

U.S.S. *John C. Calhoun*, our 26th Polaris nuclear submarine. We also have in operation 20 attack type nuclear submarines, making a total of 46. The *Calhoun* was built by the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., of Newport News, Va.

This ship is named for John Caldwell Calhoun (1782-1850). The pattern of Calhoun's life was not unlike that of the Founding Fathers. Of him and his two great political antagonists—Webster and Clay—James Bryce wrote in 1888 that they were "the ornaments" of their generation, "not indeed rising to the stature of Washington or Hamilton, but more remarkable than any save one among the statesmen who have followed them."

Calhoun belonged to the second generation of American political thinkers and public men; men who had never known life in a colony. He was born in the year when the Nation had attained de facto independence—though it took another 18 months for the treaty of peace to be signed at Paris. Like the Founding Fathers, Calhoun was well-educated, graduating from Yale with distinction. Subsequently he studied law, was admitted to the bar and practiced his profession for a brief while. But nearly all his adult life—some 40 years—he spent in elected or appointed office: as State legislator, Member of the Congress, Senator, Secretary of War, Secretary of State, twice Vice President, and almost President. His family—of Scotch-Irish ancestry from Pennsylvania—had settled in the Carolina uplands. Calhoun thus grew up in the pioneer West; for half his life he was indeed its spokesman. But marriage into the Piedmont planter aristocracy changed his views and he became the voice of the deep South—its political theorist, master logician, impassioned orator. It has been said of him that he "welded the South and divided the Union."

Calhoun's adult life spanned almost the whole of that turbulent period in American history when, after an early era of good feeling, the young Nation had to come to grips with ever deepening regional conflicts between industrial North, pioneer West, and plantation South—conflicts which time and time again brought on crises that threatened to tear the Union asunder, as indeed they did in the end. But prior to the fratricidal war that finally established this Nation as an indivisible Union, the Senate reverberated with constitutional debates that "transfixed the Nation." Calhoun, Webster, and Clay were the principal antagonists. Of their debates, Charles A. Beard wrote that they were memorable forensic contests, "worthy of a place in the annals of oratory beside the noblest intellectual tourneys of ancient and modern times." The men who participated, the "eloquence and cogency of their arguments" and not least "the results that flowed from their deliberations," make these debates a part of our history with which every American should be acquainted. Not only do we profit by studying them, for they vividly illuminate the travail that went into the building of the Union we so lightly take for granted today, but also they teach us that men of intelligence, education and integrity, alike in their deep devotion to our political covenant, may yet differ bitterly because to each it has a different meaning.

Two important political innovations occurred in Calhoun's life: the evolution of the American party as we know it today, and the unique American system of choosing nominees for the Presidency in national party conventions. Though not mentioned in the Constitution or envisaged by the Founding Fathers, these two cornerstones of our political life are today as firmly established as any part of the written covenant. Still worth reading is Calhoun's "A Disquisition on Government" which contains a lucid exposition of the American political party: how it is formed, how it operates. Written

near the end of his life, the book reflects half a century of American experience in much of which Calhoun participated.

Of Calhoun's many quotable statements, one seems singularly appropriate today: "We are greatly and rapidly—I was about to say fearfully—growing. This is our pride and our danger, our weakness and our strength."

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

STRIP MINING AND THE PROPOSED APPALACHIA BILL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I observe in this morning's newspaper that the Appalachia bill has been favorably acted upon by the committee.

In substance, a bill has been written into it which I introduced, calling for the study of the adverse impact that surface strip mining has on wildlife, fish life, vegetation, the general water supply, and the general economy of the communities which are plagued with this problem.

I have no objection to the bill being written into the Appalachia bill. However, in the Appalachia bill, before the study has been completed, there is language which I have interpreted as authorizing the expenditure of moneys for the reclamation and rehabilitation of strip-mined lands owned by private individuals.

I wrote a letter to the chairman of the committee objecting to the spending of any money for reclamation and rehabilitation of strip-mined lands until the study had been completed.

I had a talk with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and he said that he would obtain a letter from the Department of the Interior committing the Department against expenditure of any moneys for reclamation and rehabilitation of strip-mined lands until the study had been completed.

I have not seen the letter that has supposedly been written by the Department of the Interior. Hence, I let it be known that I shall object to the calling up of the Appalachia bill out of its regular order.

