

ence, as printed in the subcommittee hearings, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SPECIAL DONABLE PROPERTY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,

Washington, D.C., July 9, 1962.

HON. IVAN NESTINGEN, Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my attention that the Symington subcommittee on the stockpile is considering the introduction of a bill which would permit the use of surplus stockpile materials in AID programs and also for Federal use. It is my understanding that many of the materials, especially metals, in the stockpile could well be used in certain of our educational institutions for various purposes.

The legal opinion from GSA is to the effect that surplus stockpile material is not donable under the provisions of section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. I would therefore appreciate your views as to whether or not it would be worthwhile to propose legislation

to make some of the surplus stockpile material available for educational purposes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN, Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Donable Property.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, Washington, July 26, 1962.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN, Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: On July 13 we replied to your letter of July 9 concerning the use of surplus stockpile materials as donable surplus property.

We have reviewed the situation with educational authorities to ascertain which items could be effectively utilized by schools, colleges, and universities. This review shows that selected materials could be used in instructional programs at different levels. Others might be used in special research and development activities in colleges and universities; still others might be used in the general plant maintenance and operation programs of schools and colleges. The table which follows gives illustrative examples of some of these materials and the potential uses for them in these areas.

ent programs for other Federal surplus property.

Sincerely yours,

IVAN A. NESTINGEN, Under Secretary.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, material in the stockpile is being sought by educational institutions. Mercury is an example.

Last year, it appeared for a time that 52,000 flasks of mercury, each weighing some 76 pounds, and acquired at a total cost of more than \$12.2 million, might be excess to need, and might be available under the donable surplus property program. Before it was finally decided to place that mercury in the stockpile, colleges and universities in 35 States had applied for more than the total amount available.

Mr. President, adoption of my amendment would be in the public interest in education and health, in industry, and economic development. Public property, bought with public funds to meet a public need, is worth much more to public institutions than it is to junk dealers. The donable surplus property program has provided our hard-pressed schools and hospitals with land and equipment they could not have afforded. It has helped to educate our youngsters and to care for the sick and injured. Modification of surplus equipment for classroom use has challenged the students, and also the teachers, who thereby also were instructed. The program has stimulated research in the national interest. In many cases, research has led to production contracts, profitable to the school and the surrounding business community. The program has created new markets—for experience has shown that a research program, begun with donated material, does not end when that material is gone. Rather, the institution goes into the open market and buys new material. The donable surplus property program has been an outstanding success. It should be extended to include material in the stockpile found to be surplus to present need.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not speak at great length.

Whenever I listen to a Member of the Senate attempt to rationalize the U.S. outlawry in southeast Asia, I propose to register my dissent.

Mr. President, as I said earlier, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] made a historic speech this afternoon on the United Nations. It was a speech that needed to be made.

I am sorry that he marred his speech at the end in his colloquy with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, for, if I understood him correctly, he underwrote as a present policy the making of war in southeast Asia by the United States.

Mr. President, I not only disagree with that part of the speech of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] supported by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], with whom I also disagree, but I thor-

Strategic material	Potential uses in—			
	Instructional program		Research program, colleges and universities	Plant operation and maintenance program
	Elementary and secondary schools	Colleges and universities		
Asbestos	X	X	X	X
Copper	X	X	X	X
Corundum	X	X	X	X
Diamond dies	X	X	X	X
Feathers and down				X
Graphite	X	X	X	X
Iodine	X	X	X	
Manganese dioxide	X	X	X	
Mercury	X	X	X	X
Pyrethrum	X	X		
Ruby			X	
Selenium	X	X	X	
Shellac	X	X	X	X

Some illustrative examples of specific usages of these materials in the four areas are outlined below.

1. Laboratory instruction:

Mercury: Used in chemistry and physics laboratories for a number of purposes, such as the measurement of low atmospheric pressures, chemical reactions, and various laboratory instruments.

Quartz crystals: Used in physics laboratories for the generation and detection of high frequency and electromagnetic radiation.

