneapolis speech, are causing "a breakdown in private responsibility" and in "respect for law and order." The Senator asks that "if it is entirely proper for Government to take from some to give to others, then won't some men be led to believe that they can rightfully take from anyone who has more than they?"

This must be about the first time in 200 years that any public man has argued that charity corrupts the characters of the poor.

It is not only charity that is corrupting the poor. The search for justice is also corrupting the poor. The Goldwater theory about civil rights for Negroes is that by enacting laws about these rights the Negroes have been incited to demand these rights. According to one of his leading supporters, perhaps the most distinguished intellectual in the Goldwater camp, Prof. Milton Friedman, of Chicago University, the Civil Rights Act "has directed Negro resentment against whites."

Thus, it is not the grievances that incite the Negroes; it is the effort to redress the grievances.

The campaign has been underway only for about 2 weeks and it begins to look as if the real issue to be decided is not whether this or that policy or this or that piece of legislation is sound but whether BARRY GOLDWATER is fit to be President in the hard world of reality.

ON WARMONGERING

(By Walter Lippmann)

General Eisenhower says it is "tommyrot" to think that Senator GOLDWATER is a "warmonger"—that is to say, a man who wants to start a war. But does anybody say that BARRY GOLDWATER wants a war? I know of no one who says it, or thinks it. What is being said is that he is the kind of man who would be much more likely than President Johnson to get us into a big war.

This charge, which is affecting the campaign profoundly, is that Senator GOLDWATER's admiration of brinkmanship, his impulsive willingness to threaten nuclear war, could put this country in the position where the only choice left was between surrender and nuclear war. It is not that BARRY GOLDWATER wants to have a war; it is that he denounces every alternative to war as surrender, appeasement, or cowardice.

The crucial fallacy of his military thinking and of his ideas about foreign policy is the assumption that the United States must be and will be obeyed by all the rest of the world, by its adversaries, its rivals, its allies. Here again is that unreason of the dreamer: the illusion of superman that all opponents can be commanded to disappear. Of course, the Senator does not want a war. But he is suffering from that most dangerous of all the illusions of a statesman, the illusion of omnipotence.

Thus, if one studies his remarks on foreign policy, one finds that his idea of diplomacy is to deliver an ultimatum. If what he means is what he says, he would solve all our difficult problems by issuing an ultimatum to somebody. He would solve the Vietnamese conflict by an ultimatum to Hanoi and an ultimatum to Peiping. He would get rid of the nuisance in Cuba by an ultimatum to Castro. He would remove the Berlin wall by an ultimatum to the Soviet Government.

He is at pains to deny that he is "trigger-happy," and General Eisenhower is now testifying that no one who has seen a war could want a war. But BARRY GOLDWATER is undeniably ultimatum-happy. And this makes him a very dangerous man. For there are powerful, brave, and proud nations which oppose us on various issues. A President who would conduct foreign policy by ultimatum is failing to realize that other people are like Americans in that, driven to it, they will fight rather than surrender.

This is the specific danger of Goldwaterism in foreign affairs: an instinctive and impulsive preference for the ultimatum rather than for negotiation. That is why, without intending to have a war, he would prove to be a precipitator of warlike crises and perhaps of the ultimate crisis of a war of annihilation. For him the outer world does not really exist: the foreigners who live beyond the seas are not other men with whom we must live on this planet but abstractions who will vanish if the President barks at them.

There has been no serious discussion about foreign affairs in this campaign. There is not likely to be. For the President lives in the daylight world and there he deals with Russians and Chinese and Germans and South Americans and Vietnamese and Cypriots, all of whom are very different and most of whom are very ornery. They all have certain things in common. In the daylight world the President knows that he did not create them. He knows that he does not own them. And he knows that he cannot command them.

But BARRY GOLDWATER does not live in the daylight world and he does not deal with real people, only with the good guys and the bad guys of superman's imagining.

REASONS FOR SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S CANDIDACY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, with the economy expanding at a rate nearly double that of 4 years ago, gross national product up more than $100 billion in that period, profits at an alltime high, and unemployment down from that of 4 years ago, is it any wonder that businessmen in unprecedented numbers support the candidacy of Lyndon Johnson? The exodus of Republicans to the standard of Lyndon Johnson has been so great that one writer stated that Republicans felt themselves duty-bound, as loyal friends of the free-enterprise system, to vote Democratic this year.

To students of finance, this comes as no surprise. One of the most respected of these observers is Sylvia Porter, whose articles are widely published. In her article which was published on September 11 in the Idaho Falls Post-Register,

she listed six major reasons why President Johnson is winning such widespread support from business.

Mr. President, I am sure that Senators and others in this country who are concerned with our economic health will be interested in what Sylvia Porter wrote; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that her article entitled "Free Enterpriser" be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Post-Register, Sept. 11, 1964]

FREE ENTERPRISER

(By Sylvia Porter)

The mass defection of business and financial leaders who have been lifelong Republicans to the Democratic presidential nominee in 1964 is without precedent in modern politics. Why?

At the heart of the phenomenon is not just the commonplace answer that these Americans fear what Senator GOLDWATER policies might mean. At the heart of the phenomenon is the fact that these men and women accept Johnson as a true conservative, a sincere defender of our country's version of free enterprise, a man who understands the crucial roles business confidence and adequate profits play in a prosperous economy. They are far more pro-Johnson than anti-GOLDWATER—a complex point demanding objective analysis.

Toward Kennedy's policies businessmen generally were suspicious, even hostile, for they distrusted Kennedy as a strong-willed, young intellectual adventurer. Toward the same policies under Johnson they are openly sympathetic, for they trust Johnson as a mature man of action you can do business with.

A profoundly significant fact inherent in business support of Johnson is that the Democratic administration of Kennedy-Johnson has done more for business than any other in memory.

In his book "The Free Enterprisers: Kennedy, Johnson, and the Business Establishment," published today by G. P. Putnam's Sons, Hobart Rowens pulls together the positive moves made in Kennedy's term. This partial list well may stun those who think Kennedy deserved his antibusiness reputation. Specifically:

1. A new investment tax credit and liberalized depreciation guidelines—both extremely valuable concessions to business which are giving multimillion-dollar relief each year to businessmen investing in plants and equipment.

2. A private corporation to operate the communications satellites—a step Rowen calls an extraordinary transfer to private hands of infinite wealth and power that might have been, properly, a public trust and evidence that the Kennedy administration was not trying to affect the basic division of economic power between Government and the private sector.

3. A reduction in transportation taxes and a program to reduce regulations on transportation—just two indications that the "essence of Kennedy's philosophy" was a free market economy.

4. The Trade Expansion Act—designed to help U.S. business expand exports to prospering European nations.

5. The biggest personal and corporation income tax cuts in history—along with stated agreement that if this fiscal policy restimulated inflation, the Federal Reserve System would be free to use monetary policy to put the brakes on credit and raise interest rates.

6. A long series of orthodox financial measures to protect the U.S. dollar, curb the outflow of gold—and reassure the central bankers of the free world that our financial policies were sound.

Since Johnson took over, he has added aggressive programs to control Federal spending, a crucial factor in business approval; unprecedented efforts to bring businessmen to the White House to help "in actually determining the economic future of the country"; pledges for future tax cuts, particularly excise tax cuts.

Rowen, an editor of "Newsweek," is a nationally respected journalist who has been reporting business news from Washington for two decades. He began this book almost 2 years ago and it's no political quickie. In fact, Rowen's intention was not to defend Kennedy's conservatism but rather to prod the late President into being bolder in fighting for his original goals of a new economic era.

But the man Rowen "wanted most to read it is no longer with us." Johnson has fully taken over, is inspiring widespread business confidence even while he strives for policies which will maintain this Nation's remarkably prolonged prosperity, curb poverty, and make a "great society."

Rowen did not write this book to praise the probusiness policies of Kennedy-Johnson. Yet the record he submits gives businessmen-for-Johnson one of their most powerful election weapons.

ANGUISH AMONG NATO ALLIES ABOUT GOLDWATER CANDIDACY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, at first glance, it may seem strange that the nomination of Senator GOLDWATER, a man who often praises the NATO Alliance, has done more to disrupt this alliance than any event in recent years has done.

Yet, having just returned from Vienna, where I served as a Senate observer at the eighth regular session of the International Atomic Energy Agency General Conference, I can testify personally that this is the case. The Goldwater candidacy is everywhere regarded with derision and dismay. The fear which has been aroused in Western Europe is understandable, when one considers that the NATO Alliance survives only because our partners have put their trust in the prudence and perseverance of the U.S. Government and of its head of state; the American President has ultimate power over the lives and defense of the citizens of the NATO countries. Our allies cannot be expected to trust a presidential candidate who in the past has so often announced for reckless foreign ventures.

Max Freedman has written for the the Washington Star two thoughtful articles which set forth some of the reasons for the anguish among our NATO allies about the Goldwater candidacy. As Mr. Freedman has correctly pointed out:

Senator GOLDWATER has found the fatal formula for dismembering NATO and destroying it. Europe's fears about Senator GOLDWATER are neither panicky nor unjustified. They are prophetic and right.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Freedman's articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

GOLDWATER'S POSITION ON NATO

(By Max Freedman)

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER has always praised NATO as the primary instrument of Western security. He has promised to work for its greater unity and strength. Yet the people of Western Europe, who would benefit from his cooperation, are the first to regard his possible election as a calamity to peace. How does one explain this paradox?

The explanation can be found in his concept of the alliance. His views on NATO are shared neither by the United States nor by our European allies.

He thinks of NATO almost exclusively in military terms. Even when he talks of an Atlantic partnership as he did in his acceptance speech at San Francisco, he is still thinking of Western strength organized in opposition to communism. He does not allow himself to think of NATO as an organization capable of growth and expansion regardless of what is done by Moscow.

After all his brave words about partnership, it is distressing to find him so grudging and cautious in his attitude to the current trade negotiations with Western Europe. Without economic cooperation there can be no hope of political unity in the alliance. Yet Senator GOLDWATER, when it comes down to hard bargaining, is more eager to be the guardian of American economic interests than he is to be the architect of Atlantic unity.

There is nothing wrong with seeking to protect American interests. Everything is wrong however with a policy which makes very little effort to reconcile these interests with the needs of the Atlantic alliance, especially when Senator GOLDWATER has spoken with such glowing emphasis of the importance of moving from an alliance to a partnership.

Our allies, looking at Senator GOLDWATER'S words and record, believe they are right in thinking he wants Western Europe not as a partner in freedom but primarily as an ally in the struggle with Russia.

This disquiet becomes more acute as they realize that he wants that struggle to continue and to grow still more menacing. He completely rejects the possibility of a truce in the rivalry with Russia, even though a final settlement may be reserved for a distant age. In fact, he wants us to renew and intensify the cold war.

He has suggested that the model for our relations with Russia should be our policy towards Cuba. Presumably we should isolate Russia diplomatically, organize a massive and pitiless boycott of Russian goods, cut off all personal relations with the Russian people, and work for the overthrow and destruction of the Communist government in Moscow. He has left us in no doubt that he would encourage every rebellious tendency in Eastern Europe against Russia.

Three things must be said about this strange policy.

In the first place, Senator GOLDWATER assumes, without evidence and in defiance of all experience, that Russia should submit meekly and docilely to this hostile American policy. If Senator GOLDWATER should ever become President and try to organize such pressures against Russia, we would at once move into a dangerous area of world affairs, with peace in the balance. For the tentative truce would be replaced by massive retaliation that would bring the greatest threat to peace since the end of the Second World War. It is a measure of Senator GOLDWATER'S understanding that he thinks he can treat Russia as if it were Cuba and get away with it.

Secondly, Senator GOLDWATER utterly fails to realize that the growing sense of freedom and security in eastern Europe is the direct result of the relaxed tensions with the Soviet Union. If the United States is to heat up the cold war, as he wants us to do, the first result of the new policy would be savage repressions by Russia in eastern Europe. And if he were to persist in encouraging the Poles and Hungarians and Czechs to revolt, he would be leading them into a tragic martyrdom without parallel in modern times.

Finally, there is absolutely no evidence that a single European member of NATO wants such a policy or would be willing to support it. Senator GOLDWATER has found the fatal formula for dismembering NATO and destroying it. Europe's fears about Senator GOLDWATER are neither panicky nor unjustified. They are prophetic and right. Senator GOLDWATER, with the alliance in ruins, would then proceed to goad and torment Russia into acts of desperation. This policy can hardly commend itself to responsible voters.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

GOLDWATER IMPUGNS U.S. MOTIVES

(By Max Freedman)

In his new book, "Where I Stand," Senator BARRY GOLDWATER has laid it down as the first rule of his foreign policy that the United States must always act within the restraints and unities of NATO.

"The crux of the problem," he said, "is our tendency, even our eagerness to negotiate unilaterally with the Soviet Union." And again he urged the United States to give "a pledge not to engage in bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union on matters that directly involve the interests or security of our NATO partners." What, if anything, do these words mean?

The NATO treaty was signed in April 1949. In the last 15 years there has not been one instance in which the United States negotiated with Russia behind the back of its allies, or bartered away their interests without consultation, or displayed any eagerness for unilateral negotiations and concessions that would compromise the position of Western Europe. Ignoring this record, arguing without proof, and making his own prejudice his guide and oracle, Senator GOLDWATER proceeds to attack the motives and good faith of American policy.

He has not condemned a specific policy. He has impeached the purpose and character and reliability of that policy. If Senator GOLDWATER is right, the United States, thinking eagerly of its own interests and setting them ahead of the interests of its allies, is unworthy of being the leader of the grand alliance. It is also incapable of being a good member of NATO.

A presidential candidate should have shown less eagerness to traduce his own Government by accusing it of being willing to betray its partners. When did President Truman or President Eisenhower or President Kennedy or President Johnson do anything that justifies this attack and vindicates this censure?

The most direct negotiations between Moscow and Washington concerned the nuclear test ban treaty, which Senator GOLDWATER opposed. Those negotiations had of necessity to be limited to the nuclear powers. France chose to remain aloof, but none could have been more enthusiastic about them than Great Britain. The other members of NATO shared Britain's enthusiasm and rejoiced to ratify the treaty. What is Senator GOLDWATER talking about? On general questions of disarmament, the United States, at Geneva and the United Nations, has always worked closely with its NATO partners. It has remained for Senator GOLDWATER to accuse the United States of bad faith.

Apparently everyone except Senator GOLDWATER has regarded the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 as a special case because of the need for secrecy and the compulsion to seek a swift solution. Yet even here the allies were informed at the first opportunity. Livingston Merchant went on a special mission to Canada. Dean Acheson reported to General de Gaulle. Ambassador David Bruce in London took a memorable initiative to win British support. West Germany was resolute and unfaltering in her admiration of President Kennedy's conduct of the negotiations.

The NATO council regarded the negotiations not as a betrayal of the alliance, nor as an assertion of America's eagerness to seek an accommodation with Russia, but as a defense of all free nations amid circumstances of unprecedented peril. Why does Senator GOLDWATER falsify this record and stoop to slapdash accusations against his own country?

The United States has neither coveted nor negotiated any special trading advantages for itself with Russia. That trade is negligible. The sale of wheat was a special case and NATO, unlike Senator GOLDWATER, welcomed it. The United States has persuaded its allies to have a more stringent list of strategic items of trade than they would have preferred. American influence has been persuasive in the alliance in preventing a general rush to provide long-term credits to Russia. Where in this record can Senator GOLDWATER find any proof that America has been going it alone or being a bad member of the alliance in seeking special favors for itself?

The security of Berlin is a matter so vital to the whole alliance that any threat to that city immediately produces a major crisis with full cooperation among all the NATO countries the urgent order of the day. Britain, France, West Germany and the United States are in frequent consultation on Berlin and the whole German problem. The NATO council has dealt with these matters on many occasions. Does this sound like a sneaky American policy?

Many of our NATO partners have a larger cultural exchange program with Russia than has the United States and they have had it for a longer time.

Genuine problems and urgent division now trouble NATO and they deserve careful scrutiny. But NATO is not helped in any way by this clumsy and cheapjack attack on the motives of American policy. Senator GOLDWATER'S criticism outrages the facts and insults the United States.

THE BALTIC NATIONS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the plight of the Baltic nations arouses the deepest sympathy and compassion in all of us. These small, defenseless states have been absorbed by a huge and ruthless neighbor, without regard to legal principles and without recourse to popular sentiment. Their continued subjugation by the Soviet Union is properly a burden on the conscience of freemen everywhere.

The Baltic States, like all of the satellite and subjugated nations around the world, will surely have their day of reckoning, simply because tyranny invites its own dissolution. In the context of the nuclear age, the dissolution may be more evolutionary than revolutionary, as events in Eastern Europe in recent months have seemed to suggest. But come it will, and we in the West must do what we can to speed it along.

One suggestion as to how this could be accomplished is incorporated in a draft resolution sent to me by Rev. Vaclovas Martinkus, of St. Casimir's Rectory, in Providence, R.I. Reverend Martinkus' resolution would use the great forum of the United Nations in an attempt to secure relief for the Baltic nations. His suggested approach might well be applied at some point in the future, and it certainly merits consideration. I do not propose to submit it at this late point in the session; but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as an exhibit at this point in the RECORD.

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

DRAFT RESOLUTION BY REV. VACLOVAS MARTINKUS

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas the select committee of the House of Representatives created by House Resolution 346, 83d Congress, to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics found that the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was contrary to established principles of international law; and

Whereas the United States of America has never recognized the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and continues to maintain diplomatic relations with representatives of the former free governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

Whereas there exists a strong and undivided world opinion to eliminate all remnants of imperialism and colonialism; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask the United Nations request the Soviets:

(1) To withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

(2) To return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish all Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the people of the Baltic States.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Assembly of Captive European Nations recently observed the 10th anniversary of its founding, at a meeting held at the Carnegie Endowment International Center, in New York City.

As Mr. Aleksander Kutt, chairman of the assembly, explained, that occasion, while not a joyous one, afforded "an opportunity to call the attention of the peoples and governments of the free world to the freedom aspirations of the

captive peoples and to their stanch resistance to Communist dictatorships that subjugate them."

These aspirations for freedom are worthy of profound admiration. Indeed, self-determination for the nations of east-central Europe is a goal fundamental to all who believe in the principles of a free world.

The assembly represents the following countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. To all those who yearn for freedom in these nations, tragically deprived of their liberties by Communist tyranny and dictatorship, I express my own admiration and my highest regard. May their wishes, which so coincide with our own hopes, become a reality.

THE COUNSELOR ADVISER UNIVERSITY SUMMER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, during the past summer, approximately 2,000 persons from 50 States participated in the counselor adviser university summer education—CAUSE—program conducted by the Department of Labor under a Manpower Development and Training Act grant. In 27 colleges and universities throughout the country, training was carried on to develop a trained pool of individuals versed in the cultural background, needs, and problems of disadvantaged youth throughout our Nation.

I am pleased to note that 17 Rhode Islanders completed the training, and are now prepared to enter careers of service to the less advantaged, by working in the various State employment services, the functions of which are being expanded to aid the many young people who are out of school, out of work, out of hope. These expanded services will take the form of youth opportunity centers throughout the country specifically designed to reach and help these youths.

In a sense, the CAUSEists manning these centers could be termed the first front in the war on poverty. They will be an integral part of the Economic Opportunity Act program, and it is hoped that they will be a part of a coordinated effort to reach our less advantaged youngsters.

I commend those who have joined in this effort. Two thousand trained counselors are not many, in a nation of over 190 million people; but the youth opportunity center program is a welcome step forward.

I have stated many times that we in the United States need to develop a national youth policy, for a program of carefully coordinated and effective programs to deal with all our youth. We should be equally concerned with young people who have no particular problems, as well as with the problem-plagued. Our vision should be directed toward the development of greater challenges and the building of wider opportunities, so that we may get the very best from our young people, and may offer them the most.

CAUSE and the youth opportunity centers, as the program expands, will do much toward the implementation of a national youth policy. We in Congress have passed the Economic Opportunity Act. We must now encourage efforts such as those of CAUSE, to insure its success.

APPROPRIATION FOR NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I express my very real disappointment that the funds for the National Council on the Arts, established by Public Law 88–579, have been curtailed in the supplemental appropriation bill and in the conference from $100,000 to $50,000.

In my best judgment, the $100,000 figure was too low for the proper implementation of the Council's work. The estimate presented to the Senate Committee on Appropriations by the Bureau of the Budget and Mr. Roger Stevens, the President's special assistant on the arts, was $125,000.

It would seem that the $50,000 now proposed would threaten to curtail most seriously the important work to be undertaken by the Council, on behalf of our Nation's cultural welfare.

Last December 20, the Senate passed the bill to provide for both a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation. The bill was made less comprehensive by the House of Representatives, which acted only on the concept of a National Council on the Arts, and eliminated the provisions dealing with the Foundation.

In supporting the acceptance by the Senate on August 21 of this year, of the House version of House bill 9586 as the best possible legislation in this area which we could hope to achieve during this session of Congress, I expressed my regret that the House had not seen fit to endorse the full contents of Senate bill 2379, which combined the Council and the Foundation.

I believe that the funds provided by the supplemental appropriation bill are wholly insufficient.

I urge the Members of the Senate, who, through this legislation, have taken the lead in seeking the betterment of our cultural welfare, to join me in supporting the concept that a further supplemental appropriation during this fiscal year for the National Council on the Arts be given every consideration at the earliest possible time.

Many of us have worked over the years in behalf of the provision of proper governmental recognition to the arts in this country, and in behalf of a Federal cultural establishment. Indeed, the concepts for the legislation I am discussing have been before Congress for some 87 years. It would be tragic if, because of a lack of appropriations, the Council should be given so little scope for its work and its efforts.

NOMINATIONS OF POSTMASTERS

As in executive session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I send to the desk the nominations of nine postmasters that have been reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I ask for their immediate consideration. The nominations have been cleared with the minority leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be stated.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this evening, it adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed the foreign assistance and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1965, after accepting the amendments of the committee en bloc and adopting two subsequent amendments.

One amendment was offered by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] which reduced the limitation on the use of aid funds for research purposes from $15 million recommended by the committee to $12 million.

The other amendment adopted by the Senate was proposed by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and provided for a reduction of $50 million in the contingency fund.

Final Senate action provided for $3,250 million for title I of the bill, the Foreign Aid portion, a reduction of $50 million from the amount recommended by the committee, and $412,077,000 for title II, the related agencies portion.

The Senate was recently informed that the bill that passed the Senate has now been approved by the House, thus obviating the necessity for a conference on the bill.

So that the record may reflect this action, I ask unanimous consent that a table which shows the appropriations

for fiscal year 1964, budget estimates for fiscal year 1965, the bill as passed by the House, and as passed by the Senate, which now becomes the final action on the bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1964, and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1965

TITLE I—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

H. Doc. No.	Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 [1]	Recommended in House bill for 1965	Recommended in Senate bill for 1965
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
	ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE				
240	Development grants	$155,000,000	$224,600,000	$204,600,000	$204,600,000
285	American schools and hospitals abroad	14,300,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	16,800,000
	American hospitals abroad (special foreign currency program)	4,700,000			0
	Surveys of investment opportunities		2,100,000	2,100,000	1,600,000
285	International organizations and programs	116,000,000	134,400,000	134,272,400	134,272,400
305	Supporting assistance	330,000,000	405,000,000	405,000,000	401,000,000
	Contingency fund	50,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	99,200,000
	Inter-American social and economic cooperation program	135,000,000			
	Alliance for Progress:				
	Development grants	80,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	84,700,000
	Development loans	375,000,000	465,000,000	425,000,000	425,000,000
285	Development loans	687,300,000	922,200,000	782,200,000	773,727,600
285	Administrative expenses, AID	50,000,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	51,200,000
	Administrative expenses, State	2,700,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
	Subtotal, economic assistance	2,000,000,000	2,461,700,000	2,261,572,400	2,245,000,000
	MILITARY ASSISTANCE				
285 and 305	Military assistance	1,000,000,000	1,055,000,000	1,055,000,000	1,055,000,000
	Limitation on administrative expenses	(24,000,000)	(23,500,000)	(23,500,000)	(23,500,000)
	Total, title I, foreign assistance	3,000,000,000	3,516,700,000	3,316,572,400	3,250,000,000

TITLE II—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE (OTHER)

	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
240 and 306	Peace Corps	$92,100,000	$106,100,000	$87,100,000	$87,100,000
	Reappropriation			(17,000,000)	(17,000,000)
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS				
	Ryukyu Islands, Army, administration	10,000,000	14,441,000	14,441,000	14,441,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	Assistance to refugees in the United States	39,717,137	45,400,000	45,400,000	34,800,000
	Reappropriation				(7,600,000)
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE				
	Migrants and refugees	10,550,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
	Inter-American Development Bank	50,000,000	205,880,000	205,880,000	205,880,000
	International Development Association	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000
	Total, title II, foreign assistance (other)	264,023,137	441,677,000	422,677,000	412,077,000

TITLE III—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

	Limitation on operating expenses	($1,314,366,000)	($1,350,060,000)	($1,350,060,000)	($1,350,060,000)
240	Limitation on administrative expenses	(3,500,000)	(3,781,000)	(3,781,000)	(3,781,000)
	Total, title III, Export-Import Bank	(1,317,866,000)	(1,353,841,000)	(1,353,841,000)	(1,353,841,000)
	Grand total, all titles	3,264,023,137	3,958,377,000	3,739,249,400	3,662,077,000

[1] H. Doc. 266, dated Jan. 21, 1964, unless otherwise indicated.

THE NEED FOR SEASONAL FARM LABOR IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, many of the farmers of California are confronted with a crucial and tragic problem: how to secure sufficient temporary farm labor to harvest their crops during the peak harvesting season. I am well aware that Congress has heard many of these arguments before and that the present administration and Congress have seen fit to permit the expiration of Public Law 78, the so-called Mexican labor program. This law will expire on December 31, 1964. Its expiration will work grave hardship not only on the farmers of my State but also on those in many other States of the West and the South. Its expiration will not stop the importation of foreign labor; it will only make such importation more chaotic with inadequate standards. Its expiration will be a blow to Mexican-American relations.

The uncertainties which its expiration will bring to the average farmer who needs a few workers to help him during peak harvest periods will mean a cutback in planting which will have a great effect not only on the agricultural economy of my State and other States but on industries related to that economy such as transportation, food packaging, and food distribution.

With the impending elimination of this law, California growers have intensified their recruitment efforts of domestic workers from other States. In cooperation with the University of California and a number of private manufacturing firms, the growers are also engaged in an all-out mechanization program for the major labor-using crops.

The crops which demand peak seasonal labor and which have employed the major portion of Mexican nationals include tomatoes, strawberries, lettuce, lemons, asparagus, snap beans, melons, sugarbeets, grapes, cotton, oranges, and celery.

Mr. President, I wish to analyze very carefully the needs of California agriculture for seasonal farm labor, the progress of efforts that have been made in mechanization and what remains to be

done, the extent of California farm labor protective legislation, and the need for additional legislation at the Federal level to bring the Nation up to California standards so that we can attempt to make a judgment as to whether or not there is a need for extension of the Mexican labor program.

THE SCOPE OF CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE

Mr. President, although California is the most urbanized State in America, it is also first in agricultural production. In *1963, the cash* receipts received by California farmers for the marketing of their produce totaled $3,495,900,000. Of this, Government payments represented only $32,200,000. Farm production expenses totaled $2,692,200,000. Thus, net farm income totaled $940,700,000. While cash receipts for farm marketing were more than in 1962, an increase of more than $48 million in farm production expenses resulted in less net farm income for California farmers in 1963 over the previous year.

In 1963, the wages paid to all workers employed on California farms and in food packing and processing plants totaled $2.07 billion. Wages paid to domestic workers accounted for $1.99 billion of that total. Noting the earnings of all workers who were employed on farms in California during 1963, we find that they were paid approximately $644 million. Of that sum, foreign contract workers, primarily from Mexico, the so-called braceros, received about $73 million of that sum. This represents 3.5 percent of the earnings of all workers both on farms and in food packing and processing plants and 11.3 percent of the wages paid for on-farm work. Workers who come in under Public Law 78, the Mexican labor program, represent a small proportion of the total farmwork force, even in months of high labor need, which are May through October. But this comparison does not show the relative importance of the Mexican labor program to particular communities and for particular crops. A good example of the crucial importance of this program exists in the Salinas Valley. The Salinas Valley is centered in Monterey County. It is probably the lettuce center of the world. Agriculture is responsible for almost one-third of that county's adjusted gross income or $146 million in 1963. Crops requiring a high labor input, however, produced $115 million of this income.