If unanimous consent is requested for placing it on the calendar, I shall object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe the Senator should recognize the fact that once a bill is reported from the committee, it automatically goes on the calendar.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct. That was a misstatement on my part. I know that it goes on the calendar. I meant to say that I did not wish it called up out of order.

MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, in spite of the 3-minute limitation, I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, yesterday, I voted in favor of the resolution requested by President Johnson to deal

with the Vietnam crisis. I did so because our leaders assured us that the military evidence was such that it constituted a military challenge which had to be met with a military response.

The resolution is designed to make perfectly clear that the President has the support of the Congress and the American people in meeting the recent aggression. It is designed to inform a potential aggressor that the Congress will support the President in meeting any additional attacks of that kind.

The President acted decisively, and yet with some reason and restraint in handling the attack on our naval vessels. This resolution is designed to serve notice on any potential Communist aggressor that when our ships and men are fired upon, we shall not hesitate to return the fire.

But, Mr. President, I do not wish my vote for the resolution to be interpreted as an endorsement of our longstanding and apparently growing military involvement in Vietnam. I have had serious misgivings about our entanglement in Vietnam since we were first committed to that course 10 years ago. For 8 years prior to that commitment, the French had tried unsuccessfully to reassert their rule in southeast Asia.

That effort ended in disaster in 1954 after the cream of the French Army had been destroyed by guerrilla jungle fighting. It ended only after the expenditure of vast sums of American aid to France.

Today, 10 years after our inheritance of the French responsibility in southeast Asia, we seem to be faring no better than the French. It is my own judgment that we cannot win a conflict against sustained guerrilla activity in Vietnam without enthusiastic and vigorous action on the part of the people and the Government of South Vietnam. I do not think that kind of widespread effort has been demonstrated.

On the contrary, there seems to be considerable reluctance and a general lack of enthusiasm to carry the fighting in South Vietnam. Instead, the present leader of South Vietnam, General Khanh, is urging us on to a major American military onslaught against North Vietnam.

Any such action on our part would be fraught with the gravest of dangers and could very well entangle us in a war to the death on a vast scale claiming the lives of countless thousands of American boys. It could set the stage for world war III, involving this time the forces of Red China.

I propose, therefore, a conference of the involved nations to seek a political settlement in southeast Asia. I think the 14-nation conference suggested by General de Gaulle ought to be seriously considered. The fact that General de Gaulle frequently irritates American sensibilities is no reason to reject an otherwise fruitful suggestion. France has been the friend of America in peace and war throughout our history. Her people and her Government have had a long experience in southeast Asia.

As the Secretary-General of the U.N., Mr. U Thant, has said, it is difficult for the United Nations to undertake a settle-

18078

ment of the southeast Asia problem for the simple reason that neither North Vietnam nor the Chinese mainland is a member of the United Nations. I would hope, however, that any agreement which could be worked out at a conference of the kind which I have suggested would be enforced by the United Nations.

There will be objections to discussing a southeast Asia settlement with Red China since we do not recognize the existence of the present government of the Chinese mainland. But that government does in fact exist. It is in control of the most populous nation in the world, and it is a major factor to be reckoned with in any satisfactory settlement of the problems now convulsing southeast Asia.

Any settlement in southeast Asia that ignores China is largely useless. I am not speaking here of the larger problem of diplomatic recognition of China or her admission to the United Nations. What I am saying is that we are involved in a terribly dangerous military conflict which can only be resolved by a political settlement. If that settlement involves, as I believe it does, discussions with the Chinese as well as the North Vietnamese, let us not jeopardize the peace of the world by diplomatic rigidity. We have every right to be skeptical about Chinese commitments considering their disappointing record following the Laotian agreement. But this is no justification for a refusal to seek again a safeguarded agreement with the Chinese on southeast Asia.

In my judgment, an indefinite continuance of the military conflict in South Vietnam is a hopeless course that will lead in the end either to defeat or entanglement in the kind of major war which we are ill-prepared to fight in Asia.

Let us seek a political settlement as soon as possible for a problem that is basically political.

Mr. President, during the debate on the resolution passed by the Senate, I raised certain questions about whether we were, in effect, surrendering control over our Asia policy to the ruler of South Vietnam. I asked if we should not make it clear that we would not bind ourselves to military action in the event that the generals of South Vietnam should undertake military attacks on North Vietnam without our prior approval.