2. Shop training:

Diamond dies: Useful in numerous types of grinding and cutting operations.

Shellac: Not only used in plant operation and maintenance (separate category above), but also in shop training (cabinets, boats, models, etc.).

3. Research:

Ruby: Basic ingredient in very new development of ruby masers which are extremely powerful beams of light, the numerous applications of which are still the subject of much research.

Selenium: One of elements used in doping crystals of germanium and silicon for producing semiconductors. These form basis of all types of transistors and junction devices.

4. Operation and maintenance of plants:

Feathers: A natural product, probably requiring no further processing, which would be useful to any institution responsible for housing programs.

5. Operation of hospitals and clinics:

Iodine: Useful not only in chemistry laboratory instruction (separate category above), but also, in more refined form, in hospital treatment of wounds, etc.

The extent to which these materials could be used and the amounts which might be required cannot be predicted at this time for several reasons:

(a) The degree of refinement of the stockpile materials is not clearly indicated in the report available to us, making it difficult to determine if a particular material would be usable in the form in which it would be made available to the schools and colleges;

(b) Instructional programs, curriculums, and teaching methods of schools and colleges are undergoing extensive revisions at the present time; and

(c) Many of the research and development programs of colleges and universities are restricted or classified. Information on needed materials is available only from the directors of these activities. (This will take time.)

Since more specific information on the types and quantities of strategic materials which could be used by schools and colleges is advisable, we will continue our inquiries. However, on the basis of the information available, it is apparent that many of the items in the stockpile are needed in health and educational programs. We would suggest that the materials be made available in addition to eligible health and educational donees on the same basis as provided in pres-

oughly disagree with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], on whose committee I have the privilege of serving. In my judgment the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee talked in terms of myths, although he seems to be against myths in American foreign policy. How in the world the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee thinks that we can continue to violate one obligation after another under the U.N. Charter and violate our obligations under the Geneva accords, and preserve the United Nations as a force for keeping peace in the world, I am at a loss to understand. How the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee can think that the United States can make war in southeast Asia in violation of our international law obligations and expect the United Nations to survive, I am at a loss to understand.

I wish to recapitulate these points very quickly for the Record, for under articles XXXIII, XXXVII, and XLI, of the United Nations Charter, as I have pointed out in a series of speeches on international obligations on the floor of the Senate for the last several weeks, the United States has the clear treaty duty to take the southeast Asia crisis to the United Nations. Instead we have walked out on the United Nations. By walking out on the United Nations, by committing acts of war, the United States will go down in history as a country that helped scuttle the United Nations, unless we proceed without further delay to rebuild the United Nations. The United Nations is much weaker today than it was 90 days ago. It is much weaker today than it was 90 days ago because of the United States. I am at a loss to understand why we have played into the hands of the Communists. I am at a loss to understand why we have walked out on our professed ideals about wishing to substitute the rule of law for the jungle law of military force. It is still a jungle law of military force when it is the U.S. military force as much as in the case of Red China, Red Russia, or any other power in the world.

We started to pave the way for the inexcusable position in which the United States is now occupying itself in world affairs when John Foster Dulles, back in 1954, decided not to sign the first Geneva accord, and then persuaded South Vietnam not to sign it. Then the United States set up its protectorate in South Vietnam. The United States set up its puppet government in South Vietnam. Do we think that the world does not know it? We are in no better position in South Vietnam than Red Russia is in East Germany. We have no more right to follow the course of action we are following in South Vietnam than Red Russia has to follow the course of action she is following in East Germany. We are making war. We profess to be seeking peace.

I was shocked to hear the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who made a speech not so long ago on foreign policy myths, propound the great myth that the United States stands for peace,

and in order to preserve it, we are going to make war. That is pure nonsense.

Mr. President, John Foster Dulles also created a paper tiger known as SEATO. It is pretty well so recognized now. Sulzberger, the editor of the New York Times, wrote in a column not so long ago—and I used it in argument previously here on the floor of the Senate—that in a conference he had with John Foster Dulles, one of the reasons assigned for our taking the course of action we took in regard to SEATO was to give us what John Foster Dulles thought would be a legal right to follow the course of action that we followed in South Vietnam.