Here, Mexican nationals make up about 40 percent of the total farm labor force, especially between May and October. During these months there is a peak demand for fieldworkers to harvest lettuce, strawberries, tomatoes, celery, and broccoli, among other crops. Thus while the use of Mexican nationals is a relatively small portion of the farm labor force for the State as a whole where much of the peak season need is met by hiring domestic farmworkers as the occasion arises, in the Salinas Valley this is clearly not the case.

The termination of the Mexican labor program will mean that Monterey County will have to somehow secure in terms of human or mechanical resources, a replacement for two-fifths of its labor force if it is to maintain its present level of farm production. This replacement is not a year-round requirement. This replacement is needed only for the period extending from May through October since there is no need for additional farm labor from November through April. Throughout the year, 2,000 of those who work in agriculture in Monterey County are the farmers themselves and unpaid family workers. Between 5,000 and 8,000 are hired domestic farmworkers depending on seasonal demand and the availability of students who are on vacation from school. The Mexican nationals vary between none in February to in excess of 11,000 in May and September.

I have dealt extensively with the situation in Monterey County because it illustrates vividly, I think, the degree to which the termination of the bracero program without an adequate substitute for this lost labor will affect some parts of the California agricultural economy.

Most of us know that whether it be in the Nation as a whole or California there is not one farm problem. There are many farm problems. This is true whether you are discussing the problems of farm commodity production or those relating to farm labor requirements.

Foreign contract labor in California is primarily employed in so-called stoop labor tasks. The need for this hand labor depends on the type of crop and the extent of mechanization in thinning and harvesting that crop. There are 12 crops which have been almost constant in their need for foreign workers. Between the years 1959 and 1963, according to the California Department of Employment, over 1,000 or more Mexican nationals were employed in each of these crops.

Mr. President, I ask consent that a table showing the number of Mexican nationals employed at peak activity, for these 12 crops, in California, in 1959 and 1963 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Crops employing 1,000 or more Mexican nationals at peak activity, California, 1959 and 1963

Crop	Number of workers employed at peak activity	
	1963	1959
Tomatoes	38,100	37,140
Strawberries	10,500	8,750
Lettuce	6,140	6,880
Lemons	3,530	7,240
Asparagus	4,890	5,780
Beans, snap	2,350	2,040
Melons, all types	3,720	2,370
Sugarbeets (thin)	2,670	4,120
Grapes	2,850	2,720
Cotton (chop)	1,700	2,900
Oranges, Valencia	2,889	3,400
Celery	1,610	1,610

Source: California Department of Employment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, some have said in the Senate that if the Mexican labor program were only terminated, then employment opportunities would exist for domestic workers who are now unemployed. Superficially, this is a very appealing argument. I am sure those who make it mean well. But such an argument makes as much sense as adding two apples and four oranges and saying you have six apples. Those who make such an argument are totally unfamiliar with the real needs of California agriculture or, indeed, the agriculture of any State where there is a great demand for field labor during the peak harvesting season.

An unemployed coal miner in eastern Kentucky does not want to move to California to work in a lettuce field as stoop labor. Neither does the unemployed automobile worker in Detroit, Mich. For that matter, the unemployed aircraft worker in Los Angeles does not want to move 350 miles north to Monterey County. Nor should they. Our Nation must face up to the need for expanded job opportunities in the industrial sector of our economy, not by relocating people all over America so that they might do seasonal farm labor, but by expanding the economic opportunities within the industrial and service sectors of our economy so that they might have year-round work. Let us not take fellow human beings and offer them only a few months work each year in the fields of California. What is to happen to them during the remainder of the year? Are they to become welfare burdens on the property taxpayers of my State? Does it make sense to encourage a nomadic way of life for even domestic farmworkers and having them roam the various States of the Union seeking employment with all the hardships that such instability and constant uprooting means to their families and especially their children, not to mention themselves? About the only people getting ahead in that type of operation are the ones who sell the migrant farmworker the gasoline for his car as he moves from town to town seeking a few weeks employment here and there.

MECHANIZATION

One possible replacement for the tremendous loss of field labor which will result from the termination of the Mexican labor program is increased and expanded mechanization. Mechanization in agriculture as it concerns thinning and harvesting—the two processes demanding great amounts of labor for short periods of time—is not merely a matter of building a machine to do the job. Mechanization in this sense often means a redesigning of the crop itself.

Using machines to pick cotton and harvest field grains was not a difficult problem. Engineers could construct mechanical devices to do the same tasks that were performed by hand labor. But with the attempt to mechanically harvest fruits and vegetables, a whole new set of problems arises. Often, the type of plant, fruit, or vegetable must be changed before a particular machine becomes practicable. This requires time and a great investment of research effort, not by individual farmers, who do not have the time or funds to finance such a large-scale undertaking, but primarily by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the great land-grant colleges and universities, such as the

University of California and especially its Davis campus.

Mr. President, the Division of Agricultural Services of the University of California has just published a detailed analytical study entitled "California Agricultural Labor Requirements and Adjustments." This report, prepared by Eric Thor and John W. Mamer, discusses at length the extent of mechanization in California agriculture. I should like to summarize some of this information for the education of my colleagues on a crop by crop basis.

TOMATOES

Tomato growers will be the most crucially affected by the ending of Public Law 78. They are the largest users of foreign labor in my State. Approximately 38,100 foreign workers were employed to harvest tomatoes during the 1963 peak period. This represented 85 percent of the total workers engaged in the tomato harvest. The on-farm value of this crop was $110 million.

Mechanical harvesting of tomatoes is feasible, according to the experts at the University of California, from both an engineering and an economic standpoint. Together, engineers and plant breeders in my State have been working for several years to develop a mechanical tomato harvester and, equally important, a variety of tomatoes that can be harvested by the machine.

A prototype was completed in 1960. In 1961, four machines were built and in operation. After further development, including changes in cultural practices, 25 tomato harvesters were in operation by 1963. In that year 5 percent of the canning tomatoes were harvested by machine. This year, it is estimated that 125 machines may be in operation. In addition to the University of California machine, two commercial harvesters are also under development. The university machine does not completely do away with the need for labor, but one person on the machine replaces about five in the field. The machine sells for $18,000. It is estimated that the cost to those who use the machine will not be greatly different from the cost of harvesting by hand. By 1969, these University of California experts believe that a large proportion of the California canning tomato crop will be harvested by machine. But 1969 is still 5 years away. Besides there is no machine in use or under development which will harvest the tomatoes which are sold in the fresh market.

STRAWBERRIES

The second largest number of foreign workers is used in strawberries. In 1963, 10,500 Mexican nationals were employed during the peak week in May. This meant that almost 70 percent of those who were employed in strawberries that week came in under Public Law 78.

While the acreage in strawberries has been declining, the yields per acre have been increasing. The only mechanization in strawberries has been limited to a machine which will transport workers down the row while they are picking the berries. The University of California experts believe that there "does not appear to be any possibility of developing a machine to harvest the present strawberry varieties grown in California." While noting that engineering investigation and research continue and plant breeders are trying to develop a strawberry plant which will subject itself to mechanization, the university experts conclude that "it is doubtful that we will see the harvesting of strawberries mechanized for many years."

LETTUCE

The third largest number of foreign workers is used in lettuce. In 1963, approximately 6,140 Mexican nationals were employed during the peak week in October. This meant that almost 80 percent of the total work force employed in the lettuce harvest during the peak period consisted of workers brought in under Public Law 78.

The on-farm value of the California lettuce crop in 1963 was $85 million. Almost 120,400 acres of lettuce were harvested that year.

In 1962, the University of California began its research effort to develop a mechanical lettuce harvester. An experimental machine has now been developed. As yet, the machine does not trim the head of lettuce but it will select, cut, and convey it in the field. Commercial testing of this experimental model will take place next year. It will probably cost $10,000 per machine. According to the university experts, if the harvest rate is 200 cartons per acre, the cost per carton of lettuce will be about 9 cents. The present labor cost to select and cut is about 7 cents per carton.

While the cost would be more expensive, the machine would replace about 10 men. This factor is, of course, important with the termination of Public Law 78. The basic problem, however, is one of time. It might well be another 5 years or even a decade before this machine is perfected and in the fields of my State and other States. In the meantime, how do we harvest the crop?

ASPARAGUS AND MELONS

This story can be repeated with the other crops which are heavy users of field labor. In 1963, 4,890 Mexican nationals were employed in the asparagus harvest during the peak week. The value of the crop in 1963 was almost $30 million. While some mechanized harvesting is possible here, the problem of separating the green and the white asparagus has not been resolved. Thus, effective mechanical harvesting is still many years off.

Approximately 3,720 Mexican nationals—about 44 percent of the work force—were employed in harvesting melons during the 1963 peak week. There was a $45 million crop that year. A melon harvester is under development but due to the difficulties involved and the necessity for the development of new varieties which can be harvested mechanically, it will be unlikely that such a harvester is commercially feasible before the 1970's.

CITRUS

There are three orange-growing areas in California. Only the southern California area employs Mexican nationals to harvest oranges. In 1963, 2,880 foreign workers were employed in the peak week. Great effort has been made to develop a mechanical orange harvester, yet still unsolved is the problem of removing the fruit from the tree without breaking the peel.

The same problem exists with regard to lemons. A total of 3,530 Mexican nationals were employed during the 1963 peak week of the lemon harvest. This represented 70 percent of the workers employed. It was a $47 million crop.

The university experts conclude that "it is highly doubtful that any mechanical equipment will soon be developed to harvest citrus fruits sold for fresh consumption."

GRAPES

Grape growers utilized 2,850 Mexican nationals during the 1963 peak week. The on-farm value of the 1963 grape crop in California was almost $158 million. With regard to grapes used for raisins and wine, some mechanization has been accomplished, but it is still in the experimental stage. Even when these machines are fully developed, they will not result in the elimination of seasonal labor. They might reduce it a little and a shift in the seasonal pattern will occur. At present the only solution to mechanical harvesting of table grapes will probably be the development of new varieties. Thus, mechanical harvesting of table grapes is many years away, while mechanization of wine and raisin grapes will probably not be accomplished to any great extent before 1970. In the meantime, who will harvest the crop?

SUGARBEETS

Sugarbeet thinning employed 2,670 Mexican nationals during the 1963 peak week. There has been a decline in the use of foreign labor for sugarbeet thinning since 1958 when more than 4,000 braceros were employed. The acres harvested during that period have increased by more than 50 percent. The 1963 on-farm value of California sugarbeets was $75 million. Mechanical beet thinning machines are available; however, they have not been widely accepted by the growers since there is a greater loss in yield per acre because of the imperfections which exist in mechanical thinning. A new approach is now being taken to resolve this problem and that is to develop a precision planter.

SNAP BEANS AND CELERY

Approximately 2,350 Mexican nationals were employed to harvest snap beans during the 1963 peak week. No harvester has been successfully developed to harvest pole beans. In New York, Wisconsin, and Oregon much work has been done on mechanical harvesting of a snap type of bush bean. California, however, has not shifted from the pole to the bush variety of snap beans because bush varieties are not of as high a quality as the pole variety. Yields are also lower with the bush varieties and the area in which pole beans are grown is not particularly suitable for growing the bush variety. Work is underway to develop bush beans that have the same quality and yield per acre as the pole bean varieties.

The celery crop in California had an on-farm value of almost $27 million in 1963. It is a year-round crop and thus

field labor to harvest it is required in some part of our State each month. In 1963, 1,610 Mexican nationals were employed during the peak week. While mechanical harvesting is available, such cutting lacks the flexibility of hand cutting and results in higher costs to the grower than does the hand method of cutting.

All of this will take time. In the meantime, who will harvest the crop?

COTTON: A DRAMATIC STORY OF MECHANIZATION

Cotton, in dollar value, is still California's leading farm crop. There were 732,000 acres of cotton harvested in 1963 for a total value of over $301 million. The story of mechanization in cotton is a dramatic one. In the last 13 years, California cotton acreage has increased from 581,000 acres to 732,000 acres, yet we now use 60,000 fewer workers during the peak period. A large number of workers are still employed in harvesting cotton. Hand picking, however, has almost been eliminated. The principal tasks requiring hand labor are thinning and weeding. Of the 17,660 workers employed in cotton during the peak week in June, about 1,700 were Mexican nationals. By the end of the decade much of this hand labor will be eliminated with the development of a precision planter and chemical control of weeds.

Mr. President, the story of mechanization of cotton is impressive, but it took many years of development. The development of mechanical harvesting equipment and practices takes time. Before a completely mechanized sugarbeet harvest was possible there came two decades of experimentation and development. The work on the tomato harvester—the crop demanding the most foreign labor—has been underway for some 15 years. The question still remains: In the meantime, who will harvest these crops?

Mr. President, there is no question that work in agriculture, especially field work, is hard work. The sun is hot. There is much bending and stooping. There is always a great deal to be done in a short period of time.

California has, by and large, faced up to the legislation which is needed to provide comparable protection for those who work on its farms similar to that available in the industrial sector of our economy. I would like to review the record of my State in this respect. I think more needs to be done. That will always be so as times and conditions change. I would also like to review what the Federal Government has and has not done to protect the farmworker. Much more needs to be done here, too. Perhaps then, we will secure an understanding of the actual conditions under which both domestic and foreign laborers work in California fields and we will be on the way toward deciding whether or not additional supplemental labor is required during peak harvest periods.

CALIFORNIA PROTECTIVE FARM LABOR LAWS

Farmworkers in California are covered by minimum wages for women and minors, by child labor laws, by wage payment and wage collection laws, by workmen's compensation, by temporary disability insurance, and by farm labor camp and contractor standards. Historically, State labor laws were promulgated to regulate the working conditions of employees in industry and trade. Originally, these laws were usually limited to specific types of places of employment or to enumerated industries. Many labor laws are still limited in this manner. More and more, these laws have been extended to cover general employment. All too often, however, these more general laws have excluded agricultural employment. Even where there is no specific exclusion and the laws are broad enough so that they could include agricultural labor, they may, in their implementation, simply not be applied to agricultural workers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table, prepared by the Bureau of Labor Standards of the U.S. Department of Labor, showing the coverage of agricultural workers under 10 major labor laws on a State-by-State basis be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

Coverage of agricultural workers under 10 major labor laws

State	Farm labor camp regulation	Farm labor contractor regulation	Transportation regulation	Minimum wage law	Child labor law	Wage payment law	Wage collection law	Workmen's compensation law	Temporary disability insurance law	Unemployment insurance law	Total number of laws in each State	State migratory labor committees
Alabama											0	
Alaska					X			X			2	
Arizona	X							X			2	X
Arkansas											0	X
California	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		9	
Colorado	X	X	X		X	X					5	X
Connecticut	X		X		X			X			4	X
Delaware	X										1	X
District of Columbia					X					X	2	
Florida	X				X						2	X
Georgia											0	
Hawaii	X			X	X			X		X	5	
Idaho	X										1	X
Illinois	X				X						2	X
Indiana	(1)				X						1	X
Iowa	X										1	
Kansas	(2)										0	
Kentucky								X			1	
Louisiana								X			1	
Maine											0	
Maryland	X				X						2	X
Massachusetts	X				X	X		X			4	X
Michigan	(2)										0	
Minnesota	X					X		X			3	X
Mississippi											0	
Missouri					X						1	
Montana	X										1	
Nebraska	(2)										0	X
Nevada	X	X									2	
New Hampshire	X					X	X				3	
New Jersey	X	X			X			X			4	X
New Mexico	X										1	
New York	X	X	X		X			X			5	X
North Carolina	X		X								2	X
North Dakota	(1)										0	X
Ohio	X				X			X			3	X
Oklahoma	X										1	
Oregon	X	X	X								3	X
Pennsylvania	X	X	X		X	X	X				6	X
Puerto Rico		X		X	X			X		X	5	
Rhode Island	X										1	
South Carolina											0	X
South Dakota								X			1	
Tennessee											0	X
Texas		(3)									0	X
Utah	(1)				X						1	
Vermont								X			1	
Virginia	X				X						2	X
Washington	X	X									2	X

See footnotes at end of table.

Coverage of agricultural workers under 10 major labor laws—Continued

State	Farm labor camp regulation	Farm labor contractor regulation	Transportation regulation	Minimum wage law	Child labor law	Wage payment law	Wage collection law	Workmen's compensation law	Temporary disability insurance law	Unemployment insurance law	Total number of laws in each State	State migratory labor committees
West Virginia	X		X								2	X
Wisconsin	X			X	X			X			4	X
Wyoming	X							X			2	
Total laws:												
Agricultural workers	30	9	8	4	20	6	3	17	1	3		27
Other workers	(4)	(4)	(4)	35	52	49	21	52	4	52		

[1] Advisory standards.
[2] Mandatory standards for certain growers.
[3] Limited coverage.
[4] Not applicable.
Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on the basis of this compilation the State of California is batting 90 percent with regard to protective legislation for our farmworkers. Only one other State, Pennsylvania, comes close to the California record. Pennsylvania has passed laws in 6 of these 10 areas. But let us examine the scope of these laws in more detail.

California and 29 other States have mandatory laws or regulations which apply to all labor camps or specifically to camps for migrant farmworkers. A 1963 California law declares that there is a need for farm labor centers to help assure a supply of agricultural workers when they are needed and gives local housing authorities the power to acquire and operate farm labor centers for housing persons engaged in agricultural work. Workers whose principal source of income is from farm work are eligible to rent housing in these centers.

California and eight other States have regulations applying specifically to farm labor contractors or crew leaders. California and four of these States expressly cover labor contractors, who for a fee recruit farmworkers. Under these laws the farm labor contractor is required to obtain a license, comply with certain records requirements, refrain from engaging in certain undesirable practices, and required to file bond.

California and seven other States have laws or regulations establishing safety standards for vehicles used in the transportation of farmworkers, and for the operation of such vehicles. Under the Eisenhower administration a Federal law was passed, as you will recall, which provides for the regulation of the interstate transportation of migratory farmworkers. The Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized to establish reasonable requirements with respect to the comfort of passengers, qualifications of operators of the vehicles, and safety of operation and equipment. These requirements apply to carriers who transport migratory workers for a distance of more than 75 miles and cross an interstate boundary line. The regulations issued under this law relate to protection of passengers from cold and the provision of meal and rest stops.

California and nine other States provide a minimum age for employment of children in agriculture outside school hours. In California the age limit is 12 during vacations and 14 outside of school hours on school days. California and 16 States have a minimum age for farmwork during school hours. In California the minimum is 15, except 14 under certain conditions. In addition to the State laws that exist, two Federal laws affect the employment of children in farmwork. Under the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, a 16-year minimum age during school hours is established for those working on farms whose produce is in interstate or foreign commerce. Under the Sugar Act, if a producer is to obtain maximum benefits, he may not employ children under 14 or permit those of 14 and 15 to work more than 8 hours a day in cultivating or harvesting sugarbeets or sugarcane.

California and only three other States cover all farm employment under workmen's compensation. Thirteen States have some workmen's compensation coverage for farmworkers, but exceptions as to coverage in terms of total employees and types of work are granted.

Only Hawaii has a minimum wage law which applies specifically to all agricultural workers including men, women, and minors. Hawaii sets a $1.25 an hour minimum. However, Hawaii only covers agricultural work in any workweek in which the employer has 20 or more employees. A 1964 Michigan statute provides that if an employer has four or more nonseasonal farmworkers, he cannot employ them for more than 13 weeks in any four consecutive 3-month periods at less than $1 an hour beginning on January 1, 1965. This would increase to $1.15 on January 1, 1966, and to $1.25 on January 1, 1967.

California and seven other States have minimum wage laws which are broad enough to cover agriculture, but these laws cover women and minors only. The rates are set by administrative order. The California wage order sets a minimum of $1 an hour for women and minors who are 16 and over, employed in agricultural occupations.

California and two other States have wage payment and wage collection laws which specifically apply to all farmworkers. In California, this means a semimonthly payday, unless the employee is boarded and lodged by the employer in which case he may be paid monthly. The employee must be paid promptly if he is discharged or quits. California also provides for the use of legal procedures by the State to collect back wages for employees in agriculture.

Only Hawaii specifically covers agricultural workers under their unemployment insurance laws, provided the employer has 20 or more employees in 20 weeks in the current or preceding calendar year.

Mr. President, in 1962, Congress passed the Migrant Health Act to improve the health care and health conditions for domestic migratory farmworkers and their families. I supported this measure in the Senate and in the Appropriations Committee. California has had an extensive program in this area to better the lot of our migrant farmworkers.

In the first year of the Migrant Health Act, Congress appropriated $750,000 for grant support under this act. In the second year, Congress appropriated $1.5 million of grant support. During the current fiscal year, Congress has authorized $2.5 million in grant support.

California began its migrant health program with State funds prior to the passage of the Federal program. Thus, in the second year of the Federal program, California received $483,004 in support and during the current fiscal year, California is receiving $536,911 in Federal support. To this, the State and counties are adding $336,638 of their own funds. The result has been an extensive and an excellent program. A State staff consisting of a full-time physician, pediatrician, medical social worker, sanitarian, nursing specialist, health education specialist, and research consultant actively aids the various county programs. In volume and quality, all responsible observers agree that California is first in this area.

In Fresno County, for example, the emphasis is on family health service clinics. Not only are sick people treated there, but immunization programs are undertaken as well. Nursing services are provided to the farm labor camps. A sanitation program is underway to educate both the growers and the farmworkers. A health program has been developed.

Other counties which have a similar program in varying degrees include Butte, Colusa, Kern, Merced, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz, as well as the city of San Jose. Sutter and Yuba Counties are just beginning this program. In addition, there are four counties conducting migrant health programs solely from State funds. They are Contra Costa,

San Bernardino, San Joaquin, and Santa Clara.

I have recited this rather lengthy summary of the laws which my State has passed to protect our farmworkers and their families to show that we have not been laggard in this regard. Indeed, Mr. President, I think it is safe to say that California has led the Nation in establishing protective legislation beneficial to those who work on our farms.

A NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL MINIMUM WAGE

What remains to be done is largely in other States of the Union and by the Federal Government. I have long advocated that a national agricultural minimum wage be established. I think it is unconscionable that those who work on the farms of America should be excluded from the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Congress, by law, has established that in the industrial sector of our economy there shall be a minimum wage for those who work in interstate commerce. Under the law we approved early in 1961, that minimum for all covered industrial and service workers will be $1.25 an hour by September 3, 1965. Yet, farmworkers will not have this protection. They should have such protection.

Let us look at the record. The three Pacific Coast States of California, Oregon, and Washington now pay, according to the farm wage rate statistics issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture on July 1, 1964, an average of $1.36 an hour without board or room to farmworkers. The six New England States are next with an average of $1.30 an hour; then come the three Mid-Atlantic States with an average of $1.20 an hour; next are the West North Central States and the Mountain States with an average of $1.18 an hour, then the East North Central States with an average of $1.17 an hour. However, three areas of the Nation average below $1 an hour, although some States within these areas have an average above $1 an hour.

Mr. President, I ask consent that a table showing the per hour, without board or room, farm wage rate as of July 1, 1964, as reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

Farm wage rates, July 1, 1964

State and region	Per hour without board or room
Maine	$1.21
New Hampshire	1.25
Vermont	1.24
Massachusetts	1.33
Rhode Island	1.40
Connecticut	1.40
New England States	1.30
New York	1.22
New Jersey	1.26
Pennsylvania	1.12
Middle Atlantic States	1.20
Ohio	1.14
Indiana	1.14
Illinois	1.21
Michigan	$1.12
Wisconsin	1.25
East North Central States	1.17
Minnesota	1.19
Iowa	1.25
Missouri	1.08
North Dakota	1.13
South Dakota	1.13
Nebraska	1.20
Kansas	1.24
West North Central States	1.18
Delaware	1.07
Maryland	1.09
Virginia	.88
West Virginia	.83
North Carolina	.80
South Carolina	.59
Georgia	.72
Florida	.95
South Atlantic States	.81
Kentucky	.87
Tennessee	.73
Alabama	.67
Mississippi	.62
East South Central States	.74
Arkansas	.80
Louisiana	.74
Oklahoma	1.07
Texas	.88
West South Central States	.85
Montana	1.20
Idaho	1.31
Wyoming	1.21
Colorado	1.19
New Mexico	.92
Arizona	1.03
Utah	1.33
Nevada	1.36
Mountain States	1.18
Washington	1.40
Oregon	1.31
California	1.35
Pacific States	1.36
United States	1.13

Farm wage rates, July 1, 1964—Continued

Source: Crop Reporting Board, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am concerned not merely as a Californian whose farmers must compete with produce from other States in eastern markets, but also as an American. The average farm wage rate per hour in California is more than twice the average farm wage rate per hour in South Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi. It is a third or more higher than the average farm wage paid in Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.

This is not right. It is an issue which the next administration and the next Congress and all of us must face up to if we are to bring some minimum level of economic support to those who work on our farms.

OTHER FEDERAL LEGISLATION

I mentioned earlier the passage of the Migrant Health Act. This was a great step forward by Congress. California, through its own prior efforts, was in a unique position to utilize this program and has done so.

I regret that the record of this Congress in other areas of farm labor protective legislation, beginning with the national agricultural minimum wage which I have already discussed, has not been as good.

I supported in 1963, as I did previously, legislation reported by the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor designed to improve the hard lot of what former Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell correctly described as "the excluded American"—the domestic migrant farmworker. These measures included S. 521, the proposed Migrant Agricultural Employees and Children Educational Assistance Act; S. 522, providing for day-care services for the children of migrant agricultural workers; S. 523, dealing with agricultural child labor; S. 524, the proposed Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act; S. 525, which would establish a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor; and S. 526, which would amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program to assist farmers in providing and constructing adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers.

These measures passed the Senate on June 10 and 11, 1963. They were referred to the responsible committee of the House of Representatives. S. 524, providing for registration of migrant worker labor contractors, which had originally been recommended by the Eisenhower administration, was approved on September 7, 1964, and became Public Law 88–582.

In the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the so-called antipoverty bill, the Senate authorized the Director of the program to develop programs to assist State and local agencies, institutions, farm associations or individuals in aiding migrant workers and their families in housing, sanitation, education, and day-care of children. Private institutions and individuals could receive only loans, not grants. In the House of Representatives, these provisions were extended to cover other "seasonally employed" farmworkers.

In addition, in the Housing Act of 1964, the Senate authorized a new $10 million grant program to pay up to two-thirds of the development cost of low-rent housing for domestic farm laborers. Applicants under this program were required not to charge rentals exceeding amounts approved by the Secretary of Agriculture and to maintain the housing in good condition. This is now part of Public Law 88–560.

The provisions of S. 523 which would extend the Fair Labor Standards Act to agricultural child labor and S. 525 which would establish a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor still remain to be considered and acted upon.

Thus, while the problem of improving the living, working, and health conditions of our farmworkers has been nibbled at, the basic unfinished business still remains; that of the farm worker's level of wages. Only a national agricultural minimum wage will be effective here. Again, I hope that Congress and the administration will face up to this issue.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, I have reviewed at length the scope of California agriculture, the particular needs of some crops for large amounts of supplemental labor for short periods of time, the extent of mechanization as an alternative to this supplemental labor, and the protective legislation for farmworkers at the National and State levels. What conclusions can be drawn from this?

In the first place, with present statewide trends in crop acreage and production, seasonal labor requirements at the peak of the season will increase, rather than decrease, in the years immediately ahead. With the exception of the canning tomato harvest, mechanization will not replace the need for temporary farm labor to meet this seasonal need during the next 5 years. The loss of seasonal labor will be particularly hard felt in such areas as the Salinas Valley where there is extensive lettuce and vegetable production.

The problem for the domestic farmworker is increasing. It is more difficult for such temporary farmworkers to obtain year-round employment in rural communities. With intensive cultivation the periods of peak employment are shortening and job opportunities during the off season are diminishing.

Earlier I noted the proposals of some who would import the unemployed from other parts of America to solve the California farm labor problem. This does not solve the problem. It does not end the unemployment of the individual concerned since he will not have year-round work in California. It does not guarantee the California farmer that he will be able to meet his labor requirements in advance since after paying for an unemployed person's trip to California, there is no way to require that individual to work a specified period on a farm.

What it would mean is encouragement for a nomadic way of life for some Americans. I do not believe this is wise public policy with all that such constant migration means to one's family and the children in particular. It will mean that young people largely go uneducated. It will mean that the property taxpayers of California would in all likelihood be required to support these seasonal farm families during the remainder of the year with welfare assistance. Those who have studied employment trends and patterns find that historically those that have come to California to work in agriculture work there only a short time and then migrate to the urban areas to seek nonfarm employment there. This would mean that California farmers would have to import new domestic farmworkers from outside the State each year. At the end of the harvest period, these workers would add to the unemployment problems which already confront us in our metropolitan areas.