These and other questions are well put by Mr. James Reston in an article in the New York Times of Friday, August 7, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SOME BASIC QUESTIONS ABOUT VIETNAM
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 6.—The Nation has united quickly behind the President's strong military action in Vietnam, but unity and speed, important as they are in the present crisis, should not muffle some fundamental questions about the future political and military relationships in that area.

First, should there not be a formal public undertaking by the South Vietnamese Government that the military weapons supplied by the United States will not be used in

offensive measures against Communist North Vietnam without the advance consent of the United States?

Second, should not the United States give a similar formal undertaking to the Government of South Vietnam?

Third, is the mission of the United States in South Vietnam to provide arms and advice to the Government of South Vietnam, as stated officially in the past, or is President Johnson now asking for a congressional resolution that would authorize him to take any military measures he pleases in all of southeast Asia at the request of any southeast Asian ally?

THE FORMOSA PRECEDENT

The official view here is that it is not helpful to raise such questions when the United States must act together in a hurry, but the President, as Commander in Chief, has the power to repel any new sudden attack, as he did last weekend, and it may be wise to take a day or two to analyze where we are and where we are going.

Obviously, no formal agreement between the United States and South Vietnam could be permitted to interfere with each government's right of self-defense. No American destroyer captain under Communist attack is going to be asked to wireless Saigon for permission to defend himself, and no South Vietnamese military unit defending South Vietnam is going to be asked to get permission from the United States before firing on its attackers.

However, any attack on North Vietnam by either the United States or the South Vietnamese clearly involves the possibility of retaliation by the Communists on both, and thus should be launched only by joint agreement.

This principle of joint action in mutual danger was appended to the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of China signed here in December of 1954.

At that time, Secretary of State Dulles and Ambassador George K. C. Yeh of the Chinese Republic exchanged letters, the key paragraph of which read as follows:

"In view of the obligations of the two parties under the said treaty, and of the fact that the use of force from either of these areas (Formosa or the offshore islands) by either of the parties affects the other, it is agreed that such use of force will be a matter of joint agreement, subject to action of an emergency character which is clearly an exercise of the inherent right of self-defense."

It is stated here officially that there is already an understanding with the South Vietnamese Premier, Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, that he will not attack North Vietnam without our consent, and, of course, the U.S. controls the arms and gasoline necessary for any prolonged attack, but since General Khanh has recently been waging an open propaganda campaign for an attack on the North, it is not clear why the existing understanding should not be stated formally and publicly.

After all, even fairness to the South Vietnamese requires advance consultation, at least, before any assault on the enemy's territory.

JOHNSON'S POWERS

The proposed congressional resolution, as it now stands, is a more delicate matter. It could easily be amended to include the principle of joint agreement on any attack on the North, but amending it to restrict the President's action further is more difficult, and maybe it should not be done.

But it should at least be recognized what the resolution now authorizes. It says that the United States regards the maintenance of peace and security in southeast Asia as vital to its national interest and to world peace. And it adds:

"The United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist, any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

This is a little different from merely sending arms and advisers to South Vietnam. It would approve any military action as the President determines in any part of southeast Asia, including military action in support of any nation in the Southeast Asia Treaty (whose military support of South Vietnam has been virtually nil), provided our military action were sought and the President approved.

Maybe this is what the country wants and there is a good case to be made for it, but even in the hurry to get the resolution passed there shouldn't be much objection to looking at what it says and what it doesn't say.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I find the speech of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] very interesting, but very belated. For approximately 6 months the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Oregon have been urging support for the very suggestions which the Senator from South Dakota made this morning. His views, of course, are welcome even under the saying "Better late than never." Although conversion is always welcome, in my judgment, if Senators who have held the views of the Senator from South Dakota—and many of them have held them privately for these many months—had joined the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon 5 or 6 months ago in urging an economic, political, and diplomatic settlement of the Asiatic strife under the rules of international law, we might have been able to change the warmaking course of our Government in Asia. But one of the saddest things is that during all those months the talk of many Senators in the cloakroom has been noticeably different from their silence on the floor of the Senate. I hope that the Senator from South Dakota and others who share his views will now proceed with some vigor in trying to make their representations and their suggestions known to this administration to see if we can stop the warmaking course the United States is taking in Asia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I remind Senators that the Senate is in the morning hour, but that Senators, of course, may have additional time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, I shall ask for an additional minute so that I may yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] for a question.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the point raised by the Senator, in my judgment, about the involvement if South Vietnam proceeds to move northward into North Vietnam is very significant.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, there is a treatment of the subject by me. In my judgment, the SEATO treaty applies only when there

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18079

has been aggression by an outside nation against a member of SEATO. That aggression must be by a Communist country. And it must be such as we consider would endanger our security.