But, of course, it did not give us that legal right. If the United States were taken before the World Court on any phase of this problem, I am satisfied that we would lose a unanimous decision, because we are dead wrong.

Mr. President, who created the paper tiger known as the SEATO, and who persuaded Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines, France, and Great Britain to sign it? It is the brain-child of John Foster Dulles. That treaty created what is known in international law as a protocol agreement. That is what our administration is constantly relying upon. Not so long ago the President said that he felt all the legal authority he needed—I paraphrase him, but accurately—was the SEATO treaty. The SEATO treaty does not give Lyndon B. Johnson one iota of right to make war in South Vietnam in the absence of a declaration of war. The President of the United States is violating the Constitution every hour that he proceeds to make war in South Vietnam. The Constitution does not give the President of the United States the power to make war. That power happens to be vested in the Congress of the United States. But I say most respectfully, but critically that too many of my colleagues are ducking, weaving, and hedging on this problem.

They are not facing their responsibilities, born of the oath that they took when they came into this body. We are making war in South Vietnam, and we are making it unconstitutionally. We are killing American boys illegally. The number that we have killed thus far is a small number compared with the tens of thousands that we shall kill if we do not stop this administration's course of action in southeast Asia.

The American people apparently will have choices between degrees next November. They will have the choice between a slower-paced Democratic war and a faster-paced Republican war.

Mr. President, it is a sad thing that we have not officially called for a SEATO meeting and put it up to our alleged allies who have welshed on us in regard to the protocol agreement involving South Vietnam.

One of the saddest things is the constant reference by the leaders of this Government to the fact that North Vietnam, Laos, and Red China are violating the Geneva accords; and so they are. They ought to be held to an accounting. They ought not to be held to an accounting on the basis of a unilateral military action by the United States setting itself

up as the policeman of the world to enforce the Geneva accords, particularly when we have already been found guilty of violating the Geneva accords ourselves. For the Geneva accords set up a so-called neutral commission to police them and to point out to the world their violations. The interesting thing is that that neutral commission found North Vietnam a violator of the Geneva accords and South Vietnam a violator of the Geneva accords. The basis on which it found South Vietnam a violator of the Geneva accords was its accepting American military assistance and American military personnel in violation of the prohibitions of the Geneva accords.

That is why I am charging my Government, with sadness, of being in violation of international law in South Vietnam. It is not pleasant to make that charge, but I think there is still a fighting chance of preserving the peace, and we do not support the best interests of our country by supporting this administration's program in South Vietnam.

An interesting statement was made by the majority whip [Mr. Humphrey], and I told him I would answer him. He said he is against the escalation of war in southeast Asia, and he is satisfied the administration is against it, too. He could not be more wrong, for the program of this administration is headed toward the escalation of war in southeast Asia, and we have already done it to a serious degree.

Under article IV of the Geneva accord, we had no right to drop a single bomb on Laos. But we did. It was an act of war. It would be found to be an act of war by any international juridical tribunal that tried us. We would be found guilty.

This country has violated the borders of Cambodia. I have been advised by military personnel that we have also found it convenient, by accident, so-called, to violate the borders of North Vietnam.

Mr. President, the blueprint exists to escalate the war unless southeast Asia does the United States' bidding.

I am also interested in the talk we have heard about our having no ambition or desire for a square inch of territory; that we seek no colony. But back of it, Mr. President, is a determination for economic and military control of southeast Asia.

Before the week is over, or in the first part of next week, I expect to make a speech that I am now preparing, based upon research, as to the economic objectives and the economic operations of the United States in southeast Asia. The facts about our economic plans pierce the balloon about the motives of the United States in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, we are scuttling the United Nations by this course of action. I do not know how in the world we think we can have much influence against Russia in the future as she violates treaties by pleading that the United Nations exercise jurisdiction against Russia's violations of international law. What we ought to do is backtrack now.