In July, the unadjusted unemployment rate for the Nation was 5.0 percent. For California it was 5.9 percent. In the San Diego area it was 7.5 percent.

In farm communities, youth on vacation will not solve the grower's labor needs for the simple reason that much seasonal farmwork must be done at a time when most young people are in school. Strawberries and tomatoes, for example, are two important crops whose harvests are at a peak when school is in session. In brief, for these and other reasons, such as the distance of urban youth from the farm areas, it is doubtful that domestic recruitment of farm labor can be expected to replace fully the present need for foreign workers.

We have reviewed the extensive protection which California law provides for its farmworkers in relation to that provided for the farmworkers of other States. Only one State, Hawaii, provides unemployment compensation for farmworkers. The University of California experts have concluded in the study which I cited earlier that:

> Temporary farm labor has not, as a rule, been economically attractive to nonfarm-workers drawing unemployment insurance or receiving welfare payments. For example, a family of a man and wife and three children, in which the man is unemployed, may receive welfare payment of about $250 a month in the large urban counties. The worker may be discouraged as well by the possibility of delay in return to the welfare rolls once farm employment ends.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Workers in industries covered by unemployment compensation can receive a maximum payment of $55 per week. The State average unemployment payment in mid-1964 was $44 per week. For an unemployed worker from such an industry receiving the State average compensation, the cost of traveling to a farm job may very well wipe out the additional income from farm employment. In addition, while working on the farm, it is difficult for him to seek work in his particular trade or skill.

These experts conclude that it is not possible to predict the wage rate which would be necessary to attract workers from the nonfarm industries and from the welfare and unemployment rolls. Farm wage rates, just as prices received by the farmers for their products have tended to move upward at a much slower rate than nonfarm wage rates and the prices farmers pay for nonagricultural products.

Mr. President, on September 30, 1964, the Washington Evening Star carried a story of the action of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors announcing that those who were able bodied and on the local relief program would have a choice of working on the farms or getting off of relief once Public Law 78 expires. The supervisors provided that the minimum wage for such work would be at least $1.25 an hour and that adequate sanitary facilities and other acceptable employment conditions be provided. I ask consent that this article be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

NEW LOS ANGELES EDICT: WORK OR GET OFF RELIEF

LOS ANGELES.—The Los Angeles County relief program has been ordered changed to include this proviso:

"Work—or get off relief."

The county board of supervisors, which ordered the welfare changes yesterday, even has a type of work in mind: field hand labor.

Such work on California farms is now done mostly by Mexican nationals imported for the purpose under the State's bracero program.

Efforts to persuade unemployed persons to take over the work, at $1 to $1.25 an hour, have failed. The bracero program ends December 31.

Supervisor Ernest E. Debs said yesterday: "We have a lot of able-bodied boys on the relief program. They will not go to school or learn a trade. It seems about time to say:

" 'Either work or you will not get food.' "

The supervisors enacted a five-point program which one State official said sounded legal. A labor spokesman expressed doubts.

Supervisor Kenneth Hahn estimated the county will have 30,000 unemployed youths available to take over the bracero jobs when the labor-importation plan expires December 31.

The new regulations would make these requirements of employers hiring from relief rolls:

1. That adequate sanitary facilities and other acceptable employment conditions be provided.

2. That the minimum wage be at least $1.25.

3. That, if possible, steady employment should be provided.

4. Adequate transportation shall be provided to the farms.

5. Recipients of public assistance will not be required to work under unusual circumstances, such as illness or other difficult conditions in their families.

William Gilbert, director of the AFL–CIO Organizing Committee for Los Angeles and Orange Counties, demanded that the workers get "decent, guaranteed, minimum hourly, daily, and weekly wages."

He said that under present systems workers get $1 an hour and must pay $1.75 daily for board in places too distant for daily commuting.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the University of California experts have concluded that it is not possible to measure what effect higher wages would have in securing additional domestic workers to perform seasonal farmwork. If wages were raised in one area and not in another, one possibility is that farmworkers would be attracted away from areas where they are also needed. Thus, any increase in wage rates would have to be done on a statewide basis. Yet California is already paying at an average of $1.35 an hour, the second highest farm labor wage rates in America. The average for the State of Washington is $1.40 an hour. Thus, we return to the need for a national agricultural minimum wage.

The farmer is in pure competition. Hundreds and thousands of individual farmers, making decisions independently, cannot maintain high prices for their goods and pass their increased cost of production on to the consumers as can most of the larger corporations of America. In our industrial economy, a few major producers set the pace for the industry. It is true that where the major share of a crop is produced in California, cutbacks in our farm production might make possible higher prices. But, this will not help our farmers, or our country in the long run, since such an action would only encourage other States and foreign countries to expand their own production of that product. Once we have lost our share of the market, it would be difficult to regain it. It does little good in looking at our agricultural

production as a whole to advocate California farmers raising their wage rates, while other States and foreign countries do not, when we already pay the high level that we do.

As I said earlier, the shift in our State from agriculture requiring a seasonal labor force does not merely mean that our farmers will suffer, but it means that those workers in transportation, food processing, packing, and distribution, as well as many domestic and foreign consumers will also suffer.

The case of tomatoes is a good one. It is the crop which requires the greatest number of Mexican nationals since the harvest occurs primarily after our young people have returned to the classroom. I noted earlier that the on-farm value of the California tomato crop in 1963 was $110 million. Tomato growers spent $16 million just to grow tomatoes: for insecticides, for fertilizer, for fuel and equipment, for seeds and plants. This does not include their cost of labor.

Processors of the tomato crop, however, spent $70 million for the metal containers, $11 million for the glass containers, $1.8 million for the caps and lids, $12 million for the cartons, and $6 million for the labels needed to handle the 1963 crop. In addition, almost $22 million went to truckers to haul the tomatoes to packing plants and $32 million was spent on the transportation to get the packed product to its market.

There were 50,000 people employed by the tomato canners to process the crop. These are all Americans. No Mexican workers were involved. These employees received $45 million during the season for their work.

The total result was almost a $216 million direct contribution to the nonagricultural economy. Besides that the growers were paid about $88 million, which in turn went for farm labor, interest, taxes, and other products.

Thus, in California, the canning tomato industry amounts to a $300 million segment of our economy. This is what can be lost because an adequate substitute cannot be found for the seasonal labor which is now needed to harvest this crop.

Mr. President, our growers, in cooperation with the California Department of Employment are continuing their attempt to secure needed domestic farmworkers. But the extension of Public Law 78 is still justified. The director of the California Department of Agriculture, Mr. Charles A. Paul, in 1963, before the House Committee on Agriculture during hearings on the extension of Public Law 78, testified in support of such an extension.

I have reviewed the extent of mechanization and the problems of attracting domestic farmworkers. I now ask: In the meantime, who will harvest the crops?

In my judgment, Mr. President, I believe that there will continue to be a need for some foreign supplemental labor until almost total mechanization of fieldwork occurs. We have had the Mexican labor program under Public Law 78. I believe it has been a good one.

There has been a substantial reduction in the need for foreign labor based on the new methods which have been introduced to harvest such crops as cotton. When, with others, I successfully urged extension of Public Law 78 in the U.S. Senate on several occasions, I noted that I did not believe a single foreign worker should be imported into this country if it would adversely affect our domestic work force. I still believe that. That was the clear and expressed desire of Congress and the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951 between our Government and the Government of Mexico. Under Public Law 78 and that agreement we intended to regularize the use of foreign labor and avoid a "wetback" situation, as well as establish reasonable protection for those workers who came into our country as to prevailing wages, housing, sanitation, transportation, and other working conditions.

Before a Mexican national could be admitted, the Department of Labor, which is the agency responsible for administering this program, had to ascertain that there was no adverse effect on domestic workers. Some in this Chamber, without foundation I believe, have charged that Public Law 78 did affect domestic employment. If there was something wrong with the program it was not the fault of the Congress or the growers, it was the fault of the Department of Labor in administering that program.

Mr. President, the Mexican Government favors the continuation of the Mexican labor program. On March 20, 1963, I had the honor to serve as reporter for Committee III of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Meeting at Guanajuato, Mexico. There, several of us in the Senate and the House of Representatives sat down with our colleagues in the Mexican Congress and exchanged views on the problems of tourism, border trade, cultural exchange, and migratory farmworkers which confronts our two countries. All who were there assembled were unanimous in their support of the Mexican labor program.

We concluded:

Where American argiculture has been unable to obtain sufficient assistance in harvesting its crops from American citizens, Mexico, by agreement, has provided American farmers with Mexican nationals for temporary periods of time. We believe this is a good program, to the mutual help of both countries. Many of the problems involved have been solved. Others remain. There was unanimous agreement that the program should continue.

Illegal entry into either country ought to be prohibited by vigorous law enforcement. The problem of permanent visas was discussed. In its immigration laws the United States of America does not impose quota restrictions on Mexico, nor on the nations of the Western Hemisphere. While there were divergencies of view as to what action should be taken on the question of when permanent visas are for strictly permanent work, there was agreement that the matter should be studied.

Mr. President, the irony is that with the expiration of Public Law 78, foreign workers can still come into this country as a regular nonquota immigrant, under Public Law 414 which authorizes the granting of a permanent visa.

The Mexican Government has long been worried about this procedure, known as the green card program. Under it, Mexican farmworkers can emigrate to the United States to become permanent residents. These immigrants are admitted to our country on a permanent basis, when an American grower files a letter with our Immigration Service offering permanent employment to the Mexican worker and the Department of Labor certifies that domestic labor is not available.

There is, of course, no guarantee that the green card workers will stay on the farm. They are free to change employment once they establish residence here. All too frequently they move on to a metropolitan area and seek a job opportunity there, thus adding to the unemployment problems of our cities. The green card worker has no protection such as the bracero does who has a contract with his employer or the employer's association establishing wages and working conditions. In fiscal year 1962, 54,952 U.S. immigration visas were granted to Mexican citizens to enter the United States. It is estimated that at least 80 percent of these were former braceros who were now coming to America as green card agricultural workers. But, the green card worker cannot solve the grower's demand for labor needed only for a short period.

Mr. President, on September 24, 1964, the McClatchy newspapers located in Sacramento, Fresno, and Modesto, California, editorially noted that "California Agriculture Confronts Urgent Crisis." They urged continuation of Public Law 78 until a complete study could be made to separate fact from fiction as espoused by many groups who have a vested interest in opposing or supporting this program. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE CONFRONTS URGENT CRISIS

Signs multiply that California agriculture confronts a real crisis as a result of the impending lapsing of the law which permits the importation of Mexican workers to help harvest this State's $3.4 billion crops.

The Wall Street Journal in an excellent summary of this crisis shows the issue is moving toward possibly disastrous effects on the entire economy of California.

Agricultural leaders are concerned over the possibility that a reduction in crops may be the only answer to the farm labor bind. During the peak harvest month last year the braceros, the Mexican workers, numbered 61,000 of the 368,000 farmhands in the field.

J. J. Miller, manager of the Agricultural Producers Labor Committee, has noted that such big U.S. food concerns as the Campbell Soup Co., the H. J. Heinz Co., and the California Packing Corp. recently have built large plants in Mexico. While the companies generally say these plants are designed to serve Latin America, the fear persists that industry is going to Mexican labor if Mexican labor cannot come into the United States.

Certainly if a lack of stoop farm labor causes a curtailment of California crop production the economy of the whole State will

be adversely affected. The jobs of workers in the food processing industry will be directly threatened.

Labor unions and some welfare agencies oppose the bracero program. It is argued it takes jobs from American farm laborers and acts to depress the wages of these native workers.

The agricultural industry retorts it cannot pay the wages sought by the unions. It cites many failures of recruitment plans within America.

Despite the many studies of the bracero program one more should be made and the law should be extended until the study is completed.

This study, made in the chastening atmosphere of a real emergency, should determine what the area of compromise is between farm producers and the unions. These compromises should be weighed against curtailed crops, the removal of industrial payrolls, and other blows to workers and capital which would follow the shrinking of California agriculture.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I believe, on the basis of the evidence that I have reviewed at length, that there is a real and urgent need for the continuation of this program. I believe that Congress and the administration have done a real disservice not only to the farmers and related industrial workers of my own State but of other States as well by permitting this program to expire on December 31, 1964. I hope that once the national election fervor has subsided that we can then deal calmly and rationally with the very substantial issues which confront us in the farm labor area as we seek adequate seasonal labor to harvest our crops. This problem should be high on the agenda of the next Congress and administration.

Mr. President, I ask consent that various editorials and articles from California newspapers relating to the impact of the Mexican labor program on our economy be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 11, 1964]

CALIFORNIA'S CROPS WON'T WAIT

In spite of Governor Brown's optimistic assurances that there will be sufficient labor to harvest all crops in the State next year, California growers are becoming increasingly anxious.

Public Law 78, which authorized importation of Mexican bracero farmworkers, will expire December 31 with virtually no chance of congressional extension. And with the end of this program the future of half a billion dollars in crops, annually harvested by the braceros, is placed in serious jeopardy.

The Governor, therefore, must not wait until the end of the year to take positive action to protect not only those crops but the tens of thousands of jobs directly and indirectly dependent upon them.

Some crops will be ready for picking in January, and a number of growers are already talking of cutting back on planting that must be done within the next month or two. Precious little time is left for the necessary preparation of the ground, ordering of seedlings and arrangements for bank credit.

Although Brown this week reiterated his promise of adequate farm labor, he still hasn't clarified how that goal will be achieved.

The Governor surely knows that the stepped-up efforts of growers and State employment officials to recruit more domestic workers have been largely unavailing. Labor union officials contend higher wages are the answer. But the evidence indicates that whatever wage growers could pay within reason would not make this difficult "stoop labor" any more attractive.

The only short-term answer—and the words "short term" must be emphasized—is the importation of supplementary foreign labor through existing Public Law 414. Provisions of the law now allow the use of West Indians in Florida and this could be applied to the California manpower crisis if State and Federal agencies approve.

The climate in Washington already seems favorable for such action. But the Governor must take the initiative. The alternative would be a major disaster to California agriculture, the State's biggest business.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Aug. 23, 1964]

LABOR GUARANTEE NEEDED BY STATE FARMERS

California's multi-million dollar agricultural industry is in trouble. Its future is threatened by: Labor problems, tax problems, foreign competition.

Failure to find fast and adequate solutions to these challenges can eventually result in: Higher food prices for the consumer.

The conversion of some of the world's richest and most precious farmlands to tract homes and industrial development.

Here's the background. California's agricultural leadership is not based on strength in a single crop. It is represented in thousands of farms producing a wide variety of specialty crops.

Many of the crops are highly perishable and must be harvested and marketed on a timeclock schedule.

At the present time, most of the crops do not lend themselves to harvesting machinery. They require manual labor. Most are hand harvested.

While our Nation has more than 4 million unemployed persons, it does not have men and women who will do the kind of "stoop labor" required in our fields.

Repeated attempts to recruit satisfactory domestic labor have proved unsuccessful.

During the Korean war the Federal Government was petitioned to permit the importation of itinerant field labor from Mexico. Each year since then tens of thousands of the migrant workers have poured across the Mexican border.

After harvesting our valuable crops, these braceros—as they are called—have returned to their homes, richer in money and richer in experience.

Officials of this country, as well as those of our neighbor to the south have hailed the bracero plan as a good neighbor program of importance to both nations.

However, some union labor groups have consistently opposed the program. They have contended that American labor should be used for American crops.

Largely due to this pressure, the bracero program will be discontinued at the end of 1964. Federal laws must be changed to permit its continuation.

As a result, at this point, there is no labor supply on the horizon that will handle the California crop harvest in 1965.

Some of our own agriculturists—as well as Mexican landowners—have recognized the imminent threat to California agriculture and have developed vast farm areas just south of the Mexican border.

Mexican crops are now pouring into California. Sometimes at prices that depress local markets.

As this pressure develops, farmers are also faced with higher taxes that some claim are "confiscatory."

Appraisals—on which taxes are levied—are frequently boosted because of the adjacency to high-priced subdivisions and tract developments.

As a result, some owners are taking the position that they are being taxed at the same rate as real estate promoters and might be forced, therefore, to turn their rich soil over to bulldozers.

The picture is dismal. There is no easy solution. But—there is need for sensible action. And soon.

The tax problem should be carefully and thoughtfully researched. Some proper form of relief should be given those who maintain our farm lands and keep our California agriculture strong and vital.

The Federal Government should extend or reinstate the bracero program. We petition the Congress, the Governor, our Senators, and our Represenatives to move on this problem without delay.

The foreign competition can be beneficial. It can be destructive only if we aggravate the tax and labor problems of our own growers to the point that they are priced out of their own markets.

Action on points one and two is needed at once. Delay, and in the years ahead, California's agricultural strength will weaken and, perhaps, eventually die.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 16, 1964]

BRACERO LOSS PERILS STATE'S BILLION DOLLAR FARM INDUSTRY—NEARLY ALL CALIFORNIA COULD BE SEVERELY AFFECTED NEXT YEAR

(By Gene Blake)

California's $3.43 billion farm industry—and related business valued at $10 billion—is facing a crisis which could severely affect nearly every man, woman, and child in the State.

It will come next year if enough farmworkers are not found to harvest crops now picked by nearly 62,000 Mexican braceros at the peaks of the seasons.

Public Law 78, under which Mexican nationals have been recruited for temporary farmwork on this side of the border, ends December 31. There is no chance for another extension at the end of this year.

Growers say they cannot recruit American domestic workers for the "stoop" labor. They say they've tried, with the help of State employment departments here and across the Nation, but failed.

UNIONS DISPUTE GROWERS' CLAIMS

The growers' claims are disputed by some church, social welfare, and labor union groups, who argue that a domestic force could be obtained if better pay and working conditions were provided.

While the charges and countercharges and alternative proposals are bandied about, officials close to the situation are growing concerned.

One thing that worries them is that most Californians just don't care—because they are unaware how much their livelihood and California's entire economy depend on the State's farm industry.

For example, the Council of California Growers points out that one of every three jobs in the State rests directly or indirectly on agriculture.

SWELL TO MORE THAN $14 BILLION

California's record $3.43 billion worth of farm commodities in 1963—highest in the Nation—was three times the value of oil and natural gas production in the State.

As the farm commodities flow through the channels of trade, commerce, and industry, it is estimated by economists that the monetary effects swell to more than $14 billion.

Services of 312,900 workers, rising to a total of 406,300 at peak harvest, are utilized by farming itself.

But for every 100 employed in agriculture, another 263 are working in such closely related industries as canning, preserving, packaging, transporting, storing, and selling.

STEEL INDUSTRY INVOLVED

And there's more, when the chain reactions created by the farm industry needs are considered:

The steel industry annually sells 600,000 tons of tinplate for metal containers to California canneries. Glassmakers each year sell 1.3 billion jars, with a value of $54 million, to California food processors.

Thirty million pounds of low-density polyethylene are supplied annually by the plastics industry for use by California agriculture in items such as food packaging.

Paper products manufacturers provide 400 million fiber-box containers. About 40 million wooden containers, with a value of more than $15 million, are supplied for packing produce.

A million miles of printed labels are used by the State's food canners and packers each year. Food advertising in California amounts to over $125 million annually.

California farmers each year buy an estimated $2.2 billion worth of goods and services—labor, machines, petroleum products, transportation. California lending institutions provided California farmers with $734 million in loans in a recent year.

The estimated annual payroll in 1962 of agriculture-related business and industry in the Los Angeles-Orange County metropolitan area alone was well over $1 billion.

Thus it can be seen that nearly every Californian has a big stake in California agriculture—and ample reason to be concerned lest the crops wither and die for want of pickers.

Of course, not all the enumerated industries and jobs and income will vanish if there is no one to replace the braceros, for their numbers average annually less than 10 percent of the California farmworkers.

RATIO HAS DROPPED

The ratio has dropped from a peak of 15 percent in 1957, largely due to mechanization, growers say.

Major crops for which braceros are employed are tomatoes, strawberries, asparagus, lemons, lettuce, melons, sugarbeets, and celery.

Aggregate value of these crops in 1962 was $435 million, and it is estimated they gave a $1.74 billion boost to the State's total economy.

Western Growers Association estimates that more than 60 percent of the workers harvesting California's fresh vegetables and melons are braceros.

That industry annually accounts for 117,000 railway carlot shipments, 137,000 carload equivalents of truck transportation, 820,000 tons of ice at points of shipment alone, $10 million worth of petroleum products, $6.5 million in seeds, 156 million containers and 93 million pounds of fertilizers.

Investments of the fresh vegetable and melon industry include $34 million in packinghouses and equipment, $6 million in special harvest machinery, 17,500 trucks and 16,800 tractors.

TOMATOES CHIEF CROP

Tomatoes are the chief crop harvested by braceros, accounting for a $130 million product in 1962. Of the 43,700 workers in the tomato fields at peak harvest that year, 80 percent were braceros.

Without a sufficient force to harvest the tomatoes when they ripen, they would rot away under the blazing sun within days and the entire crop would be lost. Consider what the impact would be.

The California Tomato Growers Association reports that about 50,000 persons are employed in tomato canneries during the season.

Annual expenditures of the tomato growers, the association says, include $4 million for fuel and machinery repair service, $3.5 million for fertilizers, $3 million for insecticides and their application, $5.5 million for seeds and plants.

In 1962, tomato processors spent $70 million for metal containers, $11 million for glass containers, $1.8 million for caps and lids, $12 million for cartons, $6 million for labels, $12.8 million for trucks hauling raw tomatoes to plants, $32 million for shipping finished products to market and $45 million for cannery employees.

HUNT PLANT EXAMPLE

A lot of dry statistics? Maybe. But they mean food and clothing and shelter and perhaps even a few modest luxuries for thousands of human beings.

One example of a processing plant is the Hunt Foods & Industries, Inc., a $10 million complex in Fullerton.

It provides jobs for a permanent force of 1,400 persons, plus another 1,200 during peak production months. Its payroll averages nearly $500,000 a month.

The St. Regis Paper Co. in Fullerton devotes 85 percent of its production to agricultural needs, mostly for growers employing braceros. It utilizes $5 million worth of products annually, has an average annual payroll of $750,000, pays $300,000 for services and $80,000 in local taxes.

These are but a few examples of the industries that might be hit—with a resultant blow to the economy—should their raw materials or markets be cut off by a farm labor shortage.

Growers are working desperately on mechanization as one solution. But Dr. George B. Alcorn, director of the agricultural extension service at the University of California, says machines will not replace men for many years in most California crops now picked by hand.

The tomato harvesting machine is farthest along the development route and by next year might handle half the crop, Dr. Alcorn says.

It has taken 17 years to develop a modified tomato that can be harvested mechanically, due to the necessity of having at least 90 percent of the fruit ripen on the vine at one time. Each machine capable of harvesting about 100 acres a season is expected to cost at least $25,000.

MANY YEARS DISTANT

The citrus industry is spending $1 million on research in the next few years, but mechanical harvesting for citrus is many years distant. Mechanical harvesting of strawberries, asparagus, and celery appears to be about as far off.

Other prospects are 1967 for lettuce, the late 1960's for grapes, and 1970 for cantaloupes.

Meanwhile, California growers' fears of competition from Mexico and other States are mounting.

Mexico has doubled its irrigated acreage since 1950, from 6 million to 12 million acres. Since 1952, its exports of agricultural products into this country have increased 65 percent, from about $164 million to $271 million.

In Mexico, farm labor is plentiful and cheap—equivalent to about $1.50 a day compared with the average of $1.33 an hour in California.

California growers also are feeling the pinch of competition from other States, chiefly Texas, where the hourly rate is 84 cents. The national average is less than 95 cents.

WON'T BOTHER CONSUMER

The Council of California Growers has made no study of what might happen to consumer prices here if a shortage of farm labor develops.

"If Mexico fills the market vacuum, and apparently she has the capacity to do so, it may make little difference to the consumer," says O. W. Fillerup, executive vice president of the council.

"But it will make a big difference to the many thousands of workers employed in our agriculture-related industries—the packing sheds, the ice plants, the canneries, freeze plants, dehydrators, and truck and rail lines."

The Agricultural Producers Labor Committee, created by the citrus and avocado growers of California and Arizona, last fall set up the Farmers Harvest Association to recruit domestic workers.

During a 6-week period, with the help of the State department of employment, FHA recruited unemployed men in the Los Angeles area. They were assembled downtown each Monday and were taken by bus to grower association camps in the San Gabriel Valley and the Ventura area.

The most recruited in any 1 week was 39, and only 16 were still working at the end of the week, reported Dick Daniels, manager of FHA.

ABANDON PROGRAM

Thereafter, the number declined to such a point that the FHA and Department of Employment agreed to discontinue the program as being uneconomical.

In a nationwide search, 1,200 unemployed farmworkers were obtained from Texas, but less than 15 percent stayed through the harvest.

"They just came for the ride," one official says.

In all, during the first 6 months of the year, FHA recruited 1,879 domestic workers. Each worked an average of 70.9 hours, for a total of 133,280 man-hours.

But the number of working hours available for that type of labor totaled 8,389,440.

SEEK OTHER SOLUTIONS

And so, the growers are seeking other possible solutions. One may be a Senate bill which in effect would create an American bracero force. Another is a provision of the Immigration Act, which permits individual growers to contract for temporary or permanent foreign workers.

A section of President Johnson's $948 million antipoverty program approved by Congress last week may be of some help. It sets aside $15 million for attention to the problems of education, sanitation, child care and housing for migrant farmworkers.

Perhaps needed most at this point, however, is general public awareness of the crisis and its widespread impact.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 27, 1964]

"STOOP LABOR" MEANS LABOR ON THE FARM

(By Jerry Gillam)

Are you tired of your present job? Do you long to work outside in the fresh air instead of indoors? Would you like to go out on a California farm and pick cantaloups for a change of pace?

If the answer to those three questions is yes, you may be in big demand by the 1965 harvest season.

But don't get in line to pick cantaloups if you don't know what the job entails. It might kill you.

A cantaloup grower can lose his shirt overnight if enough good pickers aren't available when his crop ripens because the melons rot quickly if left in the field too long.

For this reason it is essential that the grower know beforehand that he can find pickers, that there will be plenty of them, and that they will work hard to beat the time element.

The Mexican bracero is at his best when it comes to picking crops like cantaloups.

This is so-called stoop labor. Its hard work, but the bracero doesn't seem to mind it, despite dust and heat.

The Western Growers Association estimates more than 60 percent of the workers harvesting California's fresh vegetables and melons are braceros.

A Federal law which permits importation of braceros to work in California fields, however, is scheduled to expire December 31.

This means that there will be a farm labor shortage that must be filled from other sources.

The braceros arrive at the cantaloup field about dawn in open trucks.

They fan out, long sacks slung from their shoulders, and start down the row behind moving trucks that drag long 2 by 12 boards from the rear on each side of the truck bed.

Scurrying along in a bent-over position like crabs, the braceros tell by color and feel which cantaloups are ripe and should be deposited in their sacks.

When a sack is loaded to weigh about 50 pounds, the bracero runs up the board on the left side, dumps the cantaloups, and runs down the board on the right side to start filling his sack again.

All this is repeated in continuous motion over and over again. The trucks don't stop except to turn down another row.

The crew boss sits atop the cab yelling at any slowpokes to go faster in Spanish.

For his work the bracero is paid by piece rate, but in no case less than $1 an hour. An average cantaloup picker can earn $200 a month.

He also is provided with free lodging and free round trip transportation from Mexico, and pays no more than $1.75 a day for meals.

The law specifies that the bracero must be guaranteed these things, plus protection by the Federal and State Government.

It also requires that the growers must exhaust the supply of local domestic farm help before they can turn to braceros.

Although the bracero accounts for only 10 percent of the annual total State farm work force, he is particularly active in stoop labor harvesting of highly perishable crops like cantaloups and tomatoes. Growers of this type of crop insist the scheduled demise of the Federal importation law will work a severe hardship on them because domestics will not do that kind of work.

Organized labor, a vigorous foe of the bracero program since it started, disagrees with this thinking.

It claims domestics can and will do the job if wages paid are high enough and working conditions are improved.

In the meantime, Governor Brown and State Employment Director Albert Tieburg have a knotty problem to solve before the 1965 harvest season rolls around.

The Governor recently promised the growers there will be enough labor, domestic or otherwise, to harvest the crops, without braceros.

But, at the same time, Brown admits, and Tieburg agrees, that the source from which this substitute labor will come is not clear, at present.

A section of the immigration law that permits individual growers to contract for temporary or permanent foreign workers may be the ultimate answer.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 31, 1964]

FEWER GROWERS HIRING BRACEROS, LABOR DEPARTMENT REPORTS INDICATE

(By Ruben Salazar)

There is a significant drop in the number of California growers who use braceros as supplemental farm labor, according to a report released today by the U.S. Department of Labor.