In my judgment, it is clear that under the SEATO agreement we have no right or no obligation to become participants in any invasion aside from an invasion by an aggressor against one of our allies. It was on that basis that I approved that measure.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I hope the Senator's interpretation is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I suggest that the Senator read it.

Mr. McGOVERN. I feel greatly reassured.

FACTS ON THE HOUSING AND SCHOOL SITUATION AMONG MISSISSIPPI NEGROES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in the midst of great emotional social issues, it is almost impossible to get an objective report. Normal day-to-day facts are virtually ignored.

But occasionally such a factual and objective report does filter into the press of the Nation. I have been most pleased to read in the Christian Science Monitor—one of the Nation's truly great newspapers, published in Boston—a story that does attempt to give some of the true facts about Mississippi.

Because this article by Mr. Saville R. Davis presents the facts of the housing and school situation among Mississippi Negroes, I want to make this factual reporting available to Members of the Senate.

I, therefore, request unanimous consent that this article entitled "Negro Housing, Plus Side Down in Dixie," from the Christian Science Monitor, of August 6, 1964, be printed at this point in the Record.

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

NEGRO HOUSING—PLUS SIDE DOWN IN DIXIE (By Saville R. Davis)

JACKSON, Miss.—It seems next to impossible in the midst of civil turmoil in Mississippi this summer to write what would be considered a fair-minded and objective account by both sides.

Emotions understandably run high.

Facts are oppositely interpreted and there are comparatively few areas where there is agreement on what facts are.

Both sides recognize this and go their own ideological ways and it would tax Solomon himself to carry water on both shoulders.

Reporters sent to Mississippi by the national news media try to cover events from both sides. They wear jackets and neckties in the steaming heat, remain professionally aloof, and go back and forth between the authorities and civil rights workers.

CHASTENING EXPERIENCE

Their assignment is to cover the news, and the ordinary definition of news does not include the arguments for segregation which are largely unchanging. But the Negroes are speaking out for the first time militantly and are under vigilante attack, so they tend to get more attention.

This correspondent made a systematic tour of the Negro districts of Jackson with an advocate of the traditional and evolving south-

ern society. The plan was to show me everything, good and bad. We covered all sections, I went along the tracks and down alleys and confirmed the findings later with a Jackson Negro on the side of civil rights.

It was a chastening experience for an inhabitant of a big northern city. The eye could readily see why white Mississippians are convinced the North "does not understand what we have done for the Negro."

There was nothing to be found that could be called a shanty town of any significant dimension in the city of Jackson itself. (Outside, of course, roll the rural Mississippi areas where the picture would be entirely different.) At the other end of the scale there were substantial numbers of well-to-do Negro houses of modern design, inviting and tastefully landscaped.

NEATLY DRESSED CHILDREN

But it was the great bulk of modest or small-sized houses that caught and held the eye. Except for occasional rows of really tiny houses, roof by roof, they were set in enough land to permit a modest bit of landscaping. The grass was trimly cut. There were gardens, normally, with blooms that many a Northern suburbanite would envy.

Houses were almost uniformly well painted. Roofs looked tight. Porches seemed to be in a good state of repair. One had to search for the untidy sight, the unpainted wall, and conspicuously few had much bare earth in place of green. There were usually plenty of trees, often covered with blossoms. The streets were clean. Children playing about were as neatly dressed as children in a low-income area could be.

The Negro schools were mostly in attractive, modern, efficient-looking buildings of the type that now is mushrooming everywhere. One was a gaily roofed complex of imaginative contemporary design that would have made a New England town selectman frown sternly and mutter about the tax rate. They were, of course, segregated schools.

It was all in startling contrast to a Negro ghetto in a Northern big city with its plague of slums, its rundown rattle-trap schools and the attendant air of hopelessness with respect to paint, repairs, and blades of grass.

There are lines here in Jackson dividing the various Negro sections from those that are white and they are clear for the most part; there are only a few mixed sections. But so are the lines fairly clear in the areas of what is called de facto segregation in the North.

A Northerner could argue that his cities are old and economically tired and that waves of immigrants had swept through the old parts of the city and turned them into badlands and the well-to-do had moved out. But it was not always green and kempt in Jackson either. The kind of landlordism that charges exorbitant rates for decaying hovels across the South used to reign here, too.