I have never proposed, and I do not propose tonight, that the United States

pull up stakes and get out of South Vietnam. But there is all the difference in the world between a program that seeks to make peace and a program that seeks to make war.

As the Senator from Idaho pointed out, the Vietcong are supposed to have some 25,000 members. The Government of South Vietnam has at least 400,000 troops. South Vietnam has 15 million people. If there is a situation in South Vietnam in which 400,000 South Vietnamese troops and more than \$5½ billion of American military aid to South Vietnam cannot control 25,000 Vietcong, we cannot possibly hope to win over there by pouring in American blood.

I do not propose to let the administration or the American people forget that France sacrificed 240,000 French boys in the Indonesian war, and we poured in \$1½ billion to help France conduct that war. Finally, the French people pulled down the French Government and said they had had enough.

We are going to lose if we get bogged down in a major war in Asia, and we are headed toward such a war with hundreds of thousands of American boys involved.

But, as the Senator from Idaho raised the question, when we get through with the military victory, what then? What will we have won? No war ever produced peace. When are we going to learn that sad lesson? We are going to be forced to use nuclear weapons if we get into a major war in that area, and thereby earn, deservedly, the hatred of mankind for decades and decades to come.

What are we going to do after we get a military victory? In my judgment, it is the best assurance for a bankrupt American nation, for we will not only be bled white in terms of blood, but we will be bled white in terms of financial resources.

We ought to stop thinking we can set ourselves up as the enforcement officer of the world and police it. We do not have the manpower, to begin with. Neither does the United States have the financial resources.

I close with the last topic. I completely disagree with the majority whip [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the other Senators who bespoke in favor of the appointment of General Taylor as Ambassador to Saigon.

I want the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to take note that General Taylor is not a George Marshall. General Taylor is not a Bradley. He is not even in their class. General Taylor is the one who, not so many years ago, urged the use of nuclear weapons if we got into trouble with Russia over Berlin—which means he was ready to start a nuclear war. General Taylor has been one of the architects, along with McNamara, of McNamara's war in South Vietnam. General Taylor has been one of those who has been following a course of action which, as I said in his presence this morning, and in that of the Secretary of Defense also, will lead us straight into a major war with Asia if the program is not stopped.

As I said earlier this afternoon, I cannot think of a greater mistake for Presi-

dent Johnson to make than to appoint a general who has been one of the war-making architects in South Vietnam as our Ambassador to South Vietnam.

We have an indication of what is going to happen already. We see which way the wind is blowing. His nomination will be confirmed in the Senate. But it will not be confirmed with the vote of the senior Senator from Oregon.

A great civilian Democrat should have been appointed Ambassador to South Vietnam, demonstrating to the world that, after all, this country, in the field of foreign policy, is run by civilians, and not by the Pentagon Building.

For months now the Pentagon has functioned as Secretary of State, and Dean Rusk has functioned as the Pentagon's flunkie. For months American foreign policy in South Vietnam and in southeast Asia has been determined by the Pentagon Building, and not by the State Department. It happens to be an ugly fact, but I believe it to be true. I am aghast at the fact that we are now representing to the world that we had to resort to the appointment of a military man as Ambassador in that troubled spot of the world, where, more than anywhere else, the peace of the globe is threatened.

All one has to do is read the news releases of the last couple of days to see how far we have gone in American foreign policy by way of military intervention. Admiral Felt made a statement in Taipei that the United States will risk a war with Red China if Red China interferes with this country's policy in southeast Asia. He should have had his uniform stripped from him immediately.

Under our form of government, we should not be permitting top military brass to make announcements to the world about what our foreign policy will be. That was a statement which should have been made by the Secretary of State, first being approved by the President, or by the President himself.

Then General Harkins came back from southeast Asia and was quoted by the New York Times as making a similar statement.

I say that General Harkins was completely out of character. His job as a military officer is to carry out military orders, not to determine foreign policy.