The Federal agency's 1963 report on foreign agricultural labor shows that only 6,122 California growers hired braceros in 1963, compared to almost 8,000 in 1962.

California Department of Employment figures list 35,000 to 40,000 California employers of farm labor.

The 6,122 employers of braceros hired 120,412 braceros in 1963 with 10,000 of them signing new contracts after their original ones expired, the Labor Department report said.

In 1962, California used 132,503 braceros and 10,000 also were recontracted.

The drop in the number of bracero users in California is mostly among those who use a small number of these Mexican nationals as farmhands, the Labor Department report said.

These were able to get domestic farmworkers during 1963, the report said.

The 6,122 California growers who used braceros in 1963 were mostly large operators in such crops as lettuce, tomatoes, strawberries and melons.

These large growers contend that the end of the bracero program December 31 will cause a critical labor shortage which could affect the State's economy greatly.

They say they have tried to recruit domestic workers without success, even though California pays a higher hourly wage than most States.

The Council of California Growers said mechanization is the chief reason for the hiring of fewer braceros in the last 5 to 10 years.

"It is obvious, therefore, that mechanization is already phasing out the bracero program on a gradual basis," council spokesman Cliff Schlegel said. "And many of our agricultural leaders believe that mechanization would, eventually, almost completely phase out this program.

"If allowed to proceed in this manner, they point out that it would be far less of a shock to agriculture and its related industries than a suddent termination."

The council also took exception to the assumption that the decline in the use of braceros in California is attributable only to smaller employers. What is happening, the council stated, is that many of the smaller operators, such as those with 2 to 5 acres in citrus, are selling out to the larger growers.

The U.S. Departments of Labor and Agriculture report that the July 1964 national composite hourly farm wage rate without board or room was $1.13.

California, with $1.35, was just below Washington, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, which paid $1.40 an hour in July.

LOWEST IN JULY

South Carolina with 59 cents an hour without room or board was the lowest for July.

The bracero program, which brings Mexican farmhands here under an international agreement and Public Law 78, is scheduled to end December 31 with no predicted chance of an extension.

One reason given by those opposing a foreign farm labor program is the high rate of unemployment among domestic farmworkers.

Users of braceros, however, say domestics will not perform "stoop" labor, no matter what the pay is.

The Rev. Richard Sample of the California Migrant Ministry, who for the last 4 years has been working with domestic farm laborers in the Fresno area, said Sunday:

"The basic issue is wages and working conditions. I see no evidence in our area that either the growers—whose main responsibility it is—or the Farm Placement Service, which needs to help the process, is doing anything to deal with these basic issues of just wages and reasonable working conditions.

"I know that domestic workers are there, ready and willing to work if they are given incentive. My own opinion is that the growers are consciously doing the very opposite thing—setting out to prove that domestics are unreliable, that domestics won't and can't do the work. This just isn't true."

The U.S. Department of Labor in its July report points out that June 1964, marked the 41st month in the strongest economic advance of the four postwar business cycles, but adds that "figures indicate that farmworkers are not sharing in the recent prosperity."

"While unemployment rates for all workers have been lower than a year earlier in every month of 1964, those for agricultural wage and salary workers (throughout the United States) have been higher in every month except February," the U.S. Department of Labor said.

IN 1956 119,600

Peak employment of Mexican braceros in 1963 was 74,800 compared to 79,400 in 1962. The highest peak reached during the present bracero program was in 1956 with 119,600

The Labor Department reported that among the largest employers of braceros in California during 1963 were:

Imperial Valley Farmers Association, 12,983 contracts in effect with individual braceros during 1962, Growers Farm Labor Association (Central Coast), 20,202; San Joaquin Farm Production Association, 20,900, and Ventura County Citrus Growers Committee, 7,105.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 13, 1964]

OFFICIALS DOUBT IF CITY WORKERS WILL AID FARMS

(By Harry Bernstein)

A new move to get unemployed workers out of the cities and onto California farms is underway, but everyone involved is dubious of its success under present conditions.

The latest experiment began last week with a series of farm area tours by groups of social workers, job placement counselors and others who deal with unemployed citizens.

The idea was to acquaint these officials with farm job prospects. They, in turn, are supposed to use this knowledge to help encourage city jobless workers to move to farm jobs.

Consensus of the group was that they will do so only with extreme reluctance, if at all, because of a host of complex psychological and emotional reasons, in addition to the historic economic reasons.

And growers who want the American workers instead of Mexican nationals agreed there is little chance that farm wages and working conditions can realistically be made much more attractive than they are now.

The result was a conclusion by all sides: don't expect any rush of jobless workers out of the city and back to the farms.

The doubts are rooted in essentially the same arguments which have been continuing angrily for nearly three decades.

LESS THAN BENEFITS

Growers insist farm jobs in California are already paying among the top wages in the Nation, with an average hourly rate of $1.35 and that they are making the at times unattractive farm jobs as good as possible within the present economic structure of agriculture, California's biggest single industry.

And, the growers said, despite all the efforts to recruit American workers, foreign workers are still needed because Americans cannot or will not do the work.

Unions, church groups, and most of the social workers on the tours last week insist with equal vigor it is unreasonable to expect jobless city workers to take farm jobs which at times pay less than unemployment or relief benefits paid in the cities.

CHEAP LABOR WANTED

And as long as the growers are able to get cheap foreign labor accustomed to Mexico's lower standard of living, they will not be

forced by normal supply and demand pressures to raise wages and improve conditions enough to get many Americans back to the farms, they argue.

The back-to-the-farm project last week was started by the State department of employment in cooperation with the Los Angeles County Bureau of Public Assistance, the Greater Los Angeles Youth Opportunities Board, and Milton Natapoff, member of the State board of agriculture.

Natapoff, undismayed by the reaction of the city visitors, insists the city-to-farm shift can be made if some changes are made by growers and if some ideas held by job placement counselors and social workers also are changed.

PILOT PROJECTS URGED

He first wants to start some pilot projects which bring young unemployed workers in small groups to work together on carefully planned, well-programed farm jobs.

"You can't just send a boy or two out to a farm away from his city friends, family and his home, bad as it may be, and expect him to quickly fit into a farm job where there are often no sanitary facilities, and no encouragement for prospects of advancement," Natapoff said.

"While the growers have to help on these problems, however, the job placement people have to start upgrading the status of farm jobs in psychological terms—farm work can be healthy, out of the asphalt jungles of the city," he said.

But the growers say that while they are anxious to get Americans to do the work for them, they don't want to encourage employment of persons who cannot physically or emotionally do the job.

William Tolbert, manager of the Ventura County Citrus Growers Association, told the city visitors, "We don't want to merely transfer the relief problems of Los Angeles to Ventura."

As if to emphasize the emotional aspect of the problem, one YOB social worker, asked if she will encourage youngsters to take farm jobs, said:

"Many of our boys are Mexican-Americans. Some of their families had lived as dirt farmers or peons for centuries. They come to our agency to get help in adjusting to city living, and to get jobs which have some sort of future.

SENSE OF ESCAPE

"I cannot in good conscience urge them to take a farm job as a picker at $1 an hour in the dusty fields from which they feel, perhaps subconsciously, they have finally escaped."

Frank M. Vujovich, a grower with large acreage in the Oxnard area, said he is one of the few there who manage to do without Mexican braceros.

"But if all tried as hard as I do to use domestics only, there wouldn't be enough to go around," he said.

"The problem of raising wages high enough to get Americans is not only that we don't know how high 'high enough' is, but because the way the farm economy works, a grower cannot pass on his payroll cost increases as manufacturers do.

WORK TO BE DONE

"I'm interested in psychology, but I've got field work to get done."

The debate has been revived publicly primarily because Congress has decided to let Public Law 78 expire December 31. This means Mexican nationals (about 120,000 were hired in California alone last year) will not come into this country for the farm jobs under the law first passed in 1951.

It is known that the Government is expected to permit immigration of Mexican nationals on a temporary basis under regular immigration laws (Public Law 414), but this plan provides none of the guarantees given to the Mexicans by the bracero law.

From the viewpoint of the unions, it is worse than the bracero program which they fought so long.

PROMPTED NEW EFFORT

The temporary immigration is expected only on condition that the growers exert even more efforts to hire Americans where possible.

This prospect largely prompted the new moves to get jobless city workers onto the farms.

The first tour by the city and county officials was in Ventura County—on a school bus. The Sunkist Lemon Packing Co. plants were the first stop.

There the lemons brought in from the fields (2.8 million boxes of them a year) are graded, cleaned, and packed for shipment in what is almost a year-round operation.

Sorters, mostly women, earn $1.50 an hour for standing by endless conveyor belts picking out bad lemons as they roll by.

Nearly 90 percent of the citrus fruit field work is done by braceros in Ventura County, with rates based on the number of boxes the men can pick in a day.

The minimum wage is $1 an hour, but Jack A. Lewis, State farm placement supervisor, said in a very few cases the minimum can be waived by the worker.

One who did so was John Kursten, 17, of Oxnard, a tall youngster whom his friends dubbed "the Green Giant."

"I make about $3 to $5 a day for my 8 hours, but I signed a waiver that they'd keep me on since I wasn't picking as much as the others," Kursten said.

ONE DOLLAR AND FIFTY CENTS ON AVERAGE

Growers are not expected to continue employing those who don't pick enough lemons to make up on a piece rate basis the $1 an hour minimum being offered.

"I guess I just ain't cut out for it," the youngster said.

S. C. Cook, ranch foreman who earns $325 a month plus his house on the ranch, said most pickers earn about $1.50 an hour on the piece rate system.

Pedro Gonzales, 40, of Juanito, Mexico, a bracero, said through an interpreter as he ate lunch with 15-year-old John Olvires, of Oxnard, an American, that he has been making about $45 a week but his young friend, a "local," was not doing as well.

The city visitors were concerned, they said, because of a lack of sanitary facilities or places to eat, in addition to the question of wages.

Natapoff, asked about such problems, promised he would "certainly recommend that any pilot project set up include such essentials as sanitary facilities and some benches to eat on instead of crates."

DIFFERENCE IN HABITS

Spokesmen for the growers emphasized to the group that there are basic differences between farm and city habits, and one noted that California farm workers have more protective legislation than any other State.

Farmworkers in California are covered by workmen's compensation, temporary disability insurance, farm labor camp standards, and minimum wages for women and minors.

But others note the work is irregular, and the average includes higher paid workers too.

Herb Lee, head of the California-Arizona Farm Labor Association, said the prices "farmers receive are relatively unchanged from 20 years ago, yet wages, benefits, and competition have increased steadily.

"It is an indication of the progressiveness of the California farmers that they have managed to remain competitive with growers in other States despite these economic disadvantages."

A young unemployed Los Angeles man was along on the tour to decide for himself what he thought of farmwork.

"It's not for me. They don't pay anything, and it's plain dirty."

"We are getting Government money to help young, jobless Americans who are not in school to get a good job, steady work, and to become good citizens," said Mrs. Atara Mont, of the Youth Opportunities Board.

"From what we have seen, a job as a field-worker doesn't fit these criteria."

The group ate at the growers' association messhall where workers are fed for $1.75 a day. The Mexican-style food was tasty and plentiful, and the rooms for single workers were clean, with nine men to a fairly large barrack-style room.

OTHER ARGUMENTS

This visit raised the issue of family housing, and Tolbert said Ventura growers now have room for 600 people in their family housing facilities, "but we can't find any takers."

The visitors did not get a chance because of time limitations to watch recruiting efforts, but the arguments continued on this score, too.

Growers insist they try, hard, to get Americans for the jobs before they ask the Government to bring in Mexican nationals.

This view was countered, however, by complaints that not only are the wages and working conditions insufficient to make recruiting programs realistic, but even the programs themselves are really halfhearted.

As one county social worker put it, they are conducted "with more of an eye on the newspapers and radio than on the potential farmworker."

The tour ended with arguments and discussions over morals, psychology, and economics going on until the last of the stragglers left the bus late in the evening after a day on California's farms.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 19, 1964]

BROWN SEES NO LACK OF FARM LABOR—SAYS STATE CROPS WILL BE HARVESTED WITHOUT BRACEROS

(By Jerry Gillam)

SACRAMENTO.—Governor Brown, Tuesday, flatly declared there will be enough labor to harvest California's farm crops next year in spite of the cutback in Mexican national labor.

He said he did not know yet where it will come from and that "it may be hard" but added:

"I assure you that there'll be enough labor, domestic or otherwise, to produce the crops of California next fall."

AGAINST EXTENSION

Brown made his remarks at his weekly press conference in response to a query as to whether he would support a continuation of the so-called Bracero Act which has allowed California farmers and ranchers to import help from Mexico, most of it stoop labor. He said he didn't think an extension of the act would help for two reasons:

1. There is no inclination to extend the bracero law on the part of congressional leaders, growers, or labor leaders.

2. Farm labor will be available if ranchers and farmers are willing to pay "a little higher wage."

However, he did not go on record as favoring a minimum wage for agricultural workers—a topic that has got him in hot water in the past.

HOPE IN MACHINERY

In the long run, he indicated, he hopes that automation may take up some of the slack, although admitting at the same time this could add to California's unemployment problem.

Meanwhile, he reported, he is conferring with his director of employment, Albert B. Tieburg; Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman; Undersecretary of Labor John F.

Henning, growers and labor leaders in seeking a solution to the problem.

Agriculture, a $3 billion-a-year business in California, last year imported some 63,000 Mexican nationals for farm help under the bracero program—Public Law 78.

The controversial 12-year-old program has been under heavy fire from California organized labor since it started.

Labor leaders claim enough domestic workers are available—if wages are high enough and working conditions are improved.

Using domestics instead of braceros, they say, would help reduce the State's unemployment rate.

The farmers argue there aren't enough suitable domestics and prefer the braceros because they work hard and don't object to stoop labor.

EXTENDED IN 1963

Public Law 78 was extended for 1 year in 1963 following a bitter battle in Congress with assurances given it would be the last time needed to obtain approval.

The Council of California Growers announced last February it would not seek further extension of the bracero program after seeing the handwriting on the wall in Washington.

In a policy statement, the council encouraged the State to fill the gap by recruitment of domestic workers in California and from other States if necessary to keep the crops from rotting in the fields.

"I am completely committed," Brown told newsmen, "to getting sufficient labor from whatever source I can to harvest the crops next year."

He added, however, that Tieburg has reported the search for other adequate domestic sources so far has been unsuccessful.

"We may have to import some labor," Brown said. "If so, I would support it, but I'm not ready to concede that today."

The Governor noted there is a section of the Immigration Act which permits individual growers to contract for temporary or permanent foreign workers.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I understand that before the Senate concludes its deliberations this evening, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] desires to speak. Therefore, I have the honor to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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.

INTRODUCTION OF SIMPLIFIED TAX SYSTEM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on October 16 of last year I offered as an amendment to the then pending tax-reduction bill, which became the Revenue Act of 1964, a plan for an optional simplified tax system. It was a distinct honor and experience for the junior Senator from Louisiana to be the floor manager of that bill. As the manager of the bill, I did not feel privileged to offer any amendments in my own right, pursuing the theory that the spokesman for the committee should support the committee bill as reported.

Nevertheless, the proposal that was made for a simplified tax system appeared to me to have great prospects for bringing equity and uniformity to our present tax system.

That amendment would have substantially simplified the tax rules and would have tended to equalize the tax treatment for high-income taxpayers with differing sources of income and types of expenses. I now propose to introduce a bill which would propose a still simpler tax system, one which would extend to middle-income taxpayers as well as upper income taxpayers and would dovetail with the simplification now available to lower bracket taxpayers through the standard deduction. In addition to simplifying the tax system for middle and lower income taxpayers, my bill would raise the limitation on the standard deduction and increase the amount of the minimum standard deduction.

I am introducing this system at this time so that it may be studied fully by the members of the Finance Committee and by other interested Senators and Members of Congress, by the Treasury, by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and by other distinguished students of the tax laws. I hope to reintroduce this bill in the next Congress and seek action on it at that time.

Subsequent to the action on the Revenue Act of 1964, the junior Senator from Louisiana was much flattered to observe that Mr. Mortimer Caplan, who served during the years of the Kennedy administration as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, declared that the proposed simplified tax system was the most hopeful thing he had seen in some time for bringing about fair, equitable, uniform tax treatment for all American taxpayers.

There is a great amount of enthusiasm for this type of tax reform from such students of the tax system as Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, Stanley B. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and a number of other outstanding persons in the Treasury Department.

Last year, when I introduced my proposal for a simplified tax system, I stated my concern about the inequity and complexity of our tax structure, particularly with regard to individuals in the upper-income brackets. I pointed out that a study of tax returns of individuals in high-income brackets showed two things: Some taxpayers do not pay nearly enough; others pay too much. While it is true that our tax rates on personal income are steeply graduated on the first $100,000 and reach a rate of 70 percent for 1965 and subsequent years under the Revenue Act of 1964, most high-income taxpayers are able either to make their income in ways that are not taxable or to benefit from a number of ways of deducting large amounts. Consequently, most high-bracket taxpayers, with the help of tax lawyers and accountants, are able to keep their taxes well below 50 percent of their gross income.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table which shows the effective tax rates paid by taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes over $500,000. This table shows that over 26 percent of taxpayers with incomes over $5 million pay no Federal income tax whatsoever. It also shows that large percentages of high-income taxpayers pay very low rates of tax.

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

Percentage distribution of effective tax rates based on adjusted gross income by income classes; all returns with adjusted gross income of $500,000 or more, 1959

[In percent]

Adjusted gross income	Median	Total	Effective tax rate (percent)									
			0	0.1 to 9.9	10 to 10.9	20 to 29.9	30 to 39.9	40 to 49.9	50 to 59.9	60 to 69.9	70 to 79.9	80 to 84.9
$500,000 to $749,999	46.0	100	0.6	0.8	1.1	6.4	17.0	45.6	13.8	8.8	5.1	0.8
$750,000 to $999,999	47.5	100	1.0	1.6	1.6	4.7	11.9	46.6	18.7	8.3	4.6	1.0
$1,000,000 to $1,999,999	48.8	100	4.0	.5	.5	4.1	11.2	47.2	17.3	8.6	6.1	.5
$2,000,000 to $4,999,999	47.3	100	3.1			6.3	9.4	48.4	14.1	9.4	7.8	1.5
$5,000,000 and over	46.8	100	26.3				5.3	31.6	15.8	15.8	5.2	
All returns	46.6	100	2.0	.8	1.0	5.4	14.2	46.0	16.5	8.0	5.4	.8

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is an amazing fact, to find out that while we contend we have a graduated income tax, based on ability to pay, one-quarter of those with incomes over $5 million do not pay any Federal income tax. They succeed in avoiding paying it by taking full advantage of all the deductions and various provisions in the law which can be exploited for them by good lawyers and good tax accountants.

Some of the methods by which tax liabilities have been kept low have been the receipt of income from State and municipal bonds which is not taxable, the deduction of contributions to charities and private foundations, and the diverting of large sums of money into types of assets which receive the much lower capital gains tax treatment. Particularly is

this true in cases where the capital gains income is offset by a large interest deduction to cover the cost of financing the transaction. The use of pension plans and profit-sharing plans by owner-managers of small, closely held corporations, percentage depletion, intangible drilling costs and stock options have all been subject to severe criticism by students of our tax system.

Nevertheless, there are still cases where individuals are actually paying much more than 50 percent of their income to the U.S. Government. It makes little or no sense for this Nation to have a tax system which crucifies one taxpayer by depriving him of most of his income, while it accords to another the privilege of retaining within his ownership and control 100 percent of his earnings, without any income tax liability whatever.

For this reason, Mr. President, I proposed last year an alternate method for computing Federal income taxes. It was my proposal that a taxpayer should have the right to elect to pay his taxes—at lower tax rates—without the benefit of the various "gimmicks" and tax-avoidance schemes which are most frequently employed by high-bracket taxpayers. The taxpayer would elect to pay taxes on interest derived from State and municipal bonds. He would pay taxes on amounts contributed in his behalf to profit-sharing plans and pension plans. He would be required to capitalize his intangible drilling cost, and would be permitted only cost depletion on mineral properties. The taxpayer would be denied deductions for contributions to all sorts of charities and foundations.

Although my proposal of last year received favorable consideration by many serious students of tax laws, it was not adopted. Some persons pointed out that it would benefit only a handful of high-income taxpayers, and I recognized its limited applicability. When I proposed the simplified tax system last year, I expressed my hope that it would, in time, become so popular that there would be a demand to extend this type of treatment to other taxpayers with smaller incomes, perhaps soon to those with incomes exceeding $10,000. However, I stated that it would be impractical at that time to extend the simplified tax system to taxpayers with incomes down to $10,000 because of the possible large revenue losses that might result. In the past year, however, I have devoted additional study to the problem—and the Treasury Department has helped me—and the revenue effects have been calculated more precisely. Extension of the simplified tax system to a broad range of middle-income taxpayers now appears to me to be feasible.

Therefore, I now propose a bill embodying a revised simplified tax system which would extend to all taxpayers with incomes over $10,000, who so elect, the advantages of equity and simplicity that would have been available only to high-income taxpayers under my proposal of last year. Like my proposal of last year, taxpayers who elect to give up the advantages of special tax treatment for certain types of income and deductions for certain expenses would be entitled to special lower tax rates. The tax rates I now propose would be, in the case of married taxpayers filing joint returns, 20 percent on the first $20,000, 25 percent on the next $8,000, and so on rising up to 50 percent on income over $100,000. In the case of a single individual, the rates would be 20 percent of the first $10,000, 25 percent of the next $4,000, and so on up to 50 percent on income in excess of $50,000.

At the conclusion of this speech, I shall place in the RECORD table 1 which shows the complete tax rate schedule that I propose as well as the schedule of rates effective in 1965 under present law. If it is believed that rates in this table are too high generally, or that the top rate of 50 percent is too high, then Congress could consider reducing the rates to figures that it deems more appropriate. Similarly, if the provisions of the bill I am introducing appear too severe, either in the deductions disallowed or the inclusions in the tax base, consideration could be given to modification.

In any event, I should like to emphasize that this method is optional and that taxpayers could continue under the rates and other provisions of present law. In fact, most taxpayers would not make the election. Once the optional method is elected by a taxpayer, his election would generally be irrevocable for 5 years, at which time it could be renewed for successive 5-year periods. Some have objected that the 5-year binding election is too harsh, particularly in cases where the taxpayer has suffered unexpected financial reverses. My revised bill should eliminate this objection. It would provide—in addition to several specific relief provisions—that the taxpayer could revoke his election at any time he desired, but he would have to recompute his income and tax for all years covered by that election as if he had not made the election. Moreover, he would have to pay an additional tax of 5 percent of the recomputed tax plus interest on any deficiency. However, in appropriate cases he could obtain a refund.

In addition to its extension to middle-income taxpayers, the system I now propose differs from my proposal of last year in several important respects. Under present law, long-term capital gains are given specially favorable tax treatment. Only half of such gains are included in income and the tax on such gains may not exceed 25 percent. This is perhaps the most widely utilized provision for specially favorable treatment of a particular type of income. My proposal of last year provided that taxpayers who elect the simplified tax method would be required to include in income their full capital gains but could pay tax at the 25-percent rate with respect to some, but not all, types of long-term capital gains. After considerable study over this past year, I am convinced that taxpayers who desire the low rates and the simplicity of the simplified tax method should be required to treat all income, including all capital gains income, in the same manner. Much of the complexity of the present tax law results from the necessity of distinguishing between capital gains and ordinary income, and many of the "gimmicks" and tax-saving schemes are designed to secure the benefit of capital gains treatment rather than ordinary income treatment. There are many valid arguments for special treatment of capital-gain income, but real simplicity, lower rates, and tax equity cannot be achieved until capital-gain income is treated like other income. Since the system I propose is entirely optional, no taxpayer would be harmed by the suggested treatment of capital gains. Tables 2 and 3, which I propose to place in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, show respectively that capital gains are concentrated in the hands of high-income taxpayers and that, among high-income taxpayers, those with a high proportion of capital gains have much lower effective tax rates than other high-income taxpayers.

In my proposal today, I am coupling with my suggestion for an optional simplified tax system a suggestion for an increase in the limitation on the standard deduction from $1,000 to $2,000 and for a $100 increase in the minimum are necessary if we are to extend to taxpayers in all income brackets a realistic standard deduction. These increases opportunity of utilizing a simplified tax system and if we are to treat more equitably middle and lower income taxpayers.

Under present law, taxpayers with incomes up to $10,000 are entitled to a standard deduction of 10 percent of income if they elect to forego itemized deductions for otherwise deductible personal expenses. Last year's tax law added another alternative to itemization of deductions or claiming the 10-percent standard deduction. Taxpayers may now claim a minimum standard deduction of $300 for a single person, $400 for a married couple, and an additional $100 for each dependent. Individuals who are 65 or over, or individuals who are blind, are allowed an additional $100 or minimum standard deduction for age or for blindness. Taxpayers with incomes up to $10,000 derive almost all their income from wages, salaries, interest, and dividends, all of which receive ordinary income treatment. Consequently, such taxpayers who elect the 10-percent standard deduction, or the minimum standard deduction, already have a relatively simple tax system. The simplified tax method that I am proposing would extend to upper income taxpayers a similar opportunity to avail themselves of a relatively simple tax system under which all income is treated alike and there are no complicated personal deductions.

However, studies have shown that very few taxpayers with incomes between $10,000 and $20,000 would find it advantageous to elect the simplified tax system unless the rates thereunder were reduced to a point where there would be a prohibitively large revenue loss to the Government. In addition, about 3 out of 4 persons with incomes of between $10,000 and $20,000 find that they have deductible expenses under present law well in excess of the present $1,000 limit of the

standard deduction. Thus, they must itemize their deductions in order to minimize their tax. Therefore, in order to afford to such middle-income taxpayers the opportunity—that is presently available to low-income taxpayers and that would become available to high-income taxpayers—to use a simplified tax system, I have proposed that the limit of the standard deduction be raised to $2,000.

Let me again emphasize that, like my proposed simplified tax method, the standard deduction is optional. Thus, taxpayers who desire to itemize their deductions for charitable contributions, medical expenses, State and local taxes, interest, and so forth, could continue to do so. However, all taxpayers who desire to forego the difficulties of recordkeeping, accounting, and reporting such expenses would have a reasonable alternative.

In the case of our lowest income taxpayers, many have found that they must itemize their deductions because, as low as they are, they nevertheless exceed 10 percent of their incomes. The minimum standard deduction enacted last year was a great help in allowing many of these low-income taxpayers to switch to a simplified tax system. However, I believe that more should be done to make simplification available to such low-income taxpayers. I am, therefore, proposing that the minimum standard deduction be increased by $100, from $300 to $400 for the single person, and from $400 to $500 for the married couple. The minimum standard deduction of $100 for each dependent, for age, or for blindness, would remain unchanged. In the case of a married couple filing separately, the minimum standard deduction for each spouse would be increased from $200 to $250. It should be noted that this increase in the minimum standard deduction would mean that taxpayers with incomes up to $1,000—surely well within the poverty area, however it may be defined—would not have any Federal income tax to pay.

Mr. President, objections to my proposal will come from several sources. One group will feel that tax reduction for upper-income taxpayers should be available only when those persons as a group have been denied the benefit of favorable tax treatment which they have enjoyed in the past. To those reformers, I would respond that they have been trying to prevail in their views for many years and that these corrections come slowly. Meanwhile, those taxpayers who have not enjoyed the benefit of favorable tax treatment have suffered under a system which, as applied to them, has been little short of confiscatory. Relief for those who have paid taxes on virtually all of their income should not be forever denied while one seeks to correct a system which contains many inequities and inconsistencies.

A second group will say that this amendment would do too much for persons making a large income. As I have pointed out, most persons making big money pay taxes at an effective rate of less than one-third of their gross income. It is unfair in my judgment to deny fair tax treatment to persons paying an effective rate above 50 percent so long as the favored tax treatment exists for the overwhelming majority of persons with similar incomes.

Finally, other groups will object to particular aspects of my plan. To critics of any of the details of the optional tax plan, let me say that I am not wedded to the specifics of the plan I am today introducing. I am not opposed to changes designed to ease any unintended harsh effects. But I will not compromise on the principles of my program—which are simplicity and equity.

Mr. President, I am critical of the current system of taxation in the United States whereby we are at cross purposes. We have a steep, progressive system of tax rates intended to make each person pay his fair share of the tax burden. But then there are so many exceptions to the rule that we find few taxpayers paying the share that was originally intended.

The plan I offer today is more realistic. It is a beginning in the direction of a tax system simpler and easier for everyone to understand, and a system with greater fairness and justice for every taxpayer.