But Jackson decided to send in the health authorities and clean up. The landlords were told quite simply, and progressively, "do this" and "do that" or take down. It was repair or raze. They were given time but not, in the tradition of the Northern city, political exemption. So the present neatness, verdure, and obvious housing self-respect came about.

MODERN SCHOOL

This is not the place to recite the arguments which support the southern system. In the interests of balance they would have to be matched by the counterarguments on the other side and this was a tour, not a polemic. Suffice it to say that some Negroes go north from Jackson and stay; others go north and return.

It is obvious that those who stay away are willing to pay a heavy cost in terms of slum living (unless they are the fortunate few who can break out somehow) in order to

exchange the system of formal segregation here for one that is factually and imperfectly segregated, but legally equal.

Those who return to the South obviously prefer the kind of life that offers a higher physical standard and condition of living while formally segregated.

In Laflore County, several hours away, I was taken on a tour of the all-Negro Amanda Elzy School by County Superintendent of Education Otis W. Allen. It was a showpiece and an impressive sight. Few of the new public schools in wealthy northern suburbs have so generous a tract of land for playing fields, buildings, and open vistas.

Visits to typical classrooms in both the elementary and high school sections showed a high pride in room decoration by the children and a high seriousness among the older students. Physics in one classroom was being taught by the new methods that give students fascinating problems to mull over at home and draw them into thinking and working their own way into physics in class.

EARNEST STUDENTS

There were hot meals for those who could afford an inexpensive cafeteria; others brought their lunches. Athletes were doing tough exercises on a field (their teams have done well) and students twirling and tooting for the school band in the gym. Classes like home economics had furnished rooms, fitted up by students in the school shop, in which to practice, and large display cases in the corridors to tend.

Most significant of all was to slip unobserved into the library and see it filled with students obviously working hard.

Whatever the arguments for and against segregating schools, of which this correspondent heard many on both sides, here was the process of education in full blast and here was a generation of Negro students learning hard from Negro teachers and principals under physical conditions that would startle the victim of a typical northern Negro slum school. Only the few Negroes in unsegregated public or private schools in the suburbs have comparable surroundings.

REPORT ON THE RESTORATION OF THE OLD SENATE AND SUPREME COURT CHAMBERS IN THE U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, because of the many expressions of renewed interest I have received concerning the restoration of the old Senate and Supreme Court Chambers in the Capitol Building, I want to make a very brief report on the status of this work.

Although no funds for this project are included in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for 1965, now under consideration, I am pleased to report that the necessary planning activities are moving along in good order at the present time. The sum of \$37,500, all of which has now been obligated, was included in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for 1964 to provide funds for the preparation of working drawings, specifications and cost estimates for the restoration. On March 6, 1964, the Architect of the Capitol entered into a contract with Associate Architects for the preparation of these documents. In addition, on March 9, 1964, the Architect secured the services of a historian from the National Park Service on a reimbursable basis to conduct the necessary research concerning these Chambers, including a search of the records at the

National Archives, for the period of 1807-60.

It is anticipated that the research at the National Archives will be completed by the end of this month. Pending completion of this research, the Associate Architects have obtained detailed information regarding the existing conditions in both Chambers, and working drawings of these spaces are being roughed out. However, final preparation of the drawings and specifications must be delayed until the required research is completed.

I am advised by the Architect of the Capitol that all of this work will be completed some time this fall. Based on the working drawings and specifications, the Architect will then prepare the cost estimates for actual restoration. It is expected that funds will be requested for this work in fiscal year 1966.

I am highly pleased to report this progress to the Senate, Mr. President, and I anxiously look forward to the time when these two historic chambers are substantially restored to the condition in which they existed and were furnished when last occupied by the Senate and Supreme Court in 1859 and 1860, respectively. In my opinion, these Chambers will be among the most outstanding and important historical shrines in our Nation. They will be appreciated and enjoyed by all who visit the Capitol, as well as those who labor here, for it was in those very rooms that many great decisions were made which have shaped the destiny of our Nation. The restoration and opening of these Chambers for public viewing will be a tribute to the outstanding roles that the Senate and the Supreme Court have played in our history.

E. A. ROLFE, JR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2215) for the relief of E. A. Rolfe, Jr., and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. McCLELLAN, and Mr. HRUSKA conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROVISION OF QUARTERS, HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE, ETC., TO CERTAIN CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1833) to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture, and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for

other purposes, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of this Act—
(1) "Government" means the Government of the United States of America.