Mr. President, here is one voice that will continue to be raised in opposition to the war-making foreign policy of the United States. My office is being flooded—I do not know how many hundreds of communications we have received today—with communications in opposition to the policy of this administration, and in support of the position that the senior Senator from Oregon is taking in opposition to our outlawry in southeast Asia.

As I have said before, if a declaration of war is passed, then the senior Senator from Oregon will of course rally behind that declaration until the war is won, at whatever cost. But so long as there is a chance to avoid that war by seeking to persuade the people of our country and change its direction from that of marching into a great holocaust and killing

hundreds of thousands of our boys unjustifiably and needlessly, I shall continue to do what I can to plead for peace.

I suggest that if we really mean all the things that have been said this afternoon about the United Nations, then we ought to start supporting the United Nations. I say to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that he ought to be supporting the position that some of us have taken now for many weeks, asking that the United States lay the crisis before the Security Council. And if it is vetoed by Red Russia, which I think it probably would be, then we should call for an extraordinary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and let the other nations of the world join in passing on what course of action ought to be followed in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I am very sorry to find myself, as a Democrat, unalterably opposed to the position of my President in South Vietnam. But I think history will record that his position has been a mistaken one. I shall continue to hope that he will change his course of action by returning our foreign policy to the framework of international law. We should proceed to lay this Asian crisis before the United Nations. If the United Nations has the potentialities that the senior Senator from Idaho bespoke of this afternoon, then the United States ought to start using it and stop scuttling it.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor. But, in accordance with an understanding previously reached to the effect that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] had a matter to bring up, 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. 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.

#### SENATOR RANDOLPH SPEAKS AT DEDICATION OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT BRIDGE—DELIVERS ELOQUENT TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT IT MEMORIALIZES

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, earlier today our colleague, Senator RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, delivered the dedication address for the ceremony opening the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge. This structure serves as a memorial to a great President, who, as Senator RANDOLPH said, "gave to us a rich heritage and a rewarding hope as we work together in the building of a better America."

The event, sponsored by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Department of Highways, and the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, was attended by several hundred people. Included were members of the Roosevelt family.

By unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks, the items on the official program,

14304

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 23, 1964

and the eloquent address of Senator RANDOLPH.

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

## PROGRAM

Master of ceremonies: Brig. Gen. C. M. Duke, Engineer Commissioner, District of Columbia.

Music by the U.S. Navy Band, Lt. Comdr. Anthony A. Mitchell, leader.

Armed Forces Joint Color Team.

National anthem.

Invocation: Rev. Robert W. Olewiler, Grace Reformed Church.

Greetings by master of ceremonies.

Introduction of distinguished guests.

"John F. Kennedy Center March," Lt. Comdr. Anthony A. Mitchell, U.S. Navy Band.

Remarks: The Honorable Jennings Randolph, U.S. Senate.

Unveiling of plaque.

Ribbon cutting.

Motorcade will form and proceed west across bridge.

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN, SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ROADS, FORMER CHAIRMAN, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND FORMER MEMBER, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ROADS, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE THEODORE ROOSEVELT BRIDGE JUNE 23, 1964

Honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, the moment has arrived. After 14 years the bridge is a reality. Convenience and necessity are well served by this structure which provides another vital link in our Interstate Highway System.

This bridge is an enduring memorial to the labors and the patience of those who have been involved since it was first authorized by Congress 10 years ago this August. Despite the scepticism and perhaps even despair which was occasionally experienced by some of its planners, the bridge is testimony that government by committee can work. For many committees and commissions as well as a President and the Congress, have had their hands in this effort. The democratic process of consultation and compromise has finally been brought to fruition. This structure is a tribute not only to the skills that have created it, but also to the skills of persons who reconciled the many interests involved.