It is time we began to reduce the premium enjoyed by the taxpayer who has tax lawyers and accountants to show him ways to avoid paying taxes to his Federal Government. It is time we make this first step toward encouraging taxpayers to report and pay on a fair and equitable basis those taxes which are properly due the Government.

Furthermore, it is time we do something to relieve the tremendous pressure that is constantly upon the Congress and its committees dealing with taxes to write more gimmicks and more special interest provisions into the laws, favoring some groups while ignoring others. If a provision such as that which I am recommending should become law, it would be my purpose to resist with all of my energy and ability any effort to make the system the subject of loopholes for the benefit of favored taxpayers. If this system should become law, it would be my purpose to seek steadily to improve upon it until a high percentage of taxpayers would prefer it to the complicated, unfair, and inequitable system that presently exists.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement indicating the number of taxpayers likely to be affected by different features of my bill together with the probable effect of these features on the revenues. Also I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD the text of the bill, a statement of some additional reasons for my optional proposal and a technical explanation of certain aspects of it, and tables 1 through 13.

Mr. President, I hope that the clerks and our able reporters of debates will seek to be a little generous in the space that they allot to these tables so that a person can read them intelligently and comprehensively—even though a little blank space might be left on the page.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, together with the explanatory statement and explanation.

The bill (S. 3250) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an optional simplified tax method, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as "The Simplified Tax Method Act of 1964."

SEC. 2. SIMPLIFIED TAX METHOD FOR ELECTING INDIVIDUALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 (relating to normal taxes and surtaxes) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subchapter:

"Subchapter U—Election of Simplified Tax Method

"Sec. 1391. Election of simplified tax.
"Sec. 1392. Simplified tax imposed.
"Sec. 1393. Simplified taxable income defined.
"Sec. 1394. Special rules.

"SEC. 1391. ELECTION OF SIMPLIFIED TAX

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in this subsection and subsection (f), an individual may, for any taxable year, elect to be subject to the simplified tax imposed by section 1392 in lieu of the tax imposed by section 1 or section 1201. An election under this section may not be made by—

"(1) an estate or trust,

"(2) a nonresident alien individual, or

"(3) a married individual, unless his spouse also makes an election under this section, or has made an election, which is in effect for such taxable year, and unless such individual and his spouse have the same taxable year.

"(b) ELECTION.—

"(1) WHEN MADE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an election under this section for any taxable year shall be made within the time prescribed by law (not including extensions thereof) for filing the return for such taxable year.

"(2) YEARS PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.—An election under this section for any taxable year ending prior to the date of the first publication of regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate under section 1394 may be made within ninety days after such date.

"(3) MANNER.—An election under this section shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe.

"(c) YEARS FOR WHICH EFFECTIVE.—An election under this section shall be effective for the taxable year for which it is made and for each of the four taxable years immediately succeeding such taxable year, unless, with respect to any such taxable year, it is revoked under subsection (d) or (e) or terminated under subsection (f).

"(d) REVOCATION OF ELECTION.—An election under this section may be revoked (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe) by the taxpayer for any taxable year with respect to which—

"(1) amendments (made after the date of such election) to this subtitle or to the regulations prescribed thereunder become effective, and the Secretary or his delegate determines that a major portion of the difference (computed without regard to such amendments) between

"(A) the tax liability of electing taxpayers as a class under this subchapter, and

"(B) the tax liability of electing taxpayers as a class which would exist under this chapter but for this subchapter
is eliminated by reason of such amendments; or

"(2) the taxpayer—

"(A) becomes disabled (within the meaning of section 213(g)(3)) and at least 50 percent of his gross income for the five taxable years immediately preceding such taxable year consisted of earned income (as defined in section 911(b)); or

"(B) is discharged in bankruptcy.

A revocation under this subsection shall be effective for the taxable year for which made and for all succeeding taxable years.

"(e) RETROACTIVE REVOCATION OF ELECTION.—

"(1) RETROACTIVE REVOCATION.—An election under this section may be revoked (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe) by the taxpayer for any taxable year.

"(2) EFFECT OF RETROACTIVE REVOCATION.—In the case of a revocation, under this subsection, of an election, except as provided in paragraphs (3) and (4), the taxpayer shall be treated (under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) as if he had never made such election.

"(3) ADDITIONAL TAX.—In the case of a revocation of an election under this subsection, in addition to the tax imposed by section 1 or section 1201, there is imposed for each year for which the election so revoked would have been effective, a tax equal to 5 percent of the tax imposed by section 1 or section 1201.

"(4) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding any law or rule of law—

"(A) any deficiency attributable to a revocation under this subsection may be assessed and

"(B) any claim for refund or credit relating to an overpayment attributable to a revocation under this section may be filed at any time within 3 years of the date on which the revocation is made.

"(f) TERMINATION OF ELECTION.—In the case of a married individual, an election under this section shall terminate commencing with any taxable year for which an election under this section is not in effect for his spouse.

"(g) ELECTION AFTER EXPIRATION, REVOCATION, OR TERMINATION OF PRIOR ELECTION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If a taxpayer has made an election under this section which has expired in accordance with subsection (c), has been revoked under subsection (d) or (e), or has terminated under subsection (f), such taxpayer may not, except as provided in paragraph (2), make an election under this section for any of the 5 taxable years following the last taxable year for which his prior election was in effect.

"(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)—

"(A) in the case of an election which has expired in accordance with subsection (c), an election under this section may be made for the first taxable year following the last taxable year for which the prior election was in effect; and

"(B) an election under this section may be made for any taxable year if the Secretary or his delegate consents to such election.

"(h) RULES FOR DETERMINING MARITAL STATUS, ETC.—For purposes of this subchapter—

"(1) MARITAL STATUS.—Section 143 (relating to determination of marital status) shall apply in determining whether an individual is married for any taxable year.

"(2) TAXABLE YEARS OF HUSBAND AND WIFE.—If the taxable years of a husband and wife begin on the same day and end on different days because of the death of either or both, they shall be treated as having the same taxable year. The preceding sentence shall not apply with respect to the surviving spouse if he remarries before the close of his taxable year.

"SEC. 1392. SIMPLIFIED TAX IMPOSED

"(a) RATES OF TAX.—A tax is hereby imposed for each taxable year for which an election under section 1391 is in effect, as follows:

"(1) INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of an individual other than an individual to whom paragraph (2) or (3) applies, the lesser of—

"(A) the tax determined in accordance with the following table:

If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $10,000	20 percent of the simplified taxable income
Over $10,000 but not over $14,000	$2,000 plus 25 percent of the excess over $10,000
Over $14,000 but not over $18,000	$3,000 plus 30 percent of the excess over $14,000
Over $18,000 but not over $32,000	$4,200 plus 35 percent of the excess over $18,000
Over $32,000 but not over $50,000	$9,000 plus 40 percent of the excess over $32,000
Over $50,000	$16,300 plus 50 percent of the excess over $50,000

; or

"(B) a tax on simplified taxable income computed at the rates provided by section 1(a) (relating to rates of tax on individuals).

"(2) HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS.—In the case of a head of a household (as defined in section 1(b)(2)) the lesser of—

"(A) the tax determined in accordance with the following table:

If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $10,000	20 percent of the simplified taxable income
Over $10,000 but not over $14,000	$2,000 plus 22.5 percent of the excess over $10,000
Over $14,000 but not over $18,000	$2,900 plus 25.0 percent of the excess over $14,000
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	$3,900 plus 27.5 percent of the excess over $18,000
Over $20,000 but not over $28,000	$4,450 plus 30.0 percent of the excess over $20,000
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	$6,850 plus 32.5 percent of the excess over $28,000
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	$8,150 plus 35.0 percent of the excess over $32,000
Over $36,000 but not over $50,000	$9,550 plus 37.5 percent of the excess over $36,000
Over $50,000 but not over $64,000	$14,800 plus 42.5 percent of the excess over $50,000
Over $64,000 but not over $100,000	$20,750 plus 45.0 percent of the excess over $64,000
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000	$36,950 plus 50.0 percent of the excess over $100,000

; or

"(B) a tax on simplified taxable income computed at the rates provided by section 1(b) (relating to rates of tax on heads of households).

"(3) MARRIED INDIVIDUALS WHO FILE JOINT RETURNS AND SURVIVING SPOUSES.—In the case of a husband and wife who file a joint return under section 6013 and in the case of a surviving spouse (as defined in section 2(b)), the lesser of—

"(A) the tax determined in accordance with the following table:

If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $20,000	20 percent of the simplified taxable income
Over $20,000 but not over $28,000	$4,000 plus 25 percent of the excess over $20,000
Over $28,000 but not over $36,000	$6,000 plus 30 percent of the excess over $28,000
Over $36,000 but not over $64,000	$8,400 plus 35 percent of the excess over $36,000
Over $64,000 but not over $100,000	$18,200 plus 40 percent of the excess over $64,000
Over $100,000	$32,600 plus 50 percent of the excess over $100,000

; or

"(B) a tax on simplified taxable income computed under section 2 (relating to tax in case of joint return or return of surviving spouse).

"(b) CREDITS AGAINST SIMPLIFIED TAX.—For any taxable year with respect to which an election under section 1391 is in effect, no credit against tax shall be allowed under section 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest received by individuals) or 37 (relating to retirement income).

"SEC. 1393. SIMPLIFIED TAXABLE INCOME DEFINED

"(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subtitle, the term 'simplified taxable income' means adjusted gross income (as defined in section 62), increased as provided by subsections (b) and (c), and reduced as provided in subsection (d).

"(b) ADDITIONS TO ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—For purposes of subsection (a), adjusted gross income shall be increased by—

"(1) AMOUNTS OTHERWISE EXCLUDED.—Amounts excluded from gross income under part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 (relating to items specifically excluded from gross income), except amounts described in—

"(A) subsections (a) and (d) of section 101 (relating to proceeds of life insurance contracts),

"(B) section 102 (relating to gifts and inheritances),

"(C) section 108 (relating to income from discharge of indebtedness), and

"(D) section 111 (relating to recovery of bad debts, prior taxes, and delinquency amounts).

"(2) INCOME FROM SOURCES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES, ETC.—Amounts excluded from gross income under—

"(A) sections 893 (relating to compensation of employees of foreign governments), 911 (relating to earned income from sources without the United States), 912 (relating to exemption for certain allowances received from the United States), 931 (relating to income from sources within possessions of the United States), and 943 (relating to exclusion of dividends to residents of Formosa or Hong Kong), and

"(B) any treaty of the United States (notwithstanding section 894, relating to income exempt under treaty).

"(3) SOCIAL SECURITY AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS.—Two-thirds of all amounts received as a pension or annuity under title II of the Social Security Act or under the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 or 1937.

"(4) UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS.—Amounts received from a State or a political subdivision thereof, or from the United States, on account of unemployment.

"(5) CONTRIBUTIONS TO EMPLOYEES' TRUSTS, ETC.—Contributions, described in sections 403(b) (relating to taxability of beneficiaries under certain annuities), 404(a) (relating to general rule for deduction for contributions of an employer to an employees' trust, etc.), 404(b) (relating to method of contribution, etc., having the effect of a plan), and 405(c) (relating to deduction for contributions to bond purchase plans), made on behalf of the taxpayer and not otherwise included in gross income, but only to the extent that the taxpayer's rights to or derived from such contributions are nonforfeitable during his taxable year. For purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe that contingencies which are not substantial shall not be taken into account in determining whether an employee's rights are

nonforfeitable. This paragraph shall not apply to contributions made on behalf of a taxpayer who is an employee within the meaning of section 401(e)(1) (relating to self-employed individuals).

"(6) SECURITIES OF THE EMPLOYER CORPORATION.—Amounts excluded from income under the second sentence of section 402(a)(1) (relating to general rule for taxability of beneficiary of exempt trust) or the second sentence of section 402(a)(2) (relating to capital gains treatment for certain distributions).

"(7) EXERCISE OF CERTAIN STOCK OPTIONS.—In the case of the transfer of a share of stock to a taxpayer pursuant to his exercise, during the taxable year, of an option which meets the requirements of section 422(a) (relating to general rule for qualified stock options), 423(a) (relating to general rule for employee stock purchase plans), or 424(a) (relating to general rule for restricted stock options), an amount equal to the excess of the fair market value of the share so transferred over the price paid under such option for such share.

"(8) GROUP-TERM LIFE INSURANCE.—Amounts equal to the cost (determined on the basis of uniform premiums, computed on the basis of 5-year age brackets, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) of group-term life insurance on the life of the taxpayer provided for part or all of the taxable year under a policy (or policies) carried directly or indirectly by the taxpayer's employer (or employers).

"(c) DEDUCTIONS DENIED.—For purposes of subsection (a), adjusted gross income shall be increased by an amount equal to the deductions allowed under—

"(1) TAXES ON OR MEASURED BY NET INCOME.—Sections 162 (relating to trade or business expenses), 164 (relating to a deduction for taxes), and 212 (relating to expenses for the production of income), for any State, local, or foreign tax on or measured by net income.

"(2) CIRCULATION EXPENDITURES.—Section 173 (relating to circulation expenditures).

"(3) AGRICULTURAL EXPENDITURES.—Sections 175 (relating to soil and water conservation expenditures), 180 (relating to expenditures by farmers for fertilizer, etc.), and 182 (relating to expenditures by farmers for clearing land).

"(4) NATURAL RESOURCES.—Sections 263(c) (relating to intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells), 613 (relating to percentage depletion), 615 (relating to exploration expenditures), and 616 (relating to development expenditures).

"(5) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—Sections 404 (relating to deduction for contributions of an employer to an employees' trust, etc.), and 405(c) (relating to deduction for contributions to bond purchase plans), to the extent attributable to contributions made on behalf of an individual who is an employee within the meaning of section 401(c)(1) (relating to self-employed individuals).

"(6) CAPITAL GAINS.—Section 1202 (relating to deduction for capital gains).

"(d) DEDUCTIONS ALLOWED.—For purposes of subsection (a), adjusted gross income shall (except as otherwise provided in subsection (c)) be reduced by an amount equal to—

"(1) PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS.—The deductions allowed by section 151 (relating to allowance of deductions for personal exemptions), other than the additional deductions for age and blindness allowed by subsections (c) and (d) of such section.

"(2) TRADE AND BUSINESS EXPENSES OF EMPLOYEES.—The deductions allowed by this chapter (other then by part VII of subchapter B, relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) which are attributable to a trade or business which consists of the performance of services by the taxpayer as an employee.

"(3) EXPENSES FOR PRODUCTION OF INCOME.—The deductions allowed by section 212 (relating to expenses for production of income).

"(4) ALIMONY, ETC., PAYMENTS.—The deductions allowed by section 215 (relating to alimony, etc., payments).

"(5) DEDUCTIONS ALLOCABLE TO ITEMS REQUIRED TO BE INCLUDED IN GROSS INCOME.—The deductions allocable to items required to be added to adjusted gross income under subsection (b), to the extent that such amounts would be allowed as deductions but for the fact that such items were not otherwise included in gross income.

"(e) ITEMS NOT TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT MORE THAN ONCE.—Nothing in this section shall permit the same item to be deducted more than once or included in income more than once.

"(f) CROSS-REFERENCES.—

"(1) For special provisions relating to contributions to employees' trusts, etc., see section 407.

"(2) For special provisions relating to stock options, see section 425(1).

"(3) For special provisions relating to trusts, see section 679.

"SEC. 1394. SPECIAL RULES.

"(a) REGULATIONS TO PREVENT AVOIDANCE OF TAX.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary in order that the income tax liability of any taxpayer who makes an election under section 1391, before, during, and after the period for which the election is effective, may be returned, determined, computed, assessed, collected, and adjusted, in such manner as clearly to reflect the income tax liability of such taxpayer and the various factors necessary for the determination of such liability, and in order to prevent avoidance of such tax liability. Such regulations may provide for the distribution, apportionment, or allocation of gross income, exclusions, deductions, credits, allowances, and items described in section 1393 between or among a taxpayer who has made an election under this section and any other person or persons. A taxpayer who makes an election under section 1391 shall be considered to have consented to the regulations under this section which are in effect on the date of such election.

"(b) CERTAIN PROVISIONS INAPPLICABLE.—For any taxable year, for which an election under section 1391 is in effect, the following provisions shall not apply:

"(1) Section 72(n)(2) (relating to limitation of tax in case of certain distributions with respect to contributions by self-employed individuals).

"(2) Section 170(b)(5) (relating to carryover of certain excess charitable contributions).

"(3) Section 632 (relating to sale of oil or gas properties).

"(4) Section 673(b) (relating to exception where trust income is payable to charitable beneficiaries).

"(5) Section 1111 (relating to distribution of stock pursuant to order enforcing the antitrust laws).

"(6) Section 1201(b) (relating to alternative tax on capital gains).

"(7) Section 1347 (relating to claims against the United States, etc.).

"(c) ADJUSTMENTS TO BASIS.—Notwithstanding any provision of section 1016 (relating to adjustments to basis) and notwithstanding any election made under this title, proper adjustment in respect of property shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be made with respect to amounts described in section 1393.

"(d) PENALTIES APPLICABLE TO CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS.—Section 72(m)(5) (relating to penalties applicable to certain amounts received by owner-employees) shall be applied as if this subchapter had not been enacted.

"(e) TAXABLE INCOME.—With respect to any taxable year for which an election under section 1391 is in effect, the term 'taxable income' wherever used in this title shall be read as 'simplified taxable income', unless the context otherwise requires.

"(f) CERTAIN TRUSTS.—With respect to any taxable year for which an election under section 1391 is in effect—

"(1) paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of section 665(b) (relating to accumulation distributions of trusts, etc.) shall not apply,

"(2) section 666(a) (relating to amount allocated in the case of accumulation distribution) shall apply to the preceding taxable years of a trust described in section 666(a) without regard to any provision of such section which would (but for this paragraph) limit its application to the 5 preceding taxable years, and

"(3) the next to the last sentence of section 668(a) (relating to amounts treated as received in prior taxable years) shall not apply.

"(g) INCOME AVERAGING.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The tax imposed by section 1302 shall, in the case of a taxpayer who so chooses, be limited to an amount determined in accordance with the principles of Part I (relating to income averaging) of Subchapter Q, provided that—

"(A) The income of a year for which an election under section 1391 is in effect shall not be averaged with the income of a year for which such an election is not in effect;

"(B) Notwithstanding section 1302(e)(2) (relating to the definition of base period), if an election under section 1391 is in effect for the computation year, the base period shall be the immediately preceding taxable years (not in excess of four) for which an election under section 1391 was in effect; and

"(C) The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(2) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—For any taxable year for which an election under section 1391 is in effect and for the four immediately succeeding taxable years, a taxpayer shall not be an eligible individual within the meaning of section 1303 (relating to individuals eligible for income averaging) unless he consents, at the time and in the manner prescribed by regulations, to the regulations under paragraph (1)(C) of this subsection.

"(h) CROSS REFERENCE.—For extension of statute of limitations in certain cases, see sections 6501(k) and 6511(d)(5)."

(b) CONTRIBUTIONS TO EMPLOYEES' TRUSTS, ETC.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Part I of subchapter D of chapter 1 (relating to pension, profit-sharing, stock bonus plans, etc.) is amended by adding after section 407 the following new section:

"SEC. 408. SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO CONTRIBUTIONS FOR EMPLOYEES WHO HAVE ELECTED SIMPLIFIED TAX METHOD

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, an employee shall include (under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) in his gross income for the taxable year contributions which are—

"(1) described in sections 403(b), 404(a), 404(b), and 405(c),

"(2) made on his behalf in any taxable year for which an election made by him under section 1391 (relating to election of simplified tax) is in effect, and

"(3) not previously included in his gross income, but only to the extent that his rights to or derived from such contributions become nonforfeitable during the taxable year. For purposes of this section, the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations, prescribe that contingencies which are not substantial shall not be taken into account in

determining whether an employee's rights are or become nonforeitable during the taxable year.

"(b) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"For treatment of contributions nonforfeitable when made, see section 1393(b)(5)."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part I of subchapter D of chapter I is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 408. SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO CONTRIBUTIONS FOR EMPLOYEES WHO HAVE ELECTED SIMPLIFIED TAX METHOD."

(c) CERTAIN STOCK OPTIONS.—Section 425 (relating to definitions and special rules) is amended by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (k) and inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection:

"(j) SPECIAL RULE FOR EMPLOYEES WHO HAVE ELECTED UNDER SECTION 1391.—Section 421(a)(1) shall not apply to any option granted to the taxpayer during a taxable year for which an election by him under section 1391 (relating to election of simplified tax) is in effect."

(d) ACCUMULATING TRUSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart E of part I of subchapter J of chapter 1 (relating to grantors and others treated as substantial owners) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 679. INDIVIDUAL ELECTING SIMPLIFIED TAX METHOD TREATED AS SUBSTANTIAL OWNER.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—An individual for whom an election under section 1391 (relating to election of simplified tax) is in effect for the taxable year shall be treated as the owner of any portion of a trust in respect of which, for such taxable year, there may be accumulated any item of gross income or any item required to be added to adjusted gross income under section 1993(b) (relating to additions to adjusted gross income), if such accumulated item may ultimately vest in such individual or his estate and must ultimately vest in such individual, his estate, or his appointees.

"(b) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of subsection (a)—

"(1) The term 'appointees' includes beneficiaries designated in the trust instrument, legatees, persons appointed by will, and persons who take in default of an appointment.

"(2) The Secretary or his delegate may provide by regulations that contingencies which are not substantial shall not be taken into account.

"(c) EXCEPTION WHERE GRANTOR OR PERSON OTHER THAN GRANTOR IS TAXABLE.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the grantor of the trust is otherwise treated as the owner under sections 671 to 677, inclusive, or if a person other than the grantor is otherwise treated as the owner under section 678."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart E of part I of subchapter J of chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 679. Individual electing simplified tax method treated as substantial owner."

(e) INCOME FROM AN EMPLOYMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 232(g) (relating to income from employment) of the Revenue Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "A taxpayer may not elect under this paragraph for any taxable year for which an election by him under section 1391 (relating to election of simplified tax) is in effect."

(f) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS EXTENDED.—

(1) LIMITATIONS ON ASSESSMENT.—Section 6501 (relating to limitations on assessment and collection) is amended by redesignating subsection (k) as subsection (l) and by inserting after subsection (j) the following new subsection:

"(k) TAXPAYERS ELECTING UNDER SECTION 1391.—In the case of a deficiency attributable to the applicaiton of regulations under section 1394(a) (relating to regulations to prevent avoidance of tax, etc.), such deficiency may be assessed at any time before the expiration of the period within which a deficiency for the last taxable year for which the election by the taxpayer under section 1391 (relating to election of simplified tax) is in effect may be assessed."

(2) LIMITATIONS ON CREDIT OR REFUND.—Section 6511(d) (relating to special rules applicable to income taxes) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) SPECIAL PERIOD OF LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO TAXPAYERS ELECTING UNDER SECTION 1391.—If the claim for credit or refund relates to an overpayment attributable to the application of regulations under section 1394(a) (relating to regulations to prevent avoidance of tax), in lieu of the 3-year period of limitations prescribed in subsection (a), the period shall be that period which ends with the expiration of the 15th day of the 40th month following the end of last taxable year for which the election by the taxpayer under section 1391 (relating to election of simplified tax) is in effect."

(g) NONSEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS.—Notwithstanding section 7852(a) (relating to separability clause), if any provision of the amendments made by this section, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid on constitutional grounds by the Supreme Court of the United States, the amendments made by this section shall have no force or effect, and the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall apply as if this section had not been enacted.

(h) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(1) The table of subchapters for chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Subchapter U. Election of Simplified Tax Method."

(2) Section 891 (relating to doubling of rates of tax on citizens and corporations of certain foreign countries) is amended by striking out "and 881" and inserting in lieu thereof "881, and 1392".

SEC. 3. INCREASE OF LIMITATION ON STANDARD DEDUCTION.

The second sentence of section 141(a) (relating to standard deduction) is amended to read as follows:

"The standard deduction shall not exceed $2,000, except that in the case of a separate return by a married individual the standard deduction shall not exceed $1,000."

SEC. 4. MINIMUM STANDARD DEDUCTION.

Paragraph (2) of section 141(c) (relating to minimum standard deduction) is amended to read as follows:

"(2)(A) $300, in the case of a joint return of a husband and wife under section 6013,

"(B) $300, in the case of a return of an individual who is not married, or

"(C) $150, in the case of a separate return by a married individual."

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1964.

The statement and explanation submitted by Mr. LONG of Louisiana are as follows:

NUMBER OF TAXPAYERS LIKELY TO BE AFFECTED BY DIFFERENT FEATURES OF LONG BILL TOGETHER WITH PROBABLE EFFECT OF THESE FEATURES ON REVENUES

The simplified tax system I proposed last year would have been elected, it was estimated, by only 14,000 taxpayers. It is now estimated that over 300,000 taxpayers would elect the optional rate system I am proposing and that their tax burden would be reduced by about $225 million. In addition, it is estimated that about 2.5 million taxpayers would benefit from the proposed increase of the standard deduction ceiling alone and that the revenue loss attributable to the increase in the standard deduction would be $210 million. Finally it is estimated that 11 million taxpayers would benefit from the increase of the minimum standard deduction and that the revenue cost would be $270 million. When all three features of my proposal are combined, the total tax reduction is estimated to be about $700 million and it is estimated that about 13.8 million taxpayers—28 percent of all the taxpayers—would benefit directly. (These estimates are shown in detail in tables 4 through 7.)

These estimates of losses of revenue due to the Long simplified tax plan as compiled for me by the Treasury Department are necessarily very much on the high side because Treasury officials have not taken into account the increased flow of revenue to the Government as a result of the fact that a considerable number of taxpayers who will elect the simplified tax plan will spend more time earning money and less time concocting tax avoidance arrangements, some of which are uneconomical and contrary to public policy, and all of which cause substantial losses in Government revenue.

Thus it is estimated that about one out of every four taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of $20,000 or more would elect the simplified optional rate system—about 300,000 taxpayers in all. An additional 114,000 taxpayers with these same incomes would elect to switch to the standard deduction because of the higher ceiling in lieu of itemizing their deductions (see table 6).

Among the middle-income group—those with incomes from $10,000 to $20,000—the optional rate system would benefit very few (only about 10,000 taxpayers), but the proposed increase in the limitation on the standard deduction would aid almost 550,000 taxpayers, or 11 percent of those in that income range who now itemize their deductions, to switch to the simple standard deduction.

Taxpayers with incomes below $10,000 would not benefit from the optional-rate system or the increase in the $1,000 limitation on the standard deduction but as a result of the proposed $100 increase in the minimum standard deduction, about 1 million of such taxpayers would get the benefit of simplification—about 300,000 would switch from itemization to the increased minimum standard deduction and 700,000 others would become nontaxable as a result of the increase in the minimum standard deduction.

In total, about 2 million taxpayers would benefit from simplification by giving up itemization or becoming nontaxable. Moreover, these same 2 million taxpayers and an additional 11.8 million would gain in terms of fairer tax treatment. The latter group includes mostly taxpayers whose income is well below $10,000 and who now claim the minimum standard deduction or the 10-percent standard deduction. It also includes 1.8 million taxpayers most of whose incomes are between $10,000 and $20,000 and who now use the standard deduction. This is the group that is now limited by the $1,000 ceiling on the standard deduction and does not therefore have the opportunity of deducting the full 10 percent of income by

electing the standard deduction. In contrast, taxpayers with incomes below $10,000 who claim the standard deduction can deduct the full 10 percent of their income. My proposal would alleviate this restriction and allow all taxpayers with incomes up to $20,000 the full benefit of the 10 percent standard deduction. Those with incomes over $20,000 will generally find the simplified tax system to be a reasonable alternative. Thus, all taxpayers, whatever their income, will be offered a reasonable option to elect a relatively simple tax system.

In addition to those benefited directly by my proposal, it is my belief that all taxpayers will benefit from a sounder, fairer, and simpler tax system and that my proposal represents an important step in that direction. As a student of our tax system, I have become increasingly impressed by the inequity and the complexity of our tax structure, particularly with regard to individuals in upper-income brackets. The difference between high-income taxpayers who do and those who do not pay high effective rates of tax is illustrated in table 8, which compares the type of high-income taxpayer who would not elect the simplified tax method with the type that would. Tables 9 through 11 illustrate the cases of taxpayers with large incomes who have succeeded in keeping their tax liability very low. In some cases, these taxpayers have paid less than 1 percent of their income in Federal taxes. In fact, there are taxpayers who have legally avoided paying any taxes at all, even though their gross income exceeded a million dollars. Tables 9 through 11 also show the situation of other taxpayers with similar amounts of income who pay more than 50 percent of their income in taxes and how this latter group of taxpayers would benefit from my proposal.