(2) "agency" means—
(A) each executive department of the Government;

(B) each agency or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government;

(C) each corporation owned or controlled by the Government, except the Tennessee Valley Authority; and

(D) the General Accounting Office.
(3) "employee" means a civilian officer or employee of an agency.

(4) "United States" means the several States of the United States of America, the District of Columbia, the territories and possessions of the United States, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(5) "quarters" means quarters owned or leased by the Government.

(6) "facilities" means household furniture and equipment, garage space, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service.

(7) "member" and "uniformed services" have the meanings given them by section 101 of title 37, United States Code.

Sec. 2. Whenever conditions of employment or of availability of quarters warrant such action, the head of each agency may provide, directly or by contract, any employee stationed in the United States, with quarters and facilities.

Sec. 3. Rental rates for quarters provided for an employee under section 2 of this Act or occupied on a rental basis by an employee or a member of the uniformed services under any other provision of law, and charges for facilities made available in connection with the occupancy of such quarters, shall be based on the reasonable value of the quarters and facilities to the employee or the member of the uniformed services concerned, in the circumstances under which the quarters and facilities are provided, occupied, or made available. The amounts of such rates and charges shall be paid by, or deducted from the salary of, such employee or member of the uniformed services, or otherwise charged against him in accordance with law. The amounts of payroll deductions for such rates and charges shall remain in the applicable appropriation or fund, but, whenever payment of such rates and charges is made by any other method, the amounts of payment shall be credited to the Government as provided by law.

Sec. 4. Whenever, as an incidental service in support of a program of the Government, any quarters and facilities are provided, by appropriate authority of the Government, to any person other than an employee or a member of the uniformed services, the rates and charges therefor shall be determined in accordance with this Act. The amounts of the payments of such rates and charges shall be credited to the Government as provided by law.

Sec. 5. An employee or a member of the uniformed services shall not be required to occupy quarters on a rental basis unless the head of the agency concerned shall determine that necessary service cannot be rendered, or that property of the Government cannot adequately be protected, otherwise.

Sec. 6. The President may issue regulations governing the provision, occupancy, and availability of quarters and facilities, the determination of rates and charges therefor, and other related matters, as are necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act. The head of each agency may prescribe and issue such regulations, not inconsistent with the regulations of the President, as may be necessary and appropri-

ate to carry out the functions of such agency head under this Act.

Sec. 7. Section 3 of this Act shall not be held or considered to repeal or modify any provision of law authorizing the provision of quarters or facilities, either without charge or at rates or charges specifically fixed by law.

Sec. 8. Section 3 of the Act of March 5, 1928 (45 Stat. 193; 5 U.S.C. 75a), is hereby repealed.

Sec. 9. The foregoing provisions of this Act shall become effective on the sixtieth day following the date of enactment of this Act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters and facilities to civilian officers, and employees of the Government, and for other purposes."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments. I have checked the question with the senior member of the committee from which the bill was reported, the ranking member of the committee on the minority side of the aisle, and also with the minority leadership. So far as I know, there are no objections to the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to.

BEEF EXPORTS—BEEF PURCHASE PROGRAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, this body recently took action, in approving higher quotas for imported red meat, to improve the lot of the hard-pressed American cattleman. At the time when that action was taken, I pointed out that this problem and the plight of the cattleman are of such dimensions that no single action alone will provide the necessary improvement in fat cattle prices.

I was pleased to note in the August issue of the Wyoming Stockman Farmer, an excellent journal published monthly in Cheyenne, Wyo., an editorial on the need to promote the sale of American beef abroad and an article detailing the beef purchase program of the Department of Agriculture.

The editorial and the article demonstrate the awareness that we must be working on all fronts to ease the cost-price squeeze which has caught our cattlemen. I ask unanimous consent that both the editorial and the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wyoming Stockman-Farmer, August 1964]

MORE PROMOTION

Although, as most of our readers will agree, we ordinarily are opposed to Government directives, and certainly still feel that wide-open beef imports have had a depressing effect on cattle prices, nevertheless, we also are in favor of promoting a product. And, thus we will have to applaud the efforts of Government, and livestock leaders, to seek new markets for Wyoming's agricultural products.

Jay Taylor, cattleman of Amarillo, Tex., and chairman of the special expert Advisory