It is another merited memorial to the President in whose memory it is dedicated. This bridge and the Interstate System of which it is a part, are products of the needs and the technology of America in the 20th century. And President Theodore Roosevelt, whose White House years ushered in the 20th century, was the first President to lead America in its role as a world power. With his mediation of the Russo-Japanese dispute, his involvement in the dispute over Algeria

by the great European powers, and his dispatch of the Great White Fleet on its world cruise, Teddy Roosevelt was the first President to reject the traditional American attitude of nonentanglement in the affairs of the Old World. He spoke to the other powers in clear terms, serving notice that the United States had come of age and was a power to be reckoned with by all nations.

In two other major areas Theodore Roosevelt was the first President to grapple with the 20th-century problems of America. He saw clearly that the vast concentrations of wealth and power in the modern corporation exceeded in some instances the power of the individual States and rivaled that of the United States and in some instances was not in national interest. He recognized the threat and acted on it. But he also recognized the inevitability of corporate growth, was not hypnotized by the curse of bigness, and was concerned only that the corporations not outgrow the law and the people they were designed to serve. His action in bringing government suit against the railroad combine of the Northern Securities Co. launched the Federal Government in its role of effective regulation of monopolies. This was a role created under the administration of one Roosevelt and extended under that of another.

But it is for his contribution to the conservation of our natural resources that most of us honor the name and memory of Teddy Roosevelt. As a rancher, as a hunter, as an explorer, and as a historian Theodore Roosevelt acquired a deep and lasting appreciation for the generosity of nature and the scenic grandeur of the American West. Yet, he was a prophet of the 20th century in recognizing as did few of his contemporaries and none of his predecessors in the White House that the natural resources of America are not inexhaustible.

With his immense talent for life and his exuberant love of nature, Teddy Roosevelt acknowledged the responsibility of his generation—and of the Federal Government—to protect and conserve America's resources for the oncoming generations. As Robert M. La Follette wrote:

"When the historian . . . shall speak of Theodore Roosevelt, he is likely to say that he did many notable things, but that his greatest work was inspiring and actually beginning a world movement for staying territorial waste and saving for the human race the things on which alone a peaceful, progressive, and happy life can be founded."

Roosevelt urged in 1901 the creation of a national forest in my own area of Appalachia. And during his two administrations he proclaimed 5 national parks, 16 national monuments, 51 wildlife refuges, and 21 national forest reserves. One can say in accuracy that with these Executive actions and the professionalization of the U.S. Forest Service which he sponsored under Gifford Pinchot, President Theodore Roosevelt created our

national forest system and the modern conservation movement. His convictions were best expressed in his own terms when laying the cornerstone of the gateway to Yellowstone Park in 1903: "I cannot too often repeat," he stated, "that the essential feature in the present management of the Yellowstone Park, as in all similar places, is its essential democracy. . . . It is the preservation of the scenery, of the forests, of the wilderness life and the wilderness game for the people as a whole, instead of leaving the enjoyment thereof to be confined to the very rich who can control private reserves."

Roosevelt's achievements in conservation of our forest resources were equaled if not exceeded by his contribution to the wise use and development of our waterways.

In his letter to the chairman of the Inland Waterway Commission, which body he created in 1907, he wrote that "works designed to control our waterways have . . . been undertaken for a single purpose, such as the improvement of navigation, development of power, the irrigation of arid lands, or the protection of lowlands from floods. . . . While the rights of the people to these and similar uses of water must be respected, the time has come for merging local projects and uses of the inland waters in a comprehensive plan designed for the benefit of the whole country."

This was the beginning of comprehensive water resource planning in America. And President Roosevelt's principles that "every stream is a unit from its source to its mouth, and that all its uses are interdependent" have become the guiding principles of water resource planning.

It is fitting that such a man and such a President be memorialized by this island refuge in the midst of the metropolitan area of our Capital City and by the bridge which offers a vista of the island. Here are woven together the two threads of his interest and initiative in the conservation of land and water.

It was said of Theodore Roosevelt by a visiting British writer that "Roosevelt is not an American, you know. He is America." In this sense, in honoring a great man and a great President, we honor ourselves as we dedicate the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge. He gave to us a rich heritage and a rewarding hope—as we work together in the building of a better America.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 24, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.