Under the simplified tax system I am proposing today, the maximum rate would be 50 percent, and lower rates would be applicable to the first $100,000 of income in the case of a married taxpayer. Nevertheless, it is estimated that about 75 percent of all taxpayers with incomes over $20,000 would not find the simplified system advantageous despite its lower rates. In fact almost 60 percent of taxpayers with incomes over $50,000 would find the present system more advantageous and would not elect the simplified system. (See table 6.) These figures point up clearly, I believe, that most high-income taxpayers find ways to avoid the impact of the present high tax rates. The difference between such high-income taxpayers and those who do pay high effective rates of tax is illustrated in table 13, which compares the type of high-income taxpayer who would not elect the simplified tax method with the type that would.

Additional Reasons for Optional Proposal and Technical Explanation of Certain Aspects

SIMPLIFICATION AND EQUITY

One principal reason for my proposal is that it would greatly simplify the tax law. I recognize, of course, that my amendment will not mean immediate simplification for many taxpayers. However, if it proves successful with respect to the group to which it applies, we will be able to extend its principles to even more taxpayers. In any event, it would reverse the trend to an ever-increasing complexity and show our determination to achieve simplification. It may be objected that, even for the group affected, the program is not a simplification because taxpayers would have to compare their tax under the present system with the tax under the optional program before deciding whether to elect. Thus two computations of tax would be required where one suffices today. This reasoning overlooks the fact that the election is irrevocable for 5 years. Once the election were made, the taxpayer would follow the simple system for the next 4 years without any need for alternative computations.

Everyone is agreed that the standard deduction, introduced in the early 1940's, simplifies the tax system for more than 25 million taxpayers; yet it, too, is elective so that the taxpayer each year must make two computations before he can decide upon his election. Nevertheless, no one would argue that because of this theoretical double computation we should discard the standard deduction.

It should be noted, however, that the standard deduction is effective only for lower income taxpayers because of the $1,000 ceiling. Almost every high-income taxpayer has deductible expenses in excess of $1,000. Thus, the standard deduction is rarely elected by high-income taxpayers. The optional method suggested herein would give high-income taxpayers an option somewhat similar to the standard deduction.

Those who now elect the standard deduction must forego only itemized deductions. Since the optional method would extend relatively greater advantages to high-income taxpayers, they would be required to forego not only itemized deductions but the other tax advantages detailed above.

IMPROVEMENT OF TAXPAYER MORALE

The present high rates, combined with the use of tax-avoidance devices by many very wealthy taxpayers, have led many taxpayers to the conclusion that the tax system is confiscatory and unfair. Others, seeing the preferential treatment accorded certain types of income, have deluged Congress with pleas for special treatment in their own situation. In the light of the present high rates and the unequal treatment of taxpayers with similar amounts of income pointed out above, these pleas have been hard to resist, and the categories of income given favored treatment have expanded. Still other taxpayers, in a silent protest against what they conceive to be an unfair system, have resorted to sharp practices and tax evasion.

The reduction of rates in the Revenue Act of 1964 will do much to alleviate these problems, but we can and should do more. My proposal would make it clear that in no case need a taxpayer pay as much as 50 percent of his income in Federal income taxes. Thus, claims that the Federal Government is a senior partner or that the tax-rate schedule is confiscatory would be stifled and their effect on taxpayers' morale eliminated. Perhaps more importantly, the reduction in the use of tax-avoidance devices, discussed above, would reduce the feeling among many taxpayers that the tax system is inequitable and would minimize the need for, and consequently the incidence of, pleas to extend preferential treatment to new categories of income.

THE 5-YEAR ELECTION

An election to pay tax under the optional program will generally be irrevocable for 5 years. If the election could be changed every year without penalty, it could be abused by taxpayers electing in alternate years and bunching their deductions, tax-exempt interest, and so forth, in years when they do not elect. Thus, they would get the benefit both of the present tax system with its provisions favoring certain types of income and expenditures and the optional method with its low, effective rates. On the other hand, if the election were made effective for all time or for a very long period of time, very few taxpayers would elect because they would be unwilling to commit themselves for so long into the future when their circumstances might very well change. A 5-year election, however, should be long enough to prevent manipulation and yet short enough so that at least some taxpayers would be willing to commit themselves to get the benefit of favorable rates.

In certain limited circumstances the election could terminate in less than 5 years. Thus the election would terminate if the taxpayer married a person who had not elected, if the law were changed so that the optional method became substantially less favorable to electing taxpayers as a group, or if the taxpayer went into bankruptcy or became disabled, so that he no longer received earned income. Moreover, the taxpayer could revoke the election if he found it desirable, provided he recomputed his tax for all prior years covered by that election (i.e., not more than 5 years) as if he had not made the election and provided he paid such recomputed tax plus an additional tax of 5 percent thereof and interest on any deficiency. In such case he would be given credit for any tax paid under the election and therefore might receive a refund.

TAX-EXEMPT INTEREST

A taxpayer who elects the optional program will be required to agree to include in income presently tax-exempt interest on State and local bonds. Taxpayers who do not desire to pay tax on such interest would, of course, not elect the optional program. In view of the number of taxpayers involved, the program should not have a significant impact on the municipal bond market.

MINERAL INCOME

A taxpayer electing under the optional program would be allowed cost depletion but not percentage depletion on mineral income. Thus, he could recover his cost in the mineral property but not anything in excess thereof. In addition, taxpayers who elect would be required to capitalize their intangible drilling costs rather than deduct them as they may do today, in many cases against other ordinary income.

PENSION AND PROFIT-SHARING PLAN CONTRIBUTIONS

Under present law an employee is not taxable when his employer makes contributions on his behalf under a qualified pension or profit-sharing plan. The employee is taxed, however, when the plan distributes his benefits to him. An employee who elects the optional method would be required to include such contributions in income when made—provided his rights under the plan are then nonforfeitable—but he would not be taxable on distributions from the plan to the extent of contributions previously included in his income.

In the case of a self-employed individual who elects the optional method, no deduction would be allowed for contributions for his own benefit under an H.R. 10 pension plan, and, to that extent, he would not be taxable on distributions by the plan.

DEDUCTIONS

Under present law taxpayers are allowed two different types of deductions.

First, adjusted gross income deductions. In computing adjusted gross income, all taxpayers may deduct trade and business expenses, 50 percent of net long-term capital gains, up to $1,000 of net capital losses, expenses attributable to rental property, depreciation and depletion in the case of trust beneficiaries, and contributions to self-employed individuals' pension plans—H.R. 10. In the case of employees only reimbursed expenses and expenses for transportation and travel away from home may be deducted from gross income as business expenses.

Second, taxable income deductions. In computing taxable income, taxpayers may

deduct from adjusted gross income personal exemptions and may elect to deduct either the standard deduction or the itemized deductions allowed by the code for expenses which are not deductible in computing adjusted gross income—principally, State and local taxes, interest paid, charitable contributions, medical expenses, casualty losses, alimony, investment expenses, and employee business expenses.

Taxpayers electing the optional method would be allowed only the adjusted gross income deductions, with modifications discussed below. They would not be allowed any taxable income deductions, either itemized deductions or the standard deduction.

In addition to adjusted gross income deductions, taxpayers who elect the simplified tax method would be allowed to deduct all investment expenses, expenses for the production of income, employee business expenses, and alimony. They would also be allowed the deduction for personal exemptions—except the additional personal exemptions for old age and blindness. Electing taxpayers would not, however, be allowed deductions with respect to net long-term capital gains, percentage depletion, intangible drilling expenses, or H.R. 10 pension contributions.

MISCELLANEOUS ADJUSTMENTS

Taxpayers who elect the optional method would be required to include in income some other presently tax-free types of income, such as two-thirds of social security and railroad retirement benefits. (The remaining third of these benefits will continue to be tax-free so that taxpayers may recover their already taxed contributions to the benefit systems.) In addition, there would be included in the income of electing taxpayers the first $200 of dividends now excluded, presently exempt foreign-source income, sick pay, and trust income accumulated for their benefit—or for the benefit of themselves, their heirs, or their appointees. Such taxpayers would not be allowed to take advantage of the dividend credit (eliminated for 1965 and subsequent years by the Revenue Act of 1964) or the retirement income credit. Electing taxpayers would be allowed the benefits of the income-averaging provisions, but these provisions would be modified so that income for years during which an election is in effect could not be averaged with income for other years.

TABLE 1.—*Optional rate schedules under the Long proposal and 1965 rate schedules under present law*

Schedule I. Long Proposal: (A) Single Taxpayers Who Do Not Qualify for Rates in Schedules II and III and (B) Married Persons Filing Separate Returns

If the amount of simplified taxable income [1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but over $10,000	Enter 0 plus 20 percent of excess over 0.
Over $10,000 but not over $14,000	Enter $2,000 plus 25 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $18,000	Enter $3,000 plus 30 percent of excess over $14,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $32,000	Enter $4,200 plus 35 percent of excess over $18,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $50,000	Enter $9,100 plus 40 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $50,000	Enter $16,300 plus 50 percent of excess over $50,000.

Schedule II. Long proposal: (A) Married Taxpayers Filing Joint Returns and (B) Certain Widows and Widowers

If the amount of simplified taxable income [1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but not over $20,000	Enter 0 plus 20 percent of excess over 0.
Over $20,000 but not over $28,000	Enter $4,000 plus 25 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $36,000	Enter $6,000 plus 30 percent of excess over $28,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $64,000	Enter $8,400 plus 35 percent of excess over $36,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $100,000	Enter $18,200 plus 40 percent of excess over $64,000.
Over $100,000	Enter $32,600 plus 50 percent of excess over $100,000.

Schedule III. Long Proposal: Unmarried (or Legally Separated) Taxpayers Who Qualify as Head of Household

If the amount of simplified taxable income [1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but not over $10,000	Enter 0 plus 20 percent of excess over 0.
Over $10,000 but not over $14,000	Enter $2,000 plus 22.5 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $18,000	Enter $2,900 plus 25 percent of excess over $14,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	Enter $3,900 plus 27.5 percent of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $28,000	Enter $4,450 plus 30 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	Enter $6,850 plus 32.5 percent of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	Enter $8,150 plus 35 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $50,000	Enter $9,550 plus 37.5 percent of excess over $36,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $64,000	Enter $14,800 plus 42.5 percent of excess over $50,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $100,000	Enter $20,750 plus 45 percent of excess over $64,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000	Enter $36,950 plus 50 percent of excess over $100,000.

Schedule IV. 1965 Rates Under Present Law: (A) Single Taxpayers Who Do Not Qualify for Rates in Schedules V and VI and (B) Married Persons Filing Separate Returns

If the amount of taxable income [1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but not over $500	Enter 0 plus 14 percent of excess over 0.
Over $500 but not over $1,000	Enter $70 plus 15 percent of excess over $500.
Over $1,000 but not over $1,500	Enter $145 plus 16 percent of excess over $1,000.
Over $1,500 but not over $2,000	Enter $225 plus 17 percent of excess over $1,500.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	Enter $310 plus 19 percent of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	Enter $690 plus 22 percent of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	Enter $1,130 plus 25 percent of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	Enter $1,630 plus 28 percent of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	Enter $2,190 plus 32 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	Enter $2,830 plus 36 percent of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	Enter $3,550 plus 39 percent of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	Enter $4,330 plus 42 percent of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	Enter $5,170 plus 45 percent of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	Enter $6,070 plus 48 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000	Enter $7,030 plus 50 percent of excess over $22,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000	Enter $9,030 plus 53 percent of excess over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000	Enter $12,210, plus 55 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000	Enter $15,510, plus 58 percent of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	Enter $18,990, plus 60 percent of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000	Enter $22,590, plus 62 percent of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000	Enter $28,790, plus 64 percent of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000	Enter $35,190, plus 66 percent of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000	Enter $41,790, plus 68 percent of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000	Enter $48,590, plus 69 percent of excess over $90,000.
Over $100,000	Enter $55,490, plus 70 percent of excess over $100,000.

Footnote at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Optional rate schedules under the Long proposal and 1965 rate schedules under present law*—Continued

Schedule V. 1965 Rates Under Present Law: (A) Married Taxpayers Filing Joint Returns and (B) Certain Widows and Widowers

If the amount of taxable income [1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but not over $1,000	Enter 0 plus 14 percent of excess over 0.
Over $1,000 but not over $2,000	Enter $140 plus 15 percent of excess over $1,000.
Over $2,000 but not over $3,000	Enter $290 plus 16 percent of excess over $2,000.
Over $3,000 but not over $4,000	Enter $450 plus 17 percent of excess over $3,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $8,000	Enter $620, plus 19 percent of excess over $4,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $12,000	Enter $1,380 plus 22 percent of excess over $8,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $16,000	Enter $2,260 plus 25 percent of excess over $12,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $20,000	Enter $3,260 plus 28 percent of excess over $16,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $24,000	Enter $4,380 plus 32 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $24,000 but not over $28,000	Enter $5,660 plus 36 percent of excess over $24,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	Enter $7,100 plus 39 percent of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	Enter $8,660 plus 42 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $40,000	Enter $10,340 plus 45 percent of excess over $36,000.
Over $40,000 but not over $44,000	Enter $12,140 plus 48 percent of excess over $40,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $52,000	Enter $14,060 plus 50 percent of excess over $44,000.
Over $52,000 but not over $64,000	Enter $18,060 plus 53 percent of excess over $52,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $76,000	Enter $24,420 plus 55 percent of excess over $64,000.
Over $76,000 but not over $88,000	Enter $31,020 plus 58 percent of excess over $76,000.
Over $88,000 but not over $100,000	Enter $37,980 plus 60 percent of excess over $88,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000	Enter $45,180 plus 62 percent of excess over $100,000.
Over $120,000 but not over $140,000	Enter $57,580 plus 64 percent of excess over $120,000.
Over $140,000 but not over $160,000	Enter $70,380 plus 66 percent of excess over $140,000.
Over $160,000 but not over $180,000	Enter $83,580 plus 68 percent of excess over $160,000.
Over $180,000 but not over $200,000	Enter $97,180 plus 69 percent of excess over $180,000.
Over $200,000	Enter $110,980 plus 70 percent of excess over $200,000.

Schedule VI. 1965 Rates Under Present Law: Unmarried (or Legally Separated) Taxpayers Who Qualify as Head of Household

If the amount of taxable income [1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but not over $1,000	Enter 0 plus 14 percent of excess over 0.
Over $1,000 but not over $2,000	Enter $140 plus 16 percent of excess over $1,000.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	Enter $300 plus 18 percent of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	Enter $660 plus 20 percent of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	Enter $1,060 plus 22 percent of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	Enter $1,500 plus 25 percent of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	Enter $2,000 plus 27 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	Enter $2,540 plus 31 percent of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	Enter $3,160 plus 32 percent of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	Enter $3,800 plus 35 percent of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	Enter $4,500 plus 36 percent of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	Enter $5,220 plus 40 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $24,000	Enter $6,020 plus 41 percent of excess over $22,000.
Over $24,000 but not over $26,000	Enter $6,840 plus 43 percent of excess over $24,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $28,000	Enter $7,700 plus 45 percent of excess over $26,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	Enter $8,600 plus 46 percent of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	Enter $10,440 plus 48 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $38,000	Enter $12,360 plus 50 percent of excess over $36,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $40,000	Enter $13,360 plus 52 percent of excess over $38,000.
Over $40,000 but not over $44,000	Enter $14,400 plus 53 percent of excess over $40,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	Enter $16,520 plus 55 percent of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $52,000	Enter $19,820 plus 56 percent of excess over $50,000.
Over $52,000 but not over $64,000	Enter $20,940 plus 58 percent of excess over $52,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $70,000	Enter $27,900 plus 59 percent of excess over $64,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $76,000	Enter $31,440 plus 61 percent of excess over $70,000.
Over $76,000 but not over $80,000	Enter $35,100 plus 62 percent of excess over $76,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $88,000	Enter $37,580 plus 63 percent of excess over $80,000.
Over $88,000 but not over $100,000	Enter $42,620 plus 64 percent of excess over $88,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000	Enter $50,300 plus 66 percent of excess over $100,000.
Over $120,000 but not over $140,000	Enter $63,500 plus 67 percent of excess over $120,000.
Over $140,000 but not over $160,000	Enter $76,900 plus 68 percent of excess over $140,000.
Over $160,000 but not over $180,000	Enter $90,500 plus 69 percent of excess over $160,000.
Over $180,000	Enter $104,300 plus 70 percent of excess over $180,000.

[1] Under the Long proposal tax is computed on "simplified taxable income" rather than "taxable income" as under present law. Simplified taxable income includes certain types of income not taxable under present law and is computed without any deduction for personal expenses (interest, taxes, contributions, etc.) and certain other items.

TABLE 2.—*Capital gains, by income levels*

Returns with adjusted gross income of—	Comprise this percentage of all taxpayers—	But receive this percentage of all capital gains
$200,000 and over	0.0096 of 1 percent	16
$100,000 and over	0.04 of 1 percent	24
$50,000 and over	0.2 of 1 percent	35
$10,000 and over	8.7 percent	69
Less than $5,000	57.8 percent	17

Published in Senate Finance Committee's Report on the Revenue Act of 1964, Jan. 28, 1964, p. 162.

TABLE 3.—*Effective tax rates under present law (1965 rates) for high-income taxpayers with low, medium, and high proportions of capital gains*

Adjusted gross income	Tax as percent of total income [1]	Adjusted gross income	Tax as percent of total income [1]
High proportion of capital gains:		Medium proportion of capital gains—Continued	
$120,000	25.9	$700,000	25.4
$170,000	24.5	$2,000,000	28.0
$300,000	22.3	Low proportion of capital gains:	
$700,000	21.0	$120,000	34.9
$2,000,000	21.4	$170,000	37.2
Medium proportion of capital gains:		$300,000	41.6
$120,000	29.1	$700,000	40.6
$170,000	29.2	$2,000,000	46.4
$300,000	28.7		

[1] Total income is adjusted gross income plus capital gains excludable from adjusted gross income.

TABLE 4.—*Revenue effect of Long proposal* [1]

AGI class	Present law tax	Tax change
Under $10,000	$18,355,000,000	−$270,000,000
$10,000 to $20,000	10,550,000,000	−140,000,000
$20,000 to $50,000	5,785,000,000	−150,000,000
$50,000 and over	4,730,000,000	−145,000,000
Total	39,420,000,000	−705,000,000

[1] Proposal would provide an optional rate schedule, extend the standard deduction ceiling to $2,000, and raise the minimum standard deduction to $400 and $100 for spouse and each dependent.

TABLE 5.—*Number of tax returns benefiting and revenue loss from the increased standard deduction ceiling of $2,000, increased minimum standard deduction, or optional feature of the Long proposal*

[Number of returns in thousands and dollar amount in millions]

AGI class	Increased ceiling		Increased minimum standard deduction		Option		Long proposal	
	Number of returns [1]	Revenue loss	Number of returns [2]	Revenue loss	Number of returns	Revenue loss	Number of returns	Revenue loss
0 to $10,000	27	([3])	11,000	$270			11,027	$270
$10,000 to $20,000	2,305	$140			10	([3])	2,315	140
$20,000 to $50,000	152	65			240	$85	392	150
$50,000 to $100,000	1	5			55	85	56	90
$100,000 and over	([4])	([3])			8	55	8	55
Total	2,485	210	11,000	270	313	225	13,798	705

[1] Benefiting only from the increased standard deduction ceiling of $2,000.
[2] Benefiting only from raising minimum standard deduction to $400 and $100 for spouse and each dependent. About 700,000 returns would become nontaxable.
[3] Less than $2,500,000.
[4] Less than 500.

TABLE 6.—*Number of returns benefiting from the increased standard deduction ceiling of $2,000, increased minimum standard deduction or optional feature of the Long proposal*

[Number in thousands]

Adjusted gross income class (thousand)	Number of taxable returns [1] present law	Number benefiting only from ceiling increase		Number benefiting only from increased minimum standard deduction [2]		Number choosing the option		Total Long proposal	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All returns:									
Under $10	41,621	27	0.1	11,000	26.4			11,027	26.5
$10 to $20	6,709	2,305	34.4			10	0.1	2,315	34.5
$20 to $50	1,042	152	14.6			240	23.0	392	37.6
$50 and over	152	1	.7			63	41.4	64	42.1
Total	49,524	2,485	5.0	11,000	22.2	313	.6	13,798	27.9
Standard deduction:									
Under $10	23,327	25	.1	10,700	45.9			10,725	46.0
$10 to $20	1,762	1,757	99.7			5	.3	1,762	100.0
$20 to $50	98	38	38.8			60	61.2	98	100.0
$50 and over	4	1	25.0			3	75.0	4	100.0
Total	25,191	1,821	7.2	10,700	42.5	68	.3	12,589	50.0
Itemized deductions:									
Under $10	18,294	2	([3])	300	1.6			302	1.7
$10 to $20	4,947	548	11.1			5	.1	553	11.2
$20 to $50	944	114	12.1			180	19.1	294	31.1
$50 and over	148	([4])				60	40.5	60	40.5
Total	24,333	664	2.7	300	1.2	245	1.0	1,209	5.0

[1] At calendar year 1963 levels of income.
[2] Includes 700,000 returns which would become nontaxable.
[3] Less than 0.05 percent.
[4] Less than 500.

TABLE 7.—*Number of returns benefiting from simplification*

[Number in thousands]

Adjusted gross income class	Number of taxable returns, present law [1]	Number benefiting from ceiling increase		Number benefiting from increased minimum standard deduction [2]		Number benefiting from option		Total, Long proposal	
		Number	Percent of class	Number	Percent of class	Number	Percent of class	Number	Percent of class
Under 10,000	41,621	2	([3])	[2] 300	0.7			[2] 302	0.7
10,000 to 20,000	6,709	548	8.2			10	0.1	558	8.3
20,000 to 50,000	1,042	114	10.9			240	23.0	354	34.0
50,000 and over	152	([4])				63	41.4	63	41.4
Total	49,524	664	1.3	[2] 300	.6	313	.6	[2] 1,277	2.6

[1] At calendar year 1963 levels of income.
[2] Also 700,000 would become nontaxable.
[3] Less than 0.05 percent.
[4] Less than 500.

TABLE 8.—*Example of tax disparity of actual taxpayers and effect of Long proposal*

Item	Present law (1965 rates)		Case B using Long option	Item	Present law (1965 rates)		Case B using Long option
	Case A	Case B			Case A	Case B	
Wages and salaries	$17,708	$201,436	$201,436	Exemptions	$2,400	$3,000	$3,000
Dividends	258,089	30,612	30,612	Deductions	396,108	23,665	
Interest	69,394						
Capital gains (100 percent) [1]	561,995	4,728	4,728	Contributions	120,330	5,299	
Other income (net)	28,595	117,548	117,548	Interest	247,809	937	
				Taxes	14,629	13,025	
Income	935,781	354,324	354,324	Medical			
				Other	13,340	4,404	
Wages and salaries	17,708	201,436					
Dividends less exclusion	257,889	30,512		Tax	137,854	198,144	158,262
Interest	69,394						
Capital gains (50 percent)	286,287	2,364		Tax as percent of income	14.7	55.9	44.7
Other income (net)	28,595	117,548					
Adjusted gross income	659,873	351,860					

[1] Includes net short-term gain of $10,579.

TABLE 9.—*Example of tax disparity of actual taxpayers and effect of Long proposal*

Item	Present law (1965 rates)		Case B using Long option	Item	Present law (1965 rates)		Case B using Long option
	Case A	Case B			Case A	Case B	
Wages and salaries		$79,802	$79,802	Exemptions	$600	$3,600	$3,600
Dividends	$178,334	302,903	302,903	Deductions	259,959	6,199	
Interest	80,232						
Capital gains (100 percent)	68,229	418	418	Contributions	2,338	2,012	
Other income (net)	503			Interest	2,758	326	
				Taxes	[1] 233,530	2,660	
Income	327,298	383,123	383,123	Medical			
				Other	21,331	1,201	
Wages and salaries		79,802					
Dividends less exclusion	178,184	302,803		Tax	12,906	232,048	172,361
Interest	80,232						
Capital gains (50 percent)	34,906	209		Tax as percent of income	3.9	60.6	45
Other income (net)	503						
Adjusted gross income	293,825	382,814					

[1] Includes a large amount of State income tax attributable to capital gains in previous year.

TABLE 10.—*Example of tax disparity of actual taxpayers and effect of Long proposal*

Item	Present law (1965 rates)		Case B using Long option	Item	Present law (1965 rates)		Case B using Long option
	Case A	Case B			Case A	Case B	
Wages and salaries	$20,000	$201,916	$201,916	Exemptions	$1,200	$1,800	$1,800
Dividends	76,318	34,994	34,994	Deductions	676,419	62,403	
Interest	206	1,174	1,174				
Capital gains (100 percent)	1,210,426	−4,491	−1,000	Contributions	463	43,155	
Other income (net)	−22,283	345,275	345,275	Interest	587,693	3,168	
				Taxes	85,401	11,072	
Income	1,284,667	578,868	582,359	Medical	2,500		
				Other	362	5,008	
Wages and salaries	20,000	201,916					
Dividends less exclusion	76,218	34,894		Tax	265	333,619	272,880
Interest	206	1,174					
Capital gains (50 percent)	605,213	−1,000		Tax as percent of income	.02	57.6	47
Other income (net)	−22,283	345,275					
Adjusted gross income	679,354	582,259					

TABLE 11.—*Example of tax disparity of actual taxpayers and effect of Long proposal*

Item	Present law (1965 rates)		Case B using Long option	Item	Present law (1965 rates)		Case B using Long option
	Case A	Case B			Case A	Case B	
Wages and salaries	$28,580	$198,243	$198,243	Exemptions	$2,400	$600	$600
Dividends	115,675			Deductions	149,820	12,912	
Interest	13,367	4,455	4,455				
Capital gains (100 percent)	27,584			Contributions	63,105	6,050	
Other income (net)	45,703	−4,619	−4,619	Interest	37,237	3,097	
				Taxes	17,566	3,764	
Income	230,909	198,079	198,079	Medical	4,207		
				Other	27,705		
Wages and salaries	28,580	198,243					
Dividends less exclusion	115,475			Tax	24,408	114,687	90,040
Interest	13,367	4,455					
Capital gains (50 percent)	13,792			Tax as percent of income	10.6	57.9	45.5
Other income (net)	45,703	−4,619					
Adjusted gross income	216,917	198,079					

TABLE 12

A. Number of returns by effective tax rates based on adjusted gross income by income classes; all returns with adjusted gross income of $500,000 or more, 1959

Adjusted gross income	Total	Effective tax rate (percent)									
		0	0.1 to 9.9	10 to 19.9	20 to 29.9	30 to 39.9	40 to 49.9	50 to 59.9	60 to 69.9	70 to 79.9	80 to 84.9
$500,000 to $749,999	529	3	4	6	34	90	241	73	47	27	4
$750,000 to $999,999	193	2	3	3	9	23	90	36	16	9	2
$1,000,000 to $1,999,999	197	8	1	1	8	22	93	34	17	12	1
$2,000,000 to $4,999,999	64	2			4	6	31	9	6	5	1
$5,000,000 and over	19	5				1	6	3	3	1	
All returns	1,002	20	8	10	55	142	461	155	89	54	8

B. Percentage distribution of effective tax rates based on adjusted gross income by income classes; all returns with adjusted gross income of $500,000 or more, 1959

[In percent]

Adjusted gross income	Median	Total	Effective tax rate (percent)									
			0	0.1 to 9.9	10 to 19.9	20 to 29.9	30 to 39.9	40 to 49.9	50 to 59.9	60 to 69.9	70 to 79.9	80 to 84.9
$500,000 to $749,999	46.0	100	0.6	0.8	1.1	6.4	17.0	45.6	13.8	8.8	5.1	0.8
$750,000 to $999,999	47.5	100	1.0	1.6	1.6	4.7	11.9	46.6	18.7	8.3	4.6	1.0
$1,000,000 to $1,999,999	48.8	100	4.0	.5	.5	4.1	11.2	47.2	17.3	8.6	6.1	.5
$2,000,000 to $4,999,999	47.3	100	3.1			6.3	9.4	48.4	14.1	9.4	7.8	1.5
$5,000,000 and over	46.8	100	26.3				5.3	31.6	15.8	15.8	5.2	
All returns	46.6	100	2.0	.8	1.0	5.4	14.2	46.0	15.5	8.9	5.4	.8

C. Number of returns by effective tax rates based on amended gross income by income classes; all returns with adjusted gross income of $500,000 or more, 1959

Amended gross income [1]	Total	Effective tax rate (percent)									
		0	0.1 to 9.9	10 to 19.9	20 to 29.9	30 to 39.9	40 to 49.9	50 to 59.9	60 to 69.9	70 to 79.9	80 to 84.9
No amended gross income	1	1									
$250,000 to $499,999	4		1		1	1		1			
$500,000 to $749,999	190	1	3	1	17	24	32	50	35	24	3
$750,000 to $999,999	239	1	2	28	100	29	27	22	19	8	3
$1,000,000 to $1,999,999	401	9	3	21	261	27	23	28	16	12	1
$2,000,000 to $4,999,999	130	2	1	8	90	5	7	5	8	4	
$5,000,000 or over	37	6		1	22		2	2	3	1	
All returns	1,002	20	10	59	491	86	91	108	81	49	7

[1] Adjusted gross income amended for each return to include in full capital gains and losses realized in 1959 and exclude capital loss carryover from the preceding 5 years.

D. Percentage distribution of effective tax rates based on amended gross income by income classes; all returns with adjusted gross income of $500,000 or more, 1959

[In percent]

Amended gross income [1]	Median	Total	Effective tax rate (percent)									
			0	0.1 to 9.9	10 to 19.9	20 to 29.9	30 to 39.9	40 to 49.9	50 to 59.9	60 to 69.9	70 to 79.9	80 to 84.9
No amended gross income		100	100.0									
$250,000 to $499,999	32.4	100		25.0		25.0	25.0		25.0			
$500,000 to $749,999	53.0	100	.5	1.5	0.5	8.9	12.6	16.9	26.4	18.4	12.7	1.6
$750,000 to $999,999	28.6	100	.4	.8	11.7	41.9	12.2	11.3	9.2	7.9	3.3	1.3
$1,000,000 to $1,999,999	23.8	100	2.3	.8	5.3	65.1	6.7	5.7	6.9	4.0	2.9	.3
$2,000,000 to $4,999,999	24.6	100	1.5	.8	6.2	69.2	3.9	5.4	3.8	6.1	3.1	
$5,000,000 or over	23.7	100	16.2		2.8	59.4		5.4	5.4	8.1	2.7	
All returns	27.6	100	2.0	.9	5.9	49.0	8.6	9.1	10.8	8.1	4.9	.7

[1] Adjusted gross income amended for each return to include in full capital gains and losses realized in 1959 and exclude capital loss carryover from the preceding 5 years.

Source, table 12: Published in Senate Finance Committee hearings (October 1963), Revenue Act of 1963, pt. 1, pp. 280–281.

TABLE 13.—*Example of tax disparity of illustrative taxpayers with $1,000,000 of income and effect of Long proposal*

	Present law (1965 rates)		Case A using Long option	Case B using Long option
	Case A	Case B		
Wages and salaries	$90,000	$50,000	$90,000	$50,000
Dividends	50,000	150,000	50,000	150,000
Interest (tax exempt)	150,000		150,000	
Capital gains (100 percent)	700,000	100,000	700,000	100,000
Other income (net)	10,000	[1] 700,000	10,000	700,000
Income	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Wages and salaries	90,000	50,000		
Dividends less exclusion	49,800	149,800		
Interest (tax exempt)				
Capital gains (50 percent)	350,000	50,000		
Other income (net)	10,000	700,000		
Adjusted gross income	499,800	949,800		
Exemptions	$2,400	$2,400	$2,400	$2,400
Deductions	300,000	30,000		
Contributions	10,000	5,000		
Interest	200,000	2,000		
Taxes	80,000	20,000		
Medical	5,000	2,000		
Other	5,000	1,000		
Tax	[2] 175,000	603,160	481,400	481,400
Tax as percent of income	17.5	60.3	48.1	48.1

[1] Partnership income.

[2] Alternative capital gains tax of 25 percent only.

PRIVATE BILLS AFFECTING TAX POLICY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, recent events compel me to express my concern that the enactment of certain private legislation may be undermining the integrity of our Federal tax law. This is a matter which I approach with great reluctance, because it involves the responsibility of Congress and congressional committees for assuring even handed treatment for all taxpayers similarly situated.

Several private bills which have recently passed the Congress have had the effect of changing substantive Federal tax rules of general application for the benefit of particular taxpayers. I recognize that private legislation has traditionally provided a means for the redress of grievances growing out of governmental act or omissions for which there is no legal remedy. But in the area of Federal taxes this type of private legislation generally has been restricted to bills which modify procedural requirements of the tax law, such as the statute of limitations, to allow a taxpayer who has made a mistake to correctly compute his tax liability where exceptional extenuating circumstances exist. This is quite different from the recent private bills which establish unique substantive tax rules to which only particular taxpayers are entitled.

It is one thing, for example, to allow a taxpayer to file a claim for refund a few days late because of his serious illness. It would be quite another thing, however, to allow one particular 50-year-old taxpayer to claim all of his medical expenses as a deduction when all other taxpayers under the age of 65 can deduct medical expenses only to the extent they exceed 3 percent of their adjusted gross income.

One recent bill, H.R. 4766, overturned, for the benefit of one particular taxpayer, recent legislation formulated by the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee to solve a difficult problem relating to the computation of percentage depletion in the brick and tile clay industry. Another bill, H.R. 5759, would grant, apparently because of compassionate considerations, a refund of excise taxes on distilled spirits which were destroyed under circumstances which did not qualify for a refund under the general substantive tax rules. A third bill, H.R. 1851, would relieve a taxpayer of his obligation to pay interest at 6 percent per annum on delinquent payments of income tax.

I am not expressing an opinion as to these specific bills. However, I am concerned that at least some of these bills did not receive sufficient consideration from the viewpoint of the tax policy embodied in the substantive tax rules which they overturned.

Until last Wednesday I had not raised objections to any such private legislation. On Wednesday, however, I offered an amendment, which was accepted, to provide capital gain treatment rather than complete tax exemption for a payment for a transfer of all substantial rights to a patent. I did this because it was consistent with general substantive tax rules.

In the future, I hope that it will be possible to have private legislation which has the effect of changing substantive tax rules for particular taxpayers, in addition to being referred to the Judiciary Committee, also referred to the Senate Committee on Finance for its consideration from the standpoint of tax policy.

Relatively few of the total number of taxpayers fail to comply with procedural requirements, but many taxpayers complain of general substantive tax rules as they apply to their particular cases. If one taxpayer is relieved of his obligation to pay interest because his late payments of income tax are due to reasonable cause, why should not all taxpayers who have reasonable cause for their late payments receive similar relief?

If compassionate considerations alone are to justify changing general substantive tax rules for particular taxpayers, our Federal tax law will become riddled with special exceptions based on the particular financial or other circumstances of selected taxpayers, thus resulting in discriminatory tax preferences rather than equity among taxpayers.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 88-606, the Speaker had appointed Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, Mr. WHITE, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. KYL, and Mr. BURTON of Utah as members of the Public Land Law Review Commission on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1192) fixing the time of assembly of the 89th Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 371) establishing that when the two Houses of Congress adjourn on Saturday, October 3, 1964, they stand adjourned sine die, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1096. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7348. An act for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE SIGNING OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON VETERANS NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE BILL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I announce that the conferees have signed the conference report on the veterans' bill, so that there will be a Veterans' Pension Act. The House would expect to act on the report tomorrow. A unanimous consent agreement has been entered into in the House so that the conference report will not have to lie over. I am happy to say that the conference report will make it possible, in view of the very fine provisions enacted by the House and, I believe, improved by the Senate, for 8 million veterans to obtain their national life insurance.

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to hear the report.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION CONFERENCE REPORT—FUNDS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to make a brief plea for legislative justice—a plea for legislative justice for several thousand little boys and girls in the District of Columbia and for seven thousand young men and women in the District of Columbia; those boys and girls and young men and women attending the elementary and secondary schools in the District of Columbia.

In the haste and under the pressure of seeking to adjourn the Congress, I wish to believe that unwittingly, and without full consideration, this injustice is pending and it is a question now as to whether the Congress of the United States in its wisdom tomorrow will prevent it from becoming a reality. I am making these few brief remarks by way of a plea for legislative justice tonight so that they can be in the RECORD for my friends in the House of Representatives to read tomorrow before they make their final decision in regard to a very serious injustice that would have been involved had we permitted the supplemental appropriation bill as reported to us from the House to be adopted by the Senate tonight.

I would have my friends in the House know the history of the action that was taken by the conference committee of the two Houses on the national education bill—a conference report that was approved by an overwhelming vote in both Houses of the Congress. Only yesterday in the House a motion was made to recommit that conference report and that motion was defeated in the House by a vote of 107 yeas to 236 nays, 87 not voting.

Then a motion was made to approve the conference report on the national defense education bill in the House, and it was passed by a vote of 320 yeas, 20 nays, 2 voting present, and 88 not voting. That conference report included a provision for including the District of Columbia in the impacted area program enjoyed in every State in this Union.

The record of today's discussion on the floor of the Senate on that conference will speak for itself, for speaker after speaker in the Senate praised that conference report.

Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from the State of Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, particularly praised the provision in the report that provided at long last for the inclusion of the District of Columbia in the impacted area program.

But when the supplemental appropriation bill came to the floor of the Senate tonight from the House of Representatives, the senior Senator from Oregon was advised that an exceptionally extraordinary legislative procedure had been followed in the House. The supplemental appropriation bill had been taken back to the floor of the House, and the House had added an amendment on the floor of the House to the supplemental appropriation bill that had the effect of excluding the District of Columbia from any funds to be spent in connection with any impacted area program for the benefit of District of Columbia schools.

That is most unjust. It is very unfair to thousands of boys and girls and young men and women in the District of Columbia to whom we owe the same obligations and responsibilities of making available to them the best education possible that we seek to do, by making available impacted area funds, in every State of the Union.

Go a few miles away to Baltimore, where there are many Federal employee civil servants, just as there are Federal employee civil servants in the State Department, the Labor Department, the Agriculture Department, and every other department of the Federal Government in Washington. Federal employees in Baltimore, Md., are included in the determination of the eligibility of Maryland and that part of Maryland for impacted area funds. One might say, "O Justice, where is thy sting?" If that is justice, then I know not what justice is.

We can go across the Potomac into the State of Virginia, where there are thousands and thousands of Federal employees—office employees—and they are accounted for in the formulation of the formula for funds allowable under the impacted area program for Virginia and those areas of Virginia in which school districts qualify for impacted area funds.

Mr. President, I could take you to State after State—for example, California, with Los Angeles and San Francisco, and other areas in that State—where there are thousands of Federal civil service employees, just as there are in the buildings in Washington, D.C., but those employees are taken account of in determining the impacted area formula that will benefit the boys and girls of California. In my own State and every other State the same situation prevails.

I understand that one of the arguments used for the extraordinary legislative course of action by the House of Representatives tonight was that funds for the school budget for the District of Columbia have already been appropriated.

Mr. President, school district after school district in city after city is waiting tonight for the providing of impacted area funds. They have appropriated their local funds, but they are hoping for and counting upon the availability of impacted area funds.

For some years now, as the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, would say if he were standing here with me tonight, he and I and the other members of the District of Columbia Committee have pleaded with the Congress to be fair with the District of Columbia, to stop its discrimination against the schools of the District of Columbia, denying to the District of Columbia the right to participate in the impacted area program.

The argument has always been, "Congress appropriates a budget for the District of Columbia and appropriates funds for the school districts, and that ought to be considered sufficient and final."

Mr. President, that is no justification for denying those little boys and girls and young men and women the same opportunity and advantages, by way of support for their schools, that the boys and girls and young men and women in other parts of the country enjoy.

Let us be frank about it. We always have a very difficult time obtaining a budget and an appropriation for the District of Columbia. As chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia that has jurisdiction over the schools, I testify here tonight with my right hand raised—and I would be glad to put my left hand on a Bible if one were in front of me—that the Congress has been unfair to the District of Columbia time and time again, year after year, in regard to the amount of money it appropriates for all of the functions of the District of Columbia. Because of its parsimony, the sad fact is that the schools in particular have been denied funds they ought to have had.

I am satisfied, without fear of successful contradiction, the District of Columbia has been denied funds in considerable amounts for purposes for which schools in cities of the same size, under State and city and local school district jurisdiction, have been receiving money. I know of no principle of fair play toward the boys and girls and young men and women of this District that can justify the blow that was struck against them tonight.

If I could get Members of the House and Senate to come with me, as I have gone time and time again, into some of the deplorable, overcrowded, congested schoolrooms in this District, and watch the educational process try to work, I have no doubt that there would be a quick reversal of the action in the House.

Do not forget that these thousands of little boys and girls and young men and women for whose just rights I am pleading tonight are going to be adult citizens tomorrow. What kind of citizens, Mr. President? There is much being said these days about various social and sociological problems in the District of Columbia. We have only ourselves to blame.

Mr. President, we cannot maintain the type of educational facility in the poorer schools of the District of Columbia which the money we included in the National Defense Education Act would have been spent to alleviate and develop good citizens. We cannot have good citizens when in childhood they are put through the inadequate educational processes that little boys and girls in the District of Columbia are being subjected to. We sought to bring some relief in our Education Subcommittee, and provided that relief in the National Defense Education Act.

For the benefit of my friends in the House I wish to tell them the procedure that was followed in the conference that resulted in the House conferees accepting that section in the Senate bill which included the District of Columbia in the Federal impacted area program.

It does not happen to be the case that those of us on the Senate side in the conference are responsible for the final arrangement that was arrived at on this section of the bill.

As I have done before, I again give full credit to the farsightedness of House conferees who had reached the same conclusion that we had reached on the Senate side. Simple justice, fair play, and sound public policy called for the inclusion of the District of Columbia in the Federal impacted area program.

Mr. President, in the years past, one of the most effective opponents of including the District of Columbia in the Federal impacted area program was the distinguished and able Representative, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT]. Let the RECORD be perfectly clear that Representative DENT, more than any other person, deserves credit for proposing in our conference committee that the House recede and accept the Senate's proposal for the inclusion of the District of Columbia in the Federal impacted area program. Representative DENT did not do that on the spur of the moment in the conference room. He had studied this subject for some days before the conference ever started. He told us the story. It is a dramatic story, and the kind of story that should give the American people great respect for, and great confidence in, those who serve them in Congress, who are willing to follow where the facts lead.

Representative DENT studied the educational situation in the District of Columbia and became convinced that what the senior Senator from Oregon has said about the deplorable situation in our poorer schools in the District of Columbia is verified by the facts. Representative DENT then went to the Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia, Dr. Hansen, one of the most dedicated school administrators I have ever known. He talked the situation over with the Superintendent of Schools in the District of Columbia. As is pointed out in the conference report filed with the Congress by the House managers of the bill, he arrived at an understanding with Dr. Hansen that the money that would accrue to the school system of the District of Columbia, as the result of being included in the Federal impacted area program, would be spent on the so-called underprivileged schools of the District of Columbia; and he had the assurance that the money would not be going to so-called noneducational expenses, but that the money would be spent for the benefit of these little boys and girls and young men and women who, as I speak here, are enrolled in a school system that makes it necessary for them to go to substandard schools within the boundary of the Capital City of the Nation.

Mr. President, I wish to say to his credit that when Representative DENT made that report in conference, the overwhelming majority of the House conferees agreed to recede and accept the section of the Senate bill that included the impacted area benefits for the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, that was an issue, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, in the House yesterday when the national defense education bill was passed by the overwhelming vote of 320 to 20, with 2 voting "present," and 88 not voting. That section was in the conference report in the Senate today when it was adopted, following a long discussion, with one favorable speech after another in support of the conference report, and on a voice vote not a dissenting "no" was uttered. The parliamentary situation we find ourselves in is difficult. I do not know how many of the 320 Members of the House who voted for the conference report yesterday were absent today. I am aware that there is a terrific pressure for adjournment. I want to see Congress adjourn. I do not want to see Congress adjourn on the basis of its last act being the committing of a great wrong against thousands of little boys and girls and young men and women. I have a trust, too. I have a trust as a Senator. I have a trust to my colleagues in the Senate, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education.

I have sought to dedicate myself to that trust over the years. I have no intention of walking out on that trust in the dying hours of this session of Congress because of the great pressure drive to adjourn and go home. I could never live with myself if I yielded to the suggestions that were made to me by some tonight: "Let it go, WAYNE; let it go; we will see what we can do next year."

Next year does not include the benefits of the impacted area program for the assistance of thousands of little boys and girls and young men and women of the District of Columbia for this year.

Mr. President, great intangible values are involved. Precious human values are involved, on which no dollar sign can be placed.

There is also, according to my sights, a great responsibility for doing everything we can to try to get our friends in the House to reconsider its precipitate action and not use an appropriation bill as a vehicle for this type of legislative action, although I have no doubt that, technically, the House is within its legislative rights because this amendment was added on the floor. I am advised that, undoubtedly, it was added on the floor because, had an attempt been made to add it in committee, it would have been subject to a point of order, for it would have been legislation on an appropriation bill, proposed by a committee, not by either body of Congress.

But formalities and technicalities cannot make a wrong right. Legislative formalities and technicalities cannot right an injustice when the major premise is wrong; and the major premise on which, apparently, the House acted is, in my judgment, wrong, for it wrongs human beings; it wrongs human values; it wrongs a group of underprivileged little boys and girls and young men and women for whom we ought to be doing everything we can to help, not harm, not keep down.

Is it a case of our inability to see the human diamonds in our own backyard when in the Senate we vote millions of dollars for educational purposes in one so-called underdeveloped country after another around the world? Although I am one of the opponents of the foreign aid bill on the basis of its present structure, no member of the Committee on Foreign Relations or no Member of the Senate has ever heard the senior Senator from Oregon object to the expenditure of aid funds to help human values abroad; to help educational processes abroad among the underprivileged people of the world, whose minds we are trying to develop and win over to the cause of freedom in order to prevent their being subjected to the slavery of communism.

But should we do less for our own underprivileged? Should we do less for our own underprivileged in the District of Columbia than we are willing to do for little boys and girls and young men and women in the slums and ghettos of Latin America, India, Pakistan, Africa, and southeast Asia? I am at a loss—I have always been at a loss—to understand the attitude of those who think it is fair and right and just to set the District of Columbia aside and say that the wonderful impacted area program for the benefit of children in the areas that qualify under the formula shall be denied to our boys and girls in the District of Columbia, a program made available to boys and girls across the District line in Maryland and Virginia and in every other State.

I do not think the House upon reflection should want its action of tonight to stand. I plead with the House not to let it stand. I plead with the House to give the benefit of the doubt, if there is a doubt—and I am at a loss to understand that doubt—to the little boys and girls and young men and women for whom I have pleaded tonight, for whom we of Congress are solely responsible for sending to poor, inadequate schools in the District of Columbia.

Let Members of the House speak with the Superintendent of Schools in the District of Columbia. Let them hear from Dr. Hansen his plea for the benefit of impacted area funds for those low-standard schools in the District of Columbia as to which he has made the commitment that he will spend the money for educational benefits to the boys and girls and young men and women in those schools.

Let the Members of the House who have any doubts visit those schools and then answer to their own consciences as to whether or not they think they ought to continue to deprive those boys and girls of the opportunities for the better education that would accrue to them if the District of Columbia were brought within the impacted area program.

I make a plea also to the leadership of the House to bring back its membership—not merely a quorum. The people of America are entitled to have the membership of the House pass on the question of protecting human values. I make a plea to the leadership in the Senate to bring back the Senate—not merely a quorum, not merely a bare 51, such as we had this afternoon. We now have a question of human values that transcends the interests of Members of Congress in either going home or staying home.

We have had raised by this parliamentary maneuver the great question of fulfilling our legislative trust, not by a bare quorum of the two Houses, but by the full membership of both Houses. I feel very deeply on this question. I know the situation in regard to the educational need in the District for the thousands of little boys and girls and the young men and women for whose educational interests I have pleaded tonight. I shall do my very best tomorrow to try to bring about a full attendance of Senators, if that becomes necessary, for final action on this question of human need.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. JOHNSTON), from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Nine postmaster nominations.

(NOTE.—The confirmation of the above nominations appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho):

S. 3249. A bill to require fresh potatoes purchased or sold in interstate commerce to be labeled according to the State in which such potatoes were grown; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 3250. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an optional simplified tax method, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. 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 10 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate,

under the order previously entered, adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, October 3, 1964, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 2, 1964:

UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, of New York, to be the Representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, vice Sidney R. Yates resigned.

The following-named persons to be Representatives and Alternate Representatives of the United States of America to the 19th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

To be representatives

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.

RUSSELL B. LONG, U.S. Senator from the State of Louisiana.

FRANK CARLSON, U.S. Senator from the State of Kansas.

William C. Foster, of the District of Columbia.

Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York.

To be alternate representatives

Charles W. Yost, of New York.

Franklin H. Williams, of California.

Mrs. Gladys A. Tillett, of North Carolina.

Richard N. Gardner, of the District of Columbia.

Charles F. Noyes, of New York.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

John W. Bowling, of Texas.

Robert A. Hurwitch, of Illinois.

John A. Lacey, of Ohio.

Walter J. Mueller, of Connecticut.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert L. Walkinshaw, of Connecticut.

Thomas E. Walsh, of Rhode Island.

John C. Weisert, of Illinois.

Robert L. Dowell, Jr., of Florida, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Richard Noyes Viets, of Texas, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

G. Paul Balabanis, of California.

Frank B. Crump, of New York.

Michael A. Davila, of Texas.

Robert W. DuBose, Jr., of California.

James J. Gormley, of New York.

Allen S. Greenberg, of the District of Columbia.

Richard A. Hollowaty, of California.

Coleman J. Nee, of Massachusetts.

Arnold P. Schifferdecker, of Missouri.

William Seth Shepard, of New Hampshire.

Theodore L. Smith, of New York.

Donald E. J. Stewart, of the District of Columbia.

Peter O. Suchman, of New York.

Walter Frederick Weiss, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James A. Allitto, of California.

Miss Elizabeth A. Bean, of Connecticut.

Joseph F. Becelia, of New York.

Miss Mary Rose Brandt, of Oregon.

David G. Brown, of Pennsylvania.

Donald E. Crafts, of Georgia.

Miss Mary A. Hartl, of Minnesota.

Frederick H. Hassett, of Missouri.

H. Kenneth Hill, of California.

Stuart H. Lippe, of Michigan.

James E. McGee, of California.

James Hamilton McNaughton, of New York.

Wilson A. Riley, Jr., of Connecticut.

Peter G. Smith, of Michigan.

Robert F. Starzel, of Vermont.

James Tarrant, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Heath Bowman, of Florida.

Marvin E. Brenner, of Pennsylvania.

Louis V. Ebert III, of Illinois.

Paul I. Loeb, of the District of Columbia.

James E. Markey, Jr., of Illinois.

Gordon W. Murchie, of California.

Frank Rettenberg, of New York.

Samuel R. Sanders, Jr., of Virginia.

Cecil L. Sanford, Jr., of North Carolina.

Charles G. Simmons, of Virginia.

Justin Sloane, of California.

G. Scott Sugden, of Maine.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Kent B. Crane, of Virginia.

Miss Joan Edmonds, of California.

Belmont F. Haydel, Jr., of Louisiana.

Calvin L. Thomas, Jr., of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James M. Fernald, of New Jersey.

John D. Folger, of the District of Columbia.

Paul G. Nyhus, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Alexander Akalovsky, of Maryland.

Stephen W. Baldanza, New Jersey.

David Chavchavadze, of Massachusetts.

Earl Norbert Garrett III, of Virginia.

Francis J. Hazard, of Tennessee.

Henry K. Heuser, of Maryland.

Adolf J. Lium, of the District of Columbia.

Keith L. MacPhee, of Virginia.

Timothy A. Pfeiffer, of Maine.

Thomas E. Sawyer, of Virginia.

F. William Small, of California.

Michael Tanes, of Massachusetts.

George J. Stanger, of New York, a Foreign Service Staff officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Dee R. Robbins, Norman, Ark., in place of N. W. Smith, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Maurice E. Ball, Fillmore, Calif., in place of J. K. Schwartz, retired.

Robert S. Gleason, Oceanside, Calif., in place of F. H. Lauraine, retired.

COLORADO

Barbara M. Spencer, Ouray, Colo., in place of M. H. McCullough, retired.

FLORIDA

Wilton P. Banks, Pompano Beach, Fla., in place of W. W. Parrish, deceased.

GEORGIA

Lowell D. Morgan, Springfield, Ga., in place of R. R. Beckwith, retired.

ILLINOIS

Martha K. Webster, Palatine, Ill., in place of C. J. O'Hara, resigned.

INDIANA

Howard Schwartz, Craigville, Ind., in place of J. L. Wasson, retired.

KANSAS

Roger K. Perry, Saint Marys, Kans., in place of Jeannette Byrnes, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Mahala Avis Ferriss, Bentonia, Miss., in place of M. H. Martin, transferred.

John D. Rosamond, Gholson, Miss., in place of L. C. Skipper, Jr., declined.

Hayden L. Martin, Pittsboro, Miss., in place of L. R. Beckett, retired.

MISSOURI

William J. Blanton, Norwood, Mo., in place of J. H. Richardson, retired.

NEBRASKA

Robert D. Nealon, Wolbach, Nebr., in place of H. E. Berney, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Helen B. Milne, Elwood, N.J., in place of E. F. Bozarth, retired.

NEW YORK

William M. Fleckenstein, Colden, N.Y., in place of G. W. Miller, retired.

Lachlan Thomson, Pawling, N.Y., in place of F. J. Clum, retired.

Earl E. Gordon, Pomona, N.Y., in place of M. N. Lynch, retired.

Willard H. Aubrey, Rouses Point, N.Y., in place of H. D. Ashline, retired.

OHIO

Frank Dobrozsi, Middletown, Ohio, in place of L. M. Taylor, resigned.

H. W. Kinney, Richmond, Ohio, in place of E. L. Clare, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

William W. Tripp, Blair, Okla., in place of F. H. Hawkins, retired.

Cecil L. Brandly, Oakwood, Okla., in place of C. A. Shaw, retired.

Beatrice H. Jones, Porter, Okla., in place of Evah Kirksey, retired.

VERMONT

James D. O'Brien, Shelburne, Vt., in place of E. T. Sevee, deceased.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Thomas P. McCann	Robert W. Burchell
Gerald F. Woolever	Arthur E. Katz
David R. Zwick	Harvey F. Orr
Nelson H. Keeler, Jr.	John R. Yetke, Jr.
James L. Webster	Andrew F. Durkee, Jr.
Harry T. Suzuki	Wayne K. Hodsen
Kevin T. Clancy	Stephen T. Ulmer
Robert A. Major	David A. Young
Carl R. Mockler	James J. Lantry
Warren D. Snider	Dan A. Nauman
Robert L. Vance, Jr.	Kent M. Ballantyne
Gill R. Goodman	Philip R. North
Howard B. Gehring	Raymond H. Canada, Jr.
Richard L. De Vries	Charles B. Mosher
Thomas D. Fisher	George K. Brown III
James W. Fry, Jr.	John W. Gresson
Nelson W. Koscheski, Jr.	Kurt L. Elste
George J. Buffleben, Jr.	Dennis J. Brady
Robert P. Dickenson	Ray A. Heller
Billy W. Richardson	Robert G. Bates
Robert E. Leggett	Rudy K. Paschel
David J. Connolly	James F. Dewey
Robert L. Kuhnle	Robert E. Fenton
Virgil F. Keith, Jr.	Michael J. Jacobs
Harry D. Nelson	William M. Baxley
Karl L. Reichelt	Jerome P. Mullins
Richard A. Walsh	William A. Caster
William B. Waff	Arthur E. Shepard
John E. Lindark	Peter C. Busick

Ronald O. MacFee
William D. Bechtel
David T. Machmer
Daniel K. Shorey
Jeffrey D. Hartman
Ernst M. Cummings
James A. Murray, Jr.
Denis J. Bluett
Robert M. Pockman
Edward E. DeMuzzio
John D. Adams
Jan F. Smith
Michael Burdian
Michael P. Studley
Michael E. Greene
David C. Brostrom
Charles E. Haas
Stephen J. Ratey, Jr.
James D. Boyce
Danna W. Starkweather
Roger W. Hassard
David L. Andrews
James F. McCahill, Jr.
Barham F. Thomson III
Murray J. Towle
Nicholas H. Allen
Richard J. Heym
Anthony R. Adams
William A. Monson
Roger L. Beving
James C. Haldeman
Karl W. Mirmak
Forrest F. Fursus, Jr.
Norman J. Cross
James L. Mapel
Gerald "D" Mills
Lyman B. Norton
Lynn M. Brown
Phillip J. Kies
Monette B. J. Ratcliff
Virgil J. O'Grady
Edwin F. Chase, Jr.
Dale W. Johnson
Charles L. Gomez
Jacob P. Aucoin, Sr.
John McDonald
Howard H. Lindsay
Thomas E. Brown

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3306, and 3307:

To be major generals, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. George Merle Powell, O19340, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Henry Schuldt Murphey, O19338, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. William Donald Graham, O20067, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Douglas Blair Kendrick, Jr., O20511, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Col. Norman Everett Peatfield, O21027, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier general, Veterinary Corps

Col. Stephen Greive Asbill, O21471, Veterinary Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Henry Schuldt Murphey, O19338, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Byron Ludwig Steger, O19661, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. James Thomas McGibony, O20406, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Conn Lewis Milburn, Jr., O20405, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Laurence Addison Potter, O22294, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Col. Frederic John Hughes, Jr., O26370, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Philip Wallace Mallory, O20916, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Oscar Elliott Ursin, O21687, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Richard Irving Crone, O21727, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Glenn Jesse Collins, O22687, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Colin Francis Vorder Bruegge, O26958, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Col. George Joseph Hayes, O57388, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of commander, in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ackerman, Eugene B.
Ackley, Richard T.
Agnew, Richard S.
Allen, Richard P.
Allison, Paul
Allmann, Richard R.
Ambrose, John E.
Anderson, Robert G.
Andresen, Ronald N.
Andrews, Jack B.
Andry, Walter G.
Angleman, Cornell C.
Anthony, John D., Jr.
Archer, Martin D.
Armstrong, Robert P.
Arnold, Henry D.
Arnold, William S. M.
Ashworth, Albert R., Jr.
Aslund, Roland E.
Aumack, Robert F.
Austin, Fuller A.
Awalt, Thomas Y., Jr.
Axell, Charles L.
Ayres, William H., Jr.
Baarstad, David E.
Bacheller, Frank E.
Backstrom, Robert I.
Bading, Herman M.
Baggett, Lee, Jr.
Bailey, Henry G.
Bailey, Richard T.
Bailey, William C.
Baker, Norman K.
Bare, Keith R.
Barkalow, Gerald H.
Barker, Franklin H.
Barker, Raymond H.
Barnard, Robert W.
Barnette, Curtis L.
Barrineau, Edwin
Barron, Joseph M.
Bates, George M.
Baty, Edward M.
Bauerlein, Leo P.
Bauernfeind, Joseph H.
Baysinger, Reaves H., Jr.
Beatty, William F.
Beck, Frederick E., Jr.
Beeler, James W.
Beesley, David L.
Beesley, Howard L.
Bell, James R.
Bellar, Fred J., Jr.
Belter, Robert H.
Benn, Joseph W., Jr.
Bennett, Robert E.
Bennie, Ralph F.
Berglund, Rex R.
Bergstrom, James H.
Berthier, Neil E.
Bigley, Thomas J.
Billings, Randall K.
Bircher, William B.
Blaha, Albert J.
Blalock, David H., Jr.
Block, Peter F.
Bloomfield, Rollin W.
Boeing, Charles E.
Bogart, Tudor M.
Boggs, Gilbert A.
Borlaug, Paul V.
Born, Waldo L.
Bortner, James A.
Boston, Leo
Boyd, David S.
Bradfield, James
Bradford, John W., Jr.
Bramley, Leslie G.
Branch, Alvin D.
Brand, Alvin
Brandenburg, Delbert E.
Branson, John J., Jr.
Brick, John H.
Bristol, Edward R., Jr.
Brook, William N., Jr.
Brown, Charles O.
Brown, Charles D.
Brown, James B.
Brown, James W.
Bruce, Forrest T.
Bruck, Thomas J.
Brumbach, Lawrence E.
Bryan, Paul E., Jr.
Buck, Roger L.
Burden, James D.
Burnett, James C.
Burt, Alexander R., Jr.
Bustard, Francis W.
Buteau, Bernard L.
Byron, Herbert I.
Byron, John B.
Cady, John P., Jr.
Caglione, Joseph, Jr.
Cahill, John W., Jr.
Caldwell, Ronald H.
Cameron, Allan K., Jr.
Campbell, James S.
Campbell, Richard B.
Canaan, Gerald C.
Carberry, James P., Jr.
Cariker, Jess L., Jr.
Carius, Robert W.
Carlton, George A.
Carpenter, Malcolm S.
Carr, William K.
Carroll, John H., Jr.
Carter, Earl L.
Carter, Frank R.
Casey, Edward J., Jr.
Cassilly, Frank R.
Catterlin, Samuel F.
Cawley, Thomas J.
Cedarburg, Owen L.
Chadwick, Daniel
Chambers, John J.
Chanaud, Henry L.
Chapman, George T., Jr.
Choyce, Charles V.
Christensen, Charles S., Jr.
Church, Clifford E., Jr.
Clark, Fred P., Jr.
Clark, Willard H., Jr.
Clarkson, Charlie J., Jr.
Clemens, Porter E.
Cochran, James A.
Coffman, Walter W.
Cogdell, John B.
Cole, Charles W.
Coleman, Frank S.
Coleman, Gerard G.
Colleary, John E., Jr.
Colvin, Robert D.
Comstock, George F., Jr.
Conkey, Carlton G.
Connolly, Robert D.
Cook, Richard M.
Coontz, Robert J.
Cooper, David L.
Cooper, Stanley G.
Cordray, Richard P.
Cornett, Francis E.
Cossaboom, William M., II
Costello, Daniel J.
Costello, Peter M., Jr.
Coughlin, John T.
Covington, Gerald E.
Cowhill, William J.
Cowperthwaite, John K.
Cramblet, Frank
Crangle, Richard H.
Crawford, Donald H.
Crosby, Howard S.
Crow, Edwin M.
Crowl, Otho W.
Cruse, Donald A.
Cunningham, Russell P., Jr.
Dauber, Robert A.
Daum, Theodore E.
Davey, Richard B.
Davidson, Harrison W., Jr.
Davidson, Richard S.
Davis, Allen B.
Davis, Jack W.
Davis, Thomas E.
Day, Lawrence C.
Debold, Joseph F.
Dellinger, Chesley Y., Jr.
Delozier, Richard G.
Demers, William H., II
Denmark, George T.
Dennis, Edwin L., Jr.
Dewey, William E.
Dickins, Richard A.
Diehl, William F.
Doak, Samuel L.
Doan, Richard C.
Draddy, John M.
Dreesen, Robert F.
Driscoll, Jerome M.
Driscoll, William T., Jr.
Dufort, Emile J., Jr.
Duggan, Frederick F., Jr.
Duggan, Richard W., II
Duncan, Richard D.
Dunnan, Neville D.
Dunning, Frederick S., Jr.
Eagye, Thomas R., II
East, George W.
Eckerd, George E.
Eckert, Earl J., Jr.
Edwards, Frederick A., Jr.
Elliott, James D.
Ellison, Leroy S.
Ellsworth, William A.
Emerson, David F.
Emlet, Harold B.
Engel, Paul H.
Engle, Raymond E.
Epps, Charles W.
Erikson, Warren W.
Estes, Windom L.
Fahland, Frank R.
Falkenstein, Rudolph F.
Farrell, John B.
Farrell, John R.
Farris, Frederick A.
Faulkenberry, Virgil T.
Feagin, Frederick K.
Fears, Donald C.
Featherston, Frank H.
Feeney, Harold
Fenno, Eric N.
Ferrucci, David E.
Finley, Alden G.
Finley, Hugh D.
Fleming, Francis L., Jr.
Fletcher, James L.
Flynn, Richard E.
Foley, Sylvester R., Jr.
Forbes, Donald K.
Forster, William G.
Foster, James R.
Foster, Raymond H.
Foucht, Richard A.
Fox, Albert D.
Fox, Richard T.
Frassa, Donald G.
French, Robert D.
Freytag, David R.
Friesen, Edwin J.
Frosio, Robert C.
Frudden, Mark P.
Gaddis, George E.
Garland, Earl E.
Garland, John C.
Gates, David E.
Geist, Richard A.
Geitz, Kenneth L.
Gercken, Otto E.
Gibbons, Paul C., Jr.
Giles, Claude F.
Gilpin, Burton H.
Gire, Larold W.
Gobble, George F.
Goewey, William I.
Goldbeck, Lewis H., Jr.
Goldman, Howard A.
Goode, Martin
Gooding, Niles R., Jr.
Goodwin, Edmund E.
Greer, James C.
Gregory, George T.
Grigg, William H.
Grimm, William F.
Groff, Bruce F.
Grosvenor, Alexander G. B.
Grunwald, Edward A.
Gureck, William A.
Hage, Lealand P.
Hall, Berkeley W.
Halleland, Henry L.
Hamer, Robert R., Jr.
Hamill, Jerome E.
Hamilton, Donald C.
Hamm, Warren C., Jr.
Hanlon, Kevin
Hanson, Carl T.
Hardgrave, James B.
Hardy, Martin E.
Harkness, Vinton O., Jr.
Harris, John
Harris, Richard D.
Harris, Robert D., Jr.
Hart, George L.
Hartshorn, David L.
Harty, Thomas G.
Haselton, Waring B., Jr.
Hawkins, Larry L.
Hawkins, William H.
Hayes, Stanley M.
Hays, Ronald J.
Heerwagen, David D.
Hegrat, Donald M.
Heininger, Howard G., Jr.
Hemann, John W.
Henderson, Stanley W.
Henry, Martin H.
Hickey, Charles F.
Hicks, Lawrence F.
Highberg, Roy W.
Hill, Allen E.
Hilscher, Carl C.
Hirstein, Robert V.
Hoare, Robert E.
Hofer, Frank N., Jr.
Hoffman, Robert D.
Hofford, John L.
Hofstra, Edward J.
Hofto, Leslie C.
Hohn, Henry E.
Holman, Rockwell
Holmes, John S.
Hoover, Matthew V.
Hopkins, Clifford D.
Hopkins, Mark, Jr.
Horan, John E., Jr.
Hornbeck, Donald R.
Hosemann, Leland J.
Hotes, John L.
Howell, Joe P., Jr.
Hower, Floyd E., Jr.
Hubbard, Donald
Huff, Mahlon S.
Hughes, Frank W., Jr.
Hughes, Ray S.
Hughes, Wayne L.
Hugo, William P.
Hunsley, Lindel A., II
Hussmann, Harry L., III

Huth, Ralph L.
Iredale, John P.
Jacobssen, George E., Jr.
Jarrell, Donald L.
Jeffries, Claude E., Jr.
Jenista, James F., Jr.
Jensen, Arlo J.
Jensen, Donald L.
Jensen, Wayne L.
Jepson, John A.
Johnson, Daniel C.
Johnson, Homer R.
Johnson, Ian J.
Johnson, Merlin L.
Johnson, Neal J.
Johnson, Phillip T.
Johnson, Robert W.
Johnson, Willard E.
Johnston, Richard C.
Jones, Cecil B., Jr.
Jones, John P.
Jones, Ray P.
Jones, Stanley W.
Jordan, Watt W., Jr.
Kaiser, Robert D.
Kamrad, Joseph G.
Kaufman, Norman L.
Kaufman, Richard F.
Kaune, James E.
Kay, Howard N.
Kays, Jack C.
Kearney, John R.
Keller, Robert G.
Kelly, Ronald T.
Kelly, William P., Jr.
Kempf, Cecil J.
Kennedy, James R., Jr.
Kernan, William H.
Ketchmark, Giles J.
Kidd, Owen A.
Kiehl, William A.
Kiker, Herbert W., Jr.
King, Robert A.
Kingsbury, Ben P.
Kirkhorn, Robert L.
Kirkpatrick, Darrell F.
Kivlen, Alexander L.
Kjeldgaard, Peter D.
Klemm, Wilbur C.
Kluga, Norbert R.
Knoizen, Arthur K.
Kolstad, Tom I.
Kost, John D., Jr.
Kozman, Robert J.
Kremer, George
Krantzman, Harry M.
Kraus, Rudolf L.
Kreinberg, Alfred G.
Kremer, John L.
Kretchman, Frank C.
Krohn, Stanley W.
Laney, Edward V., Jr.
Lasell, Max H.
Lasley, William W.
Lassen, William V.
Lassiter, Will E.
Lawrence, Gregory E., Jr.
Lawrence, John V., Jr.
Lawrence, William P.
Leary, Ramon W.
Ledew, Thomas A.
Lee, Byron A.
Lehman, Donald A.
Lemon, Robert T.
Leser, John R.
Lester, Louis R., Jr.
Leue, David E.
Lewis, Daniel A.
Linder, James B.
Lintner, Richard W.
Lisanby, James W.
Lockwood, Harold R.
Lofton, Edgar K., Jr.
Lombard, Richard L.
Long, Charles R.
Longino, Hugh E., Jr.
Loomis, Aubrey K.
Lorfano, Joseph J., Jr.
Loux, Raymond E.
Lovata, Albert F.
Lovelace, Robert H.
Lovell, James A., Jr.
Lund, John D.
Lynam, Donald M.
Lyne, George C.
Lytle, James H.
MacDowell, Charles R.
MacKell, Richard A.
Mackenzie, John D.
Mackey, Robert R.
Madera, Harry P.
Madison, Douglas W.
Magee, Jack E.
Mahon, Richard B.
Maier, Charles W., Jr.
Maire, Rex E.
Majesky, John E.
Malloy, John E.
Mandeville, Robert C., Jr.
Mann, Earl
Manning, Richard T.
Mantz, Roy T.
Marcellus, Russell A.
Marlin, Hubert A.
Martin, Richard W.
Massa, Emiddio
Mathis, Paul J.
Matson, Willis A., II
Mauney, Thomas C.
Mayer, Donald R.
Mayer, Joseph C.
Mayo, William H.
McAnulty, Robert M., Jr.
McArthur, John C.
McArthy, Richard L.
McAvenia, James F., Jr.
McClain, Kirby L., III
McClaran, Stephen W.
McClure, James R.
McCoy, Joseph C., Jr.
McDonald, Robert P.
McFall, Albert D.
McGarrah, William E., Jr.
McGinnis, Ted R.
McGlaughlin, Thomas H.
McIntyre, Andrew
McJunkin, Russel E., Jr.
McKay, Robert B.
McKnight, Jesse E., Jr.
McLoughlin, Howard T.
McNabb, Joseph M.
McNally, John J., Jr.
McNulty, Gerald
McQuiston, Edward I., Jr.
McVoy, James L.
Mealy, Daniel N.
Meek, Donald B.
Messner, James R.
Michaud, Robert A.
Miguel, Theodore, Jr.
Miller, Adair
Miller, Raymond L.
Miller, Richard A.
Miller, William A.
Mills, Joseph E.
Minkkinen, Erkki O.
Minnis, Marion L., Jr.
Moberly, Arthur L.
Moberly, Richard O., Jr.
Modeen, Donald O.
Mohr, Charles H.
Molzan, Edward W.
Montague, Lloyd L.
Moore, Lundi A.
Moore, Roderick B.
Moore, William F.
Moors, Donald E.
Morin, Gene D.
Morrison, Lewis E.
Morrissey, John N.
Muck, Floyd R.
Mull, Charles L., II
Mulligan, James A., Jr.
Murphy, Frank M., Jr.
Myatt, Bert, Jr.
Myer, George W.
Neander, Stanley B.
Neiger, Ralph E.
Nelson, George G.
Nelson, Marvin D., Jr.
Nelson, Robert L.
Netro, Robert J.
Newark, Theodore E.
Newman, Fred S.
Newman, James F.
Nicholson, Richard E.
Nicholson, Jerome E.
Noble, Robert E.
Noble, Thomas I.
Nordan, Emile E.
Norton, Curtis R., Jr.
Notz, Robert C.
Nussbaumer, John J.
Nutt, Thomas O., Jr.
Oakes, Raymond H.
O'Brien, John W.
O'Brien, Charles J., Jr.
O'Connor, Francis E.
O'Donnell, George J., Jr.
O'Drain, John E.
Odrobina, Stephen R.
Ohlrich, Walter E., Jr.
O'Neill, Thomas F., Jr.
Orem, Charles A.
Otten, Henry E.
Ottensmeyer, Robert M.
Page, George L.
Palmer, Gary H.
Palmquist, John R.
Parce, James R.
Parode, Harlan D.
Parrish, William I.
Pausner, Joseph J., Jr.
Pearson, George R. M.
Pelton, Eugene A.
Pelton, Robert L.
Pennington, Otis C.
Pester, Fred J.
Peters, Ralph C., Jr.
Petersen, Donald E.
Pettit, Royce E., Jr.
Pezzel, Engelbert G.
Pfeiffer, King W.
Phillips, Charles T.
Phillips, Edward G.
Phillips, Lawrence E.
Pickering, Richard C.
Pinzel, Lawrence E.
Platte, William A.
Platzek, Eugene H.
Polgar, Paul S.
Portnoy, Howard R.
Potts, Bobby L.
Pouliot, Jean R.
Powell, James R., Jr.
Preston, Frank W.
Preston, Joseph M., Jr.
Price, Byron
Pride, Alfred M.
Profilet, Leo T.
Pullar, Andrew, Jr.
Purdy, Harlan R.
Putnam, Charles L.
Quaid, Marvin M., Jr.
Quigley, Donovan B.
Quinn, Jack Q.
Radcliffe, Roderick T.
Ralston, John, Jr.
Rasmussen, James P., Jr.
Rau, William F.
Reavis, Jackson B.
Redmond, John G.
Reed, Robert K.
Reed, Sherman C.
Reichl, Charles J.
Resek, Lawrence H.
Reynolds, Kenneth C.
Richards, William L., Jr.
Ripley, Robert K.
Risser, James B.
Roberts, Gerald G.
Robertson, John W.
Robisch, Herbert E.
Rockwell, Frank A.
Rogers, Thomas S., Jr.
Rosendahl, Edmund I.
Rosenquist, Donald E.
Ross, Thomas H.
Roth, Franklin H.
Rowe, John D.
Rubey, Ervin B., Jr.
Ruble, Byron C.
Rulis, Robert A.
Rumble, Maurice W.
Rutledge, Howard E.
Ryan, John J., Jr.
Ryan, Philip J.
Saari, Aimo M.
Sabalos, Nicholas
Sample, Richard J.
Sample, Robert J.
Sampson, Jesse E.
Sands, James W.
Sandsberry, Jack C.
Sargent, Herbert A.
Sattler, Donald C.
Saunders, Stephen I., Jr.
Schaub, Robert L.
Schenker, Marvin L.
Schied, Charles F.
Schneider, Arthur F.
Schoelen, Lawrence A.
Scholl, Kenneth C.
Schroeder, Robert A.
Schultz, Jesse Z.
Schultz, Milton J., Jr.
Schwab, Robert W.
Scott, James H.
Scott, Melvin L.
Scoville, Jack
Scribner, Henry I., Jr.
Scully, Donald G.
Sebenius, Carl H., Jr.
Selby, Donald E.
Shafer, Walter R.
Shaffran, William S.
Shannon, Rickard W.
Shartel, Edward A.
Shaw, Fletcher H.
Sheridan, William R.
Sherman, Thomas H., Jr.
Shields, William B.
Shipman, Junious E.
Shultz, Robert T.
Siergiej, Edward S.
Sims, Harvey K.
Singer, Arnold N.
Skalla, Derald Z.
Skinner, Clifford A., Jr.
Skinner, Glenn E., Jr.
Skirm, George L., Jr.
Slankard, Max L.
Sleeper, Sherwin J.
Smith, Jerome W.
Smith, Maurice E.
Smith, Robert F., Jr.
Smith, Thomas M.
Smith, William D.
Smolinski, Joseph P., Jr.
Snodgrass, Cornelius S., Jr.
Snyder, Carl S., Jr.
Snyder, Francis M.
Snyder, John C.
Snyder, Roy D., Jr.
Solomon, Jerome E., Jr.
Sorg, George A.
Southall, Walter E., Jr.
Space, David J.
Sparks, Harold A., Jr.
Spayde, Keith C., Jr.
Speer, Paul H.
Speiser, Jack E.
Spence, Benjamin E.
Spencer, Ralph G.
Spiller, John H., Jr.
Springer, Roy M., Jr.
Stack, Richard A.
Stapp, Aron L.
Steentofte, Eric H.
Stephan, Charles R.
St. John, Alvin P.
St. Louis, Norman E.
Stoddard, Clarence W., Jr.
Stollenwerck, William M.
Stolpe, Richarp H.
Stone, Bruce G.
Storey, Joseph D.
Streich, Paul R.
Strobel, James W.
Stull, Donald
Sudhoff, Herbert A.
Sullivan, Don M.
Summers, Gilbert L.
Sundt, Wilbur A.
Sutherland, Donald C.
Swadener, John R.
Swanson, Charles A. L.
Switzer, James R.
Taylor, Leslie A., Jr.
Tebo, Ballard W.
Terrell, Fred W., Jr.
Thom, Norman R.
Thomas, Earle V.
Thomas, Robert L.
Thomas, Walter R.
Thompson, James J.
Thompson, Robert C.
Thompson, William B., Jr.
Thorndike, Robert F.
Thorp, John H.
Thurston, Dick W.
Tipton, Harold F., Jr.
Todd, Troy E.
Todd, William E.
Tolbert, Robert R.
Tollgaard, Elmer M.
Touch, Ralph J.
Toy, Frank E.
Traynor, Lawrence E.
Tregurtha, James D., Jr.
Trimble, Dan M.
Trost, Carlisle A. H.
Tuomela, Clyde H.
Tvede, Ralph M., Jr.
Twite, Martin J., Jr.
Tyson, James J., Jr.
Underwood, Leland J.
Valentine, Robert F.
Vankleeck, Justin L.
Varner, Byron D.
Varner, Eldon P., Jr.
Vaughn, Robert E.
Veit, William H.
Vines, Thomas E.
Vogel, Oscar J., Jr.
Vollmer, Robert J.
Vosseler, Warren P.
Wagner, Eugene R.
Wagner, Robert H.
Wallace, David T.
Wallace, Edwin S., Jr.
Wallace, Kenneth R.
Waller, Alexander E., Jr.
Warwick, William B.
Wasniewski, Emil F.
Weatherly, Robert T.
Webb, William H.
Weeks, Grady A.
Weymouth, Burton R.
Whaley, William S.
Wheat, Newton L.
White, Grover C., Jr.
White, James A.
White, Wendell A.
Whitehead, Richard T.
Whitley, Walter J.
Whitlock, Richard T.
Whitman, Donald L.
Wholey, Lloyd C.
Wikeen, Donald B.
Wilbur, Harley D.
Wilder, Fred W.
Wilgus, Carlton L.
Wilhite, Alan S.
Wilkins, James R., Jr.
Wilkinson, Donald W.
Wille, James E.
Willi, Thomas A.
Williams, William A., III
Willingham, William E., Jr.
Wilson, Alexander B.
Wilson, Joseph W.
Winton, John R., Jr.
Wise, Gerald W.
Wiseman, Richard F.
Wisenbaker, Eugene M.
Wood, Peter W.
Woodruff, Richard F.
Woodworth, Charles M.
Woolcock, Thomas E.
Wooldridge, Edmund T., Jr.
Worchesek, Robert R.
Wright, William B.
Wuest, Carl I.
Wuethrich, Don L.
Wunderlich, Robert
Wurzbacher, Robert T.
Yowell, Grover M.
Ziarnik, Walter P.
Zink, Stewart T.
Zwolinski, Frank J.

Lt. Comdrs. Lucy B. Caskey and Muriel J. Lewis for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the line subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 2, 1964:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Raul H. Castro, of Arizona, to be Ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Robert W. Goodnow to be major, and ending Humphrey K. Hastings, Jr., to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 24, 1964.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Robert Abraham to be colonel, and ending Sumner Willard to be professor of foreign languages, U.S. Military Academy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 21, 1964.

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives and alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 19th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

To be representatives

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.
RUSSELL B. LONG, U.S. Senator from the State of Louisiana.
FRANK CARLSON, U.S. Senator from the State of Kansas.
William C. Foster, of the District of Columbia.
Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York.

To be alternate representatives

Charles W. Yost, of New York.
Franklin H. Williams, of California.
Mrs. Gladys A. Tillett, of North Carolina.
Richard N. Gardner, of the District of Columbia.
Charles P. Noyes, of New York.
Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, vice Sydney R. Yates, resigned.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also Consuls General of the United States of America:

John W. Bowling, of Texas.
Robert A. Hurwitch, of Illinois.
John A. Lacey, of Ohio.
Walter J. Mueller, of Connecticut.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert L. Walkinshaw, of Connecticut.
Thomas E. Walsh, of Rhode Island.
John C. Weisert, of Illinois.

Robert L. Dowell, Jr., of Florida, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Richard Noyes Viets, of Texas, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

G. Paul Balabanis, of California.
Frank B. Crump, of New York.
Michael A. Davila, of Texas.
Robert W. DuBose, Jr., of California.
James J. Gormley, of New York.
Allen S. Greenberg, of the District of Columbia.
Richard A. Holloway, of California.
Coleman J. Nee, of Massachusetts.
Arnold P. Schifferdecker, of Missouri.
William Seth Shepard, of New Hampshire.
Theodore L. Smith, of New York.
Donald E. J. Stewart, of the District of Columbia.
Peter O. Suchman, of New York.
Walter Frederick Weiss, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James A. Allitto, of California.
Miss Elizabeth A. Bean, of Connecticut.
Joseph F. Becelia, of New York.
Miss Mary Rose Brandt, of Oregon.
David G. Brown, of Pennsylvania.
Donald E. Crafts, of Georgia.
Miss Mary A. Hartl, of Minnesota.
Frederick H. Hassett, of Missouri.
H. Kenneth Hill, of California.
Stuart H. Lippe, of Michigan.
James E. McGee, of California.
James Hamilton McNaughton, of New York.
Wilson A. Riley, Jr., of Connecticut.
Peter G. Smith, of Michigan.
Robert F. Starzel, of Vermont.
James Tarrant, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Heath Bowman, of Florida.
Marvin E. Brenner, of Pennsylvania.
Louis V. Ebert III, of Illinois.
Paul I. Loeb, of the District of Columbia.
James E. Markey, Jr., of Illinois.
Gordon W. Murchie, of California.
Frank Rettenberg, of New York.
Samuel R. Sanders, Jr., of Virginia.
Cecil L. Sanford, Jr., of North Carolina.
Charles G. Simmons, of Virginia.
Justin Sloane, of California.
G. Scott Sugden, of Maine.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Kent B. Crane, of Virginia.
Miss Joan Edmonds, of California.
Belmont F. Haydel, Jr., of Louisiana.
Calvin L. Thomas, Jr., of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James M. Fernald, of New Jersey.
John D. Folger, of the District of Columbia.
Paul G. Nyhus, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Alexander Akalovsky, of Maryland.
Stephen W. Baldanza, of New Jersey.
David Chavchavadze, of Massachusetts.
Earl Norbert Garrett III, of Virginia.
Francis J. Hazard, of Tennessee.
Henry K. Heuser, of Maryland.
Adolf J. Lium, of the District of Columbia.
Keith L. MacPhee, of Virginia.
Timothy A. Pfeiffer, of Maine.
Thomas E. Sawyer, of Virginia.
F. William Small, of California.
Michael Tanes, of Massachusetts.

George J. Stanger, of New York, a Foreign Service staff officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Eugene C. Patterson, of Georgia, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights, vice Robert G. Storey, resigned.

U.S. MARSHAL

James F. Delaney, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years, vice James V. Ryan, resigned.

BOARD OF PAROLE

Charlotte Paul Groshell, of Washington, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1970.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Jon O. Newman, of Connecticut, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Connecticut for the term of 4 years, vice Robert C. Zampano, resigned.

POSTMASTERS

MICHIGAN

Joseph J. Lozeau, Bridgman.

MINNESOTA

Thomas E. Torgeson, Kensington.
Edward C. Ricke, Morgan.

MONTANA

John R. McCormick, Kremlin.

NEBRASKA

Virgil C. Penny, Oxford.

PENNSYLVANIA

Victor N. Deane, Kane.
John P. Vensel, West Alexander.

WISCONSIN

Andrew G. Bernoski, Fifield.
Donovan E. Ireland, Lodi.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Galatians 6: 10: *As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men.*

Almighty God, may our minds and hearts this day be resident and regnant with the spirit of the Man of Galilee, who went about doing good.

We penitently confess that we are guilty of making so little of the many opportunities which we daily have of helping to build a better world.

May we never be content to sing the praises and place the stamp of approval upon the good deeds of others while we ourselves are standing idly by.

Inspire us with a passion to make a worthy contribution to the higher welfare of our beloved country and all mankind.

Grant that we may be the champions of those values in life which are abiding and enduring.

Help us then to meet and minister to the moral and spiritual needs and demands of humanity, for man cannot live by bread alone.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1096. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1640. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 65–